COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

For meeting to be held on:	Submitted by:	For:
August 26, 2014	James Gates, Treasurer	Action

Subject:

2013 MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

BACKGROUND

The Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) is an initiative designed by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to provide taxpayers with information on service delivery and municipalities with a tool to improve those services over time.
A number of the measures have changed starting with 2009 reporting year, due to the inclusion of amortization of tangible capital assets making it difficult to compare to previous measures.

Objectives of the program are:

- to provide a tool to assess how well municipal services are delivered
- to improve performance: measuring the efficiency (cost) and effectiveness (quality) of local services
- to strengthen local accountability to taxpayers and promote greater understanding of municipal responsibilities by the taxpayer, and
- to provide a systematic resource that allows municipalities to share information on performance and learn better/new practices from each other

The program was introduced for the 2000 reporting year and has been refined each year since then. The program requires municipalities to collect specific data on core service areas, submit their data to the Province and report to their constituents on the results.

In order to meet the requirements of the report to taxpayers, Municipalities can report to their taxpayers through direct mail, the property tax bill, and ads in local newspapers or periodicals. They can alternatively post the information on their website.

ANALYSIS

Performance measures can be categorized in two ways; as an efficiency measure, or as an effectiveness measure.

SUBJECT: 2013 MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Efficiency measures provide a cost per unit or the ratio of input / output. The input numbers are expenditure numbers coming from the Financial Information Return (FIR), and will be divided by an output, or total units. Example: lane kilometre is an output.

Effectiveness measures provide information about the quality of service delivery, and may consist of counts (number of complaints, number of new lots created) or ratios (percentage of residential waste diverted for recycling, number of conventional transit trips per person)

Both measures are needed to properly assess service delivery. An efficiency measure, on its own, may indicate the cheapest form of service delivery and that could be perceived as optimal because it would yield the lowest cost per unit. With effectiveness measures, other factors are evaluated such as how well services meet municipal service quality goals and expectations of the public.

The attached schedule is in a format recommended by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Included are the comparative results for the years 2002 to 2011. In some instances there have been changes in the definitions resulting in significant variances in the numbers.

DEFINITIONS

lane kilometre - Is a continuous lane of road which conveys traffic in one direction. Total lane kilometres are determined by multiplying the number of lane kilometres by the number of lanes for each road.
Example: Municipality A has 140 km of roads. All roads have 2 lanes. Total lane km = 280

Example: Municipality B has 200 km of roads of which 30 km have 4 lanes. Total lane km (170 times 2, plus 30 times 4) = 460.

paved (hard top) road - Are defined as roads with an asphalt surface, concrete surface, composite pavement, portland cement or surface treatment.

source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing - Municipal Performance Measurement Program

WHAT DO THE FIGURES MEAN?

It can be useful to compare measurements with preceding years. Reasons for major variations from prior years can be determined. For example, a significant change in

weather from one year to the next and / or increases in the cost of asphalt would be factors that would impact the transportation related measurements.

Comparisons with other municipalities, especially neighbouring counties, may also be useful. However, with any municipality to municipality comparison it is important to keep in mind the following:

- although, many municipal operations are similar, they are not identical;
- due to geographic location, weather conditions can be very different, and as such impact costs; (that can be even evident within a municipality)
- approved service levels will differ; (a large urban centre within a municipality can impact costs) and;
- financial reporting on FIR's may vary.

A number of changes were introduced starting with the 2009 reporting year, some due to the introduction of amortization of tangible capital assets into the formula and others due to a change in the cost formula. The 2013 reporting requirements remain unchanged from 2011 Municipal Performance Measurement Program reporting requirements.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Municipal Performance Measures shown in Appendix A be posted on the County of Middlesex's website.

Appendix A

2013 - OPERATING COSTS
General Government

MPAC and tax write-offs have been eliminated from the General Government operating and total costs starting with 2009 reporting year

Operating Costs for Governance & Corporate Management X 100

Total Municipal Operating Costs

$1,060,772
---------- X 100
$51,834,231

= 2.0 % of total municipal operating costs were spent on Governance and Corporate Management

Previous Years

2012 = 1.9%
2011 = 1.9%
2010 = 1.8%
2009 = 2.0%

2013 Total Costs includes General Government Tangible Assets' amortization

Total Costs for Governance & Corporate Management
Plus Amortization
X 100

Total Municipal Operating Costs

$$\frac{\$1,375,973}{\$60,412,937} \times 100$$

= 2.3 % of total municipal operating costs were spent on Governance and Corporate Management

Efficiency Measure
General Government: Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a % of total municipal operating costs.

Objective
Efficient administration supporting County services

Notes
This measure reflects the cost of general government. General government includes governance, administration, financial services, legal services, information technology and human resources.

Previous Years

2012 = 2.2%
2011 = 2.2%
2010 = 2.1%
2009 = 2.3%

2013 - OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS

Includes administration and direct overhead

Operating costs for Paved Roads

Total paved lane kilometre

$2,698,615

1,583

= $1,704.75 per paved lane kilometre

Previous Years

2012 = $1,649.95
2011 = $1,363.76
2010 = $1,763.07
2009 = $1,716.33

2013 Total Costs includes Paved Road's Tangible Assets' amortization

Operating costs for Paved Roads
Plus Amortization

Total paved lane kilometre

$7,523,354

1,583
= $4,752.59 per paved lane kilometre

Efficiency Measure
Paved Roads: Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre

Objective
Efficient maintenance of paved roads

Notes
This measure is primarily patching on asphalt roads, repair including frost heave, base, utility cut; patching; shoulder maintenance; surface maintenance; surface sweeping; surface flushing; administration and direct overhead.

Previous Years

2012 = $4,607.78
2011 = $4,139.72
2010 = $4,297.46
2009 = $4,090.37

2013 - OPERATING COSTS FOR BRIDGES & CULVERTS

(New as of 2009)

Operating costs for Bridges & Culverts

Total Square Metres of Surface Area
on Bridges and Culverts

$281,808

65,397

= $4.31 per square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts

Previous Years

2012 = $14.73
2011 = $ 7.71
2010 = $11.00
2009 = $ 2.96

2013 Total Costs includes Bridges & Culverts' Tangible Assets' amortization

Operating costs for Bridges & Culverts
Plus Amortization

Total Square Metres of Surface Area on Bridges and Culverts

$678,452

65,397

= $10.37 per square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts

Efficiency Measure
Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area

Objective
Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts

Previous Years

2012 = $19.77
2011 = $12.15
2010 = $15.07
2009 = $ 7.27

2013 - WINTER CONTROL

Maintenance of Roadways per lane kilometre

Operating Costs for Winter Maintenance

Total lane km Maintained in Winter

$3,176,959

1,583

= $2,006.92 per lane kilometre maintained in winter

Efficiency Measure
Winter Control: Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.

Objective
Efficient winter road maintenance services

Notes
Factors that influence these results include:

- severity of the winter (amount of snow fall, incidents of icy conditions);
- amount and the cost of salt and sand used;
- levels of approved service;
- length of road system, and in particular length of major arterial roads within the road system;
- proximity to a large urban centre.

Previous Years

2012 = $1,208.95
2011 = $1,710.78
2010 = $1,564.34
2009 = $1,548.98
2008 = $2,425.58
2007 = $1,977.29
2006 = $1,605.73
2005 = $2,110.72
2004 = $1,902.15
2003 = $1,994.90
2002 = $1,405.87

2013 - WINTER CONTROL

Maintenance of Roadways per lane kilometre

includes Winter Control Tangible Assets' amortization

Operating Costs for Winter Maintenance
Plus Amortization

Total lane km Maintained in Winter

$3,542,389

1,583

= $2,237.77 per lane kilometre maintained in winter

Efficiency Measure
Winter Control: Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.
Objective
Efficient winter road maintenance services
Notes
Factors that influence these results include:

- severity of the winter (amount of snow fall, incidents of icy conditions);
- amount and the cost of salt and sand used;
- levels of approved service;
- length of road system, and in particular length of major arterial roads within the road system;
- proximity to a large urban centre.

Previous Years

2012 = $1,418.33
2011 = $1,903.93
2010 = $1,741.66
2009 = $1,715.11

2013– LIBRARY SERVICES

Operating costs for library services per person

Operating Costs for Library Services
Total Population

Efficiency Measure

$$\frac{\$\ 2{,}994{,}327}{70{,}903}$$

= $42.23 per person

Previous Years

2012 = $35.23
2011 = $36.03
2010 = $33.22
2009 = $32.80
2008 = $36.01
2007 = $36.70
2006 = $31.95
2005 = $32.96
2004 = $31.39

Total costs for library services per person

Total Costs for Library Services
Total Population

Efficiency Measure

$$\frac{\$\ 3{,}378{,}831}{70{,}903}$$

= $47.65

Previous Years

2012 = $40.38 per person
2011 = $40.95
2010 = $37.45
2009 = $37.03

Operating costs for library services per use

Operating Costs for Library Services

Library Services per Use

Efficiency Measure

$$\frac{\$2,994,327}{1,325,441}$$

= $2.26 per library use

Previous Years

2012 = $1.75
2011 = $1.94
2010 = $2.46
2009 = $2.37
2008 = $2.94
2007 = $2.37
2006 = $2.45
2005 = $2.24
2004 = $2.00

Operating costs for library services per use includes library's amortization

Operating Costs for Library Services
Plus Amortization

Library Services per Use

Efficiency Measure

$$\frac{\$3,378,831}{1,325,441}$$

= $2.55 per Library use

Comments:

1. "Uses" were determined by taking a census over an average week and then prorating over the year. They were adjusted for online use and activity use.
2. The County of Middlesex's facility costs are recorded as the rent paid to the lower tiers.

Previous Years

2012 = $2.01
2011 = $2.21
2010 = $2.77
2009 = $2.68

2013- ADEQUACY OF ROADS

PERCENTAGE OF PAVED LANE KILOMETRES RATED AS GOOD TO VERY GOOD

Number of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good
---------- X 100
Total number of paved lane kilometres

911 X 100

1,583

= 57.5% of lane kilometres tested were rated as good to very good

Effectiveness Measure
Adequacy of Roads: Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.

Objective
To measure the change in quality of the driving surface from year to year.

Previous Year

2012 = 57.5%
2011 = 59.9%
2010 = 59.9%
2009 = 59.9%
2008 = 52.6%
2007 = 52.6%
2006 = 49.5%
2005 = 46.66%
2004 = 44.58%
2003 = 46.03%
2002 = 44.21%

2013 - ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES & CULVERTS

PERCENTAGE OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS WHERE THE CONDITION IS RATED AS GOOD TO VERY GOOD

Number of bridges and culverts where the condition of primary components is rated as good to very good, requiring only maintenance
---------- X 100
Total number of bridges and culverts

430 **X 100**

430

=100 % of lane kilometres tested were rated as good to very good

Effectiveness Measure
Adequacy of Bridges and Culverts: Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good and requires only maintenance.

Objective
To measure the change in quality of the bridges and culverts from year to year.

Previous Years

2012 = 100%
2011 = 100%
2010 = 100%
2009 = 100%

2013 - EFFECTIVE SNOW & ICE CONTROL

PERCENTAGE OF WINTER EVENTS WHERE THE RESPONSE MET OR EXCEEDED LOCALLY DETERMINED ROAD MAINTENANCE STANDARDS

$$\frac{\text{Number of winter events where response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards}}{\text{Total number of winter events}} \times 100$$

$$\frac{88}{88} \times 100$$

= 100 % of winter events where response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards.

Effectiveness Measure
Effective Snow & Ice Control: Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards.

Objective
To measure response to snow and ice conditions.

Comparatives

This effectiveness measure has remained consistent at 100% since 2000.

2013– LIBRARY SERVICES

Total library uses per person

$$\frac{\text{Total library uses}}{\text{Total population}}$$

Effectiveness Measure

$$\frac{1{,}325{,}441}{70{,}903}$$

= 18.694 uses per person in Middlesex County

Previous Years

2012 = 20.110
2011 = 18.550
2010 = 13.505
2009 = 13.836
2008 = 12.248
2007 = 15.509
2006 = 13.018
2005 = 17.743
2004 = 15.748

Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses = 45.1%
Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses = 54.9%

Previous Years	Electronic	Non-electronic
2012 =	47.8%	52.2%
2011 =	44.4%	55.6%
2010 =	31.0%	69.0%
2009 =	32.4%	67.6%
2008 =	19.5%	80.5%
2007 =	38.3%	61.7%
2006 =	24.2%	75.8%
2005 =	25.2%	74.8%

2013- PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN REPORTING YEAR

PERCENTAGE OF LAND DESIGANTED FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES WHICH WAS NOT REDESIGNATED FOR OTHER USES DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2013

---------- X 100

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2013

$$\frac{262{,}477 \times 100}{262{,}461}$$

= 100% of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year

Previous Years

2012 = 99.99%
2011 = 99.99%
2010 = 100%

2013- PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO BASE YEAR

PERCENTAGE OF LAND DESIGANTED FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES WHICH WAS NOT REDESIGNATED FOR OTHER USES RELATIVE TO THE BASE YEAR 2000

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of

December 31, 2013
---------- X 100

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2003

262,477 X 100

262,710

= 99.9 % of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2003

Previous Years

2012 = 99.9%
2011 = 99.9%
2010 = 99.9%

2013- CHANGE IN SIZE OF SETTLEMENT AREA

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN THE SIZE OF THE SETTLEMENT AREA RELATIVE TO THE BASE YEAR 2004

Hectares of land in settlement area as at December 31, 2013 less the number of hectares of land in the settlement area as of January 1, 2004

---------- X 100

Hectares of land in the settlement area as of January 1, 2004

$$\frac{233 \times 100}{7{,}292}$$

= 3.2 % increase (decrease) in the settlement area relative to January 1, 2004

Previous Years

2012 = 3.1%
2011 = 3.1%
2010 = 2.9%
2009 = 2.9%