

	<h2>COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE</h2>	
For meeting to be held on: August 11, 2009	Submitted by: James Gates, County Treasurer	For: Action
Subject: <h3 style="text-align: center;">2008 MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT</h3>		

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.

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.

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 kilometres is an output.

...../2

SUBJECT: MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

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 2000 to 2005. In some instances there have 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.

SUBJECT: MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

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.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments

Appendix A

2008 - OPERATING COSTS

General Government Support

Operating Costs for Governance & Corporate Management	X	100

Total Municipal Operating Costs		

\$1,996,684		

		X 100
\$46,320,990		

= 4.3 % 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 and human resources.

Previous Years

2007 = 3.9%

2006 = 5.2%

2005 = 4.48%

2004 = 5.80%

2003 = 6.40%

2002 = 6.77%

2001 = 2.38%

The difference between 2002 & 2001 is due to several factors

- loss of revenue from the City of London re: annexation compensation. 2002 - \$0, 2001 - \$272,000.
- 2002 numbers include facility costs, which were not part of the numerator in 2001.
- 2002 numbers reflect increases in payroll and consulting costs

2000 = 3.01%

2008 - OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS**Operating costs for Paved Roads**

Total paved lane kilometre

\$272,540

1,583

= \$172.17 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. The amount of patching can vary from year to year due to the municipality's program and weather conditions.

Previous Years

2007 = \$182.09

2006 = \$172.66

2005 = \$172.56

2004 = \$136.24

2003 = \$109.10

2002 = \$164.42

2001 = \$175.16

2000 = \$133.50

2008 - WINTER CONTROL

Maintenance of Roadways per lane kilometre

Operating Costs for Winter Maintenance

Total lane km Maintained in Winter

\$3,839,691

1,583

= **\$2,425.58** 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

2007 = \$1,977.29

2006 = \$1,605.73

2005 = \$2,110.72

2004 = \$1,902.15

2003 = \$1,994.90

2002 = \$1,405.87

2001 = \$1,302.95

2000 = \$1,471.36

2008– LIBRARY SERVICES (NEW IN 2004)

Operating costs for library services per person

$$\frac{\text{Operating Costs for Library Services}}{\text{Total Population}}$$

Efficiency Measure

$$\frac{\$ 2,485,834}{69,024}$$

= \$36.01 per person

2007 = \$36.70

2006 = \$31.95

2005 = \$32.96

2004 = \$31.39

Operating costs for library services per use

$$\frac{\text{Operating Costs for Library Services}}{\text{Total Library Uses for your Municipality}}$$

Efficiency Measure

$$\frac{\$2,485,834}{845,410}$$

= \$2.94 per library use

Previous Years

2007 = \$2.37

2006 = \$2.45

2005 = \$2.24

2004 = \$2.00

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.

2008- 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

$$\frac{\text{-----}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kms. tested}} \times 100$$

$$\frac{833}{\text{-----}} \times 100$$

1,583

= 52.6% 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 Years

2007 = 52.6%

2006 = 49.5%

2005 = 46.66%

2004 = 44.58%

2003 = 46.03%

2002 = 44.21%

2001 = 44.24%

2000 = 75.46%

There were significant changes in the definition, therefore the 2000 number is not comparable.

2008- EFFECTIVE SNOW & ICE CONTROL

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

Number of winter events where response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards
 ----- X 100
 Total number of winter events

$$\frac{60 \quad X \quad 100}{60}$$

= 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.

2008– LIBRARY SERVICES (NEW IN 2004)

Total library uses per person

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

Effectiveness Measure

$$\frac{845,410}{69,024}$$

= 12.248 uses per person in Middlesex County

Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses = 19.5%

Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses = 80.5%

Previous Years

2007 = 15.509

2006 = 13.018

2005 = 17.743

2004 = 15.748

2008- LOCATION OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

PERCENTAGE OF NEW LOTS, BLOCKS AND / OR UNITS WITH FINAL APPROVAL WHICH ARE LOCATED WITHIN SETTLEMENT AREAS

Number of new lots, blocks and /or units which are located within settlement areas
----- X 100
Total number of new lots, blocks and /or units with final approval within the entire municipality

$$\frac{231}{231} \times 100$$

= **100 %** of new lots, blocks and / or units with final approval are located within settlement areas.

Comparatives – This measure has been 100% consistently since 2000.

2008- PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN REPORTING YEAR

PERCENTAGE OF LAND DESIGNATED 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, 2008

----- X 100

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2008

262,502 X 100

262,560

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

**2008- PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO
BASE YEAR****PERCENTAGE OF LAND DESIGNATED 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, 2008****----- X 100****Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of
January 1, 2000****262,502 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 2000**