



**OMBI**

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL CAO's  
BENCHMARKING INITIATIVE

**2014**

PARTNERING FOR SERVICE EXCELLENCE

Performance  
Measurement Report



# Table of Contents

## Overview

- Summary ..... I
- Who Reports What ..... I - II
- What is the Service?..... III
- Influencing Factors..... III
- Additional Information..... III
- How to Read the Graphs..... IV - V

## Service Areas

1	Accounts Payable .....	1
2	Building Permits and Inspection.....	7
3	By-Law Enforcement .....	11
4	Child Care .....	17
5	Clerks .....	23
6	Culture.....	29
7	Emergency Hostels .....	33
8	Emergency Medical Services (EMS).....	39
9	Facilities.....	47
10	Fire Services.....	53
11	Fleet.....	59
12	General Government .....	65
13	General Revenue .....	67
14	Human Resources.....	73

15	Information Technology .....	77
16	Investment Management .....	81
17	Legal.....	85
18	Libraries .....	89
19	Licensing .....	95
20	Long Term Care.....	99
21	Parking .....	105
22	Parks .....	111
23	Payroll.....	117
24	Planning .....	121
25	POA (Court Services).....	125
26	Police Services .....	131
27	Purchasing .....	141
28	Roads .....	145
29	Social Assistance .....	153
30	Social Housing.....	161
31	Sports and Recreation .....	165
32	Taxation .....	171
33	Transit .....	177
34	Waste Management .....	181
35	Wastewater .....	189
36	Water .....	197



Overview



## 2014 Performance Measurement Report - Summary

On behalf of its member municipalities, OMBI is pleased to present the 2014 Performance Measurement Report, marking the ninth year OMBI has been publicly reporting results.

This document reflects the joint efforts of 14 municipalities and includes 160 measures across 36 municipal service areas. The results in this report will be made available to the public on November 2, 2015; and OMBI partners can access results for all measures in the data warehouse at any time.

The 2014 Performance Measurement Report includes three years of data wherever possible (2012, 2013 and 2014). However, there are instances where measures that have been introduced in 2014 will only have one year and/or there may only be one or two years of data available for those municipalities who are reporting a service area publicly for the first time. This applies to some service areas from the cities of Calgary, Winnipeg, and our newest partner, Montreal.

The Report is a comparative report and although it does not provide an evaluation of, or an explanation for, each municipality's results, there may be instances where additional explanation is provided in order to support the results. Questions about specific results should be directed to the respective municipality through the Municipal Lead or the OMBI Program Office.

***The results were downloaded on SEPTEMBER 11, 2015. Changes made in the Data Warehouse after this date, are not reflected in the report.***

## Who Reports What

"Who Reports What" located on page II, identifies the following:

- Municipalities where the service is provided and results appear in the report; and
- Municipalities where the service is not provided and/or results are not available.


The City of London did not collect data in 2015 due to a work stoppage that impacted 750 staff members; therefore, there are no results for 2014 included in this report. In 2016, the City of London will be collecting two years' worth of data and will return to the regular public reporting timelines.

The City of Montreal is new to the OMBI partnership for 2014 reporting. While participating in all applicable service areas, there are some areas in which results are not yet being publicly reported. Full participation is expected on a gradual basis as they transition into full reporting.

## Who Reports What

	Service provision differs between municipalities; therefore not all partners collect or report data in all service areas. Please refer to legend for further explanation.																																						
	Accounts Payable	Building	By-law Enforcement	Child Care	Clerks	Culture	Emergency Hostels	Emergency Medical Services	Facilities	Fire	Fleet	General Government	General Revenue	Human Resources	Information Technology	Investment Management	Legal	Libraries	Licensing	Long Term Care	Parking	Parks	Payroll	Planning	POA (Court Services)	Police	Purchasing	Roads	Social Assistance	Social Housing	Sports and Recreation	Taxation	Transit	Waste Management	Wastewater	Water			
Calgary																																							
Durham																																							
Halton																																							
Hamilton																																							
London																																							
Montreal																																							
Niagara																																							
Ottawa																																							
Thunder Bay																																							
Toronto																																							
Waterloo																																							
Windsor																																							
Winnipeg																																							
York																																							

<b>LEGEND</b>	Service is provided and results appear in report	Service is not provided and/or results are not available
---------------	--	--



## What is the Service?

A brief description of the service area and its objectives are found at the front of each service area section.

## Influencing Factors

Results can be influenced by a number of factors and the influencing factors pertaining to the measures in the 2014 Performance Measurement Report are found at the front of each service area section.

The influencing factors speak to the uniqueness of each municipality such as population, geographic size, organizational form, government type and legislation. They also can include other unique service area or municipal impacts, specific to the reported service.

Of particular influence in a number of OMBI results, are ***Municipal Purchases (Operating and Capital)***. The total Purchases made by a municipality in any given year can fluctuate significantly based on available budgets, timing of large capital expenditures, funding provided by third parties and external agencies, and other one-time factors. When used as a component of a measure, it can lead to variances in year-over-year results, without necessarily reflecting a change in service levels.

Additionally, in keeping with past practice and where applicable, cost measures are presented based on ***OMBI Total Cost***, which captures operating cost plus amortization. It should be noted that amortization rates and capitalization thresholds are unique to each individual municipality and it can lead to significant differences between operating cost and total cost for each municipality.

All cost presented in the report are current dollars (dollar value in other time periods; not converted into present-day dollars). Inflation between 2012 and 2014 can easily explain cost increases of 4-5% even if it impacts all municipalities equally.

## Additional Information

Within each service area, additional information may be included to help the reader better understand the service, how results are calculated and/or speak to specific information about a municipality where large variances are noted.

## How to Read the Graphs

The graphs are designed to show how participating municipalities compare with each other on selected service measures. Results for 2014 are shown along with comparative results from 2012 and 2013, where available.

1

**Question:** Identifies what the graph is showing, i.e. How many, How much, What is...

2

**Figure Number and Name of Measure:** Refers to the figure number in order of appearance by service area and refers to the official measure name as per the OMBI Data Warehouse, i.e. *Fig. 34.1 Tonnes of all Material Collected per Household - Residential*

3

**Unit of Measure (y axis):** Refers to the unit of measure, e.g. dollars, percent, number.

4

**Median Line:** The median is the middle value in a set or range of data, i.e. if you had the numbers 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9, the median would be 5.

5

### Abbreviations:

CAL	City of Calgary
DUR	Region of Durham
HAL	Halton Region
HAM	City of Hamilton
LON	City of London
MTL	City of Montreal
NIAG	Niagara Region
OTT	City of Ottawa
TBAY	City of Thunder Bay
TOR	City of Toronto
WAT	Region of Waterloo
WIND	City of Windsor
WINN	City of Winnipeg
YORK	York Region
MED	Median

6

**Year:** Identifies the reporting year.

7

**Result:** Identifies the result as provided by each partner reporting data for any one measure.

N/A indicates one of the following:

- Municipality did not have data available at time of printing; or
- Municipality did not collect data for that year and/or does not collect data for that specific measure.

8

**Source and Measure Type:** Identifies the measure number and type of measure based on OMBI framework, e.g. SWST205 (Service Level).

9

**Note:** Information that applies all municipalities.

10

**Comment:** Information that applies to a specific municipality and used to explain any anomalies.


# Waste Management

1

## How many tonnes of residential waste are collected per household?

Fig 34.1 Tonnes of all Material Collected per Household - Residential

2



5

7

6

Source: SWST205 (Service Level)

8

9

Note: The measure includes organics, blue box, leaf and yard, municipal hazardous or special waste, other recycle materials such as wood, metal and tires, as well as construction and demolition materials.

Comment:

10



Service Areas

# 1 Accounts Payable



## What is the Service?

Accounts Payable Services ensure the efficient and effective management of payments to suppliers. The Accounts Payable function supports the delivery of municipal products and services, thus adding to the credibility and overall reputation of the municipality.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Timely processing of invoices
- Accurate payment of bills
- Analyzing patterns in expenses and taking advantage of available discounts
- Maintaining relationships with suppliers
- Providing customer service to internal departments and vendors

## Influencing Factors


- **Organizational Form:** Centralized vs. decentralized functions.
- **Policy and Practices:** Objectives on stretching payables differ between municipalities and service areas.
- **Processes & Systems:** Differences in system generated vs. manually generated invoices (e.g. phone lines, utilities), differences in records management (e.g. document imaging vs. not imaging), and the nature of the payment approval process (e.g. electronic vs. manual).



# Accounts Payable

## How many invoices are paid per \$1,000,000 of municipal purchases?

Fig 1.1 Total Number of Invoices Paid per \$1,000,000 of Municipal Purchases (Operating and Capital) for Goods and Services




<b>2012</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>254</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>233</b>

Source: FINV230 (Service Level)

## How much does it cost to process an invoice?

Fig 1.2 Accounts Payable Operating Cost per Invoice Paid




2012	\$7.49	\$8.10	\$5.59	\$5.67	\$7.08	N/A	\$4.51	\$7.83	\$5.22	\$8.84	\$3.88	\$7.84	N/A	\$3.87	\$6.38
2013	\$7.23	\$8.59	\$5.77	\$5.92	\$7.97	\$3.89	\$4.98	\$8.71	\$5.21	\$11.01	\$3.77	\$7.52	\$5.10	\$4.00	\$5.85
2014	\$7.24	\$7.90	\$5.77	\$6.32	N/A	\$4.16	\$5.47	\$8.63	\$5.35	\$11.06	\$3.65	\$7.27	\$4.60	\$4.09	\$5.77

Source: FINV317 (Efficiency)

## How many invoices are processed by each accounts payable staff member?

Fig 1.3 Number of Invoices Paid per Accounts Payable FTE

(In Thousands)




2012	11,792	8,984	16,917	15,302	9,936	N/A	14,038	11,361	14,282	12,456	18,598	9,026	N/A	21,582	13,247
2013	12,666	8,950	16,884	15,302	9,765	18,609	14,210	10,599	13,626	11,045	18,079	8,746	12,481	20,552	13,146
2014	13,129	9,013	17,242	15,495	N/A	18,158	12,152	10,362	13,253	12,108	18,572	9,178	13,913	21,216	13,253

Source: FINV325 (Efficiency)

## What percentage of invoices are paid within 30 days?

Fig 1.4 Percent of Invoices Paid Within 30 Days



Year	CAL	DUR	HAL	HAM	LON	MTL	NIAG	OTT	TBAY	TOR	WAT	WIND	WINN	YORK	MED
2012	85.0%	66.4%	71.0%	80.9%	82.4%	N/A	76.4%	74.8%	74.2%	75.4%	86.9%	69.4%	N/A	53.7%	75.1%
2013	80.0%	71.3%	71.4%	80.9%	80.6%	61.0%	75.5%	78.0%	73.9%	67.7%	84.9%	72.3%	76.6%	53.7%	74.7%
2014	83.7%	72.7%	69.0%	80.0%	N/A	59.2%	78.6%	79.0%	73.8%	69.1%	85.6%	69.2%	79.5%	49.3%	73.8%

Source: FINV410 (Customer Service)



## 2 Building Permits and Inspections



### What is the Service?

Building Permits and Inspections Services are governed with the goal to protect the public.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Ensuring buildings and structures are constructed, renovated or demolished in a safe and orderly manner
- Undertaking reviews and inspections to verify whether new construction or renovation has incorporated the minimum building standards for health, life safety, accessibility, structural sufficiency, environmental integrity and energy efficiency
- Issuing building permits and enforcing the Ontario Building Code Act, the Ontario Building Code and applicable law



### Influencing Factors:

**Complexity:** Size and technical complexity of permit applications and construction work requiring varying amounts of review/inspection times e.g. Industrial, Institutional, Commercial (ICI) and High Rise Residential applications offer more unique circumstances to review and assess, while residential construction tends to require more inspections and attention.

**Geography:** Can lead to more travel time, fewer inspections per day resulting in higher costs per permit. Some municipalities deliver services from more than one location which requires more resources and raises costs.

**Inspection Services:** Nature of the inspection process varies by project, and by municipality.

**Legislative Changes:** Administering new requirements of the Building Code Act and the Ontario Building Code and other revisions or 'new' Acts and Regulations adds to the process for review and inspection and increases operating costs, short term and long term (this does not take into consideration the regulatory regime in other provinces).

**Municipal Policy:** Permit requirements will vary between jurisdictions, i.e. phasing of permits (one for the foundation, one for plumbing, one for the structure, etc.; vs. one that covers all phases of construction).

### Additional Information


*The Cities of Calgary, Montreal and Winnipeg do not follow the same guidelines as Ontario; however results are included, where possible.*

# Building Permits and Inspections

## How many building permits were issued?

Fig 2.1 Number of Building Permits Issued in the Calendar Year

(In Thousands)




2012	22,941	7,352	3,391	N/A	6,828	1,397	15,741	2,413	N/A	6,828
2013	24,814	7,376	3,457	14,807	7,196	1,438	16,466	2,101	8,461	7,376
2014	26,124	6,872	N/A	16,170	7,471	1,216	16,847	2,203	8,561	8,016

Source: BLDG206 (Service Level)

Note: Building permits include residential, ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) and other (agriculture and tents) categories. Building Permits are defined as permits required for construction that is subject to the Building Code Act and Ontario Building Code (for Ontario municipalities); Manitoba Building Code (Winnipeg); Alberta Building Code (Calgary); and Quebec Building Code (Montreal).

## How many new residential dwelling units were created?

Fig 2.2 New Residential Units Created per 100,000 Population




<b>2012</b>	<b>921</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>504</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>1,293</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>553</b>	<b>510</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>1,207</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>556</b>

Source: BLDG221 (Service Level)

Note: This is an economic indicator that highlights development trends in a municipality. Typically, there is a correlation between the number of new residential dwelling units, population growth and the overall economic growth of a municipality.

## How much does it cost to conduct reviews of construction plans, issue building permits, conduct inspections and enforce the Building Code Act and Regulations?

Fig 2.3 Operating Cost of Building Permits and Inspection Services per \$1,000 in Construction Value




2012	\$5.42	\$5.37	\$5.72	N/A	\$8.18	\$5.17	\$7.10	\$12.63	N/A	\$5.72
2013	\$4.19	\$9.31	\$6.22	N/A	\$9.01	\$7.66	\$6.65	\$21.55	\$6.66	\$7.16
2014	\$5.59	\$9.14	N/A	N/A	\$8.41	\$14.01	\$8.29	\$16.68	\$8.50	\$8.50

Source: BLDG325M (Efficiency)

Note: Fluctuation in year over year results is impacted by construction values.

# 3 By-law Enforcement



## What is the Service?

By-law Enforcement Services help protect the public health, safety and property rights of citizens through timely, consistent and effective enforcement of By-laws.

The number and nature of municipal By-laws vary extensively throughout OMBI municipalities; therefore OMBI benchmarks the following By-laws only:

- Animal control
- Noise control
- Property standards
- Yard maintenance
- Zoning enforcement

For the purposes of this report, the term “specified” refers to noise control, property standards, yard maintenance and zoning enforcement By-laws.

## Influencing Factors

**Contracted Services:** Components may be contracted out or provided by municipal staff.

**Enforcement:** Differing service delivery models and organizational forms.

**Geography:** Total square kilometers and population density of the municipality.

**Inspections:** Extent and complexity of the inspections done by each municipality, including the use of proactive inspections.

**Service Levels:** Different service standards set by each municipality’s Council, i.e. response time is dependent on the standard set by the municipality and the nature of the complaint.


**Processes & Systems:** Type and quality of systems used to track complaints, inspections and other data.

# By-law Enforcement

## How many noise, property standards, yard maintenance and zoning by-law complaints are received?

Fig 3.1 Number of Specified By-law Complaints per 100,000 Population

(In Thousands)




<b>2012</b>	<b>2,430</b>	<b>2,421</b>	<b>1,261</b>	<b>2,727</b>	<b>832</b>	<b>1,655</b>	<b>2,958</b>	<b>2,418</b>	<b>2,420</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>2,427</b>	<b>2,324</b>	<b>1,213</b>	<b>2,938</b>	<b>837</b>	<b>1,744</b>	<b>2,856</b>	<b>2,621</b>	<b>2,376</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>2,475</b>	<b>2,191</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>2,582</b>	<b>885</b>	<b>1,504</b>	<b>2,996</b>	<b>2,663</b>	<b>2,475</b>

Source: BYLW205 (Service Level)

Note: Measure includes reactive (citizen-initiated) and proactive investigations logged.

## How many inspections are made for noise, property standards, yard maintenance and zoning by-law complaints?

Fig 3.2 Total Number of Inspections per Specified By-law Complaint




2012	1.23	1.91	1.85	N/A	3.79	1.72	2.36	2.01	1.91
2013	1.29	1.91	1.95	N/A	3.77	1.52	2.34	1.03	1.91
2014	1.25	2.15	N/A	N/A	3.77	1.44	2.14	0.99	1.79

Source: BYLW226 (Service Level)

Note: Inspections are used to verify the validity of a complaint. Lower results may be due to alternative methods of citizen interaction, e.g. sending a letter, calling a citizen and/or following up in person. Ottawa does not track due to technology restrictions.

## What percentage of residents complied with noise, property standards, yard maintenance and zoning by-law complaints?

Fig 3.3 Percent of Compliance to Specified By-laws




<b>2012</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>92%</b>

Source: BYLW120 (Community Impact)

Note: Experts interpret compliance to mean no municipal action or prosecution required. If a contractor is hired by a City, or court action is taken, this would be considered as non-compliance. Ottawa does not report due to technology restrictions.

## What percentage of all By-law complaints were for noise, property standards, yard maintenance and zoning by-laws?

Fig 3.4 Percent of All By-law Complaints represented by the Specified By-laws




<b>2012</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>69%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>72%</b>

Source: BYLW207 (Service Level)

## What is the total cost to enforce animal control, noise control, property standards, yard maintenance and zoning by-laws?

Fig 3.5 Enforcement Operating Cost for Animal Control and Specified By-laws per 100,000 Population


(In Thousands)



2012	\$1,151	\$1,298	\$839	\$714	\$514	\$1,150	\$1,423	\$806	\$995
2013	\$1,175	\$1,321	\$832	\$747	\$531	\$1,229	\$1,385	\$768	\$1,004
2014	\$1,180	\$1,384	N/A	\$765	\$583	\$1,195	\$1,272	\$769	\$1,180

Source: BYLW270 (Service Level)

## 4 Child Care



### What is the Service?

Municipal Children's Services divisions plan and manage their local child care system, focusing on the integration of government initiatives, inter-agency coordination and the development of quality programs and services for children and their families.

Municipalities are mandated by provincial legislation under the Day Nursery Act (DNA) as Service System Managers to plan, direct and deliver child care services.

#### *Specific objectives include:*

- Providing a continuum of quality community-based services accessible to children, their families and caregivers
- Fostering partnerships with the community in planning and service delivery integration to ensure equitable access to high quality child care for children and support for families
- Providing financial support to eligible families to enable them to participate fully in employment, training and developmental opportunities
- Innovating and building on leading practices



### Influencing Factors

**Demographics:** Population density and dispersion will vary by municipality. The cost of providing services, in certain areas, to certain populations, will be impacted by unique local and regional factors, such as population and population growth, and low income.

**Licensed Spaces:** Number of licensed spaces is driven primarily by demand, demographics and population and secondarily by the availability/alacrity of operators to open or expand their current spaces and the Ministry of Education in licensing the spaces. Municipalities can influence growth in spaces; however, given the current provincial system, municipalities do not control the licensing framework and therefore, do not independently direct or drive strategic growth in the supply of licensed spaces.

**Mix of Child Care Spaces:** Can be driven by the cost of care, e.g. some operators will not provide infant care as the staffing costs can make this less financially viable/lucrative than providing care for older children. The cost is primarily driven by staffing costs. The DNA requires three (3) staff for 10 infants vs. three (3) staff for 15 toddlers.


**Funding:** Provincial funding is the main determinant of the level of service. Recent changes to the provincial funding formula will impact service levels. Municipal funding beyond the DNA cost-sharing requirements also has an impact on service levels.

**Data Availability:** Census data used to develop these outcomes is not always current and projections are not always accurate. LICO (Low Income Cut-off) and Child Population measures are impacted. LICO information provided by the Ministry is outdated and difficult to use.

# Child Care

## How many regulated child care spaces are available?

Fig 4.1 Regulated Child Care Spaces in Municipality per 1,000 Children (12 and under)




<b>2012</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>168</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>186</b>

Source: CHDC105 (Community Impact)

Note: Total Regulated Spaces is the number of licensed spaces in child care centres, preschools and home child care agencies.

## What percent of available spaces are subsidized?

Fig 4.2 Percent of Spaces that are Subsidized




<b>2012</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>17%</b>

Source: CHDC112 (Community Impact)

Note: The results illustrate that high demand can be indicative of the number of lower-income families requiring child care. Other factors contributing to the results include total funding, the growth in total number of spaces created and the waitlist.

## What percent of children are from low-income families?

Fig 4.3 Percent of Children in the Municipality (12 and under) that are from Low Income Families (2014)




Source: CHDC115 (Community Impact)

Note: LICO (Low-Income Cut-off) population is extrapolated from 2006 census data. Lower-income families tend to drive the demand for subsidized spaces for children 12 and under.

## What is the total investment per child in the municipality?

Fig 4.4 Total Operating Cost per Child (12 and under) in the Municipality (includes amortization)

(In Thousands)



2012	\$419	\$472	\$670	\$707	\$598	\$806	\$1,040	\$509	\$639	\$379	\$619
2013	\$429	\$487	\$681	\$685	\$601	\$786	\$1,043	\$511	\$625	\$448	\$613
2014	\$438	\$492	\$722	N/A	\$646	\$782	\$1,068	\$515	\$609	\$488	\$609


Source: CHDC220T (Service Level)

Note: The result includes Provincial funding and any additional Municipal contributions.

## How much does a subsidized child care space cost?

Fig 4.5 Annual Child Care Cost per Normalized Subsidized Child Care Space

(In Thousands)




2012	\$6,276	\$7,106	\$4,805	\$5,503	\$6,382	\$5,594	\$5,895	\$4,779	\$5,076	\$5,509	\$5,552
2013	\$6,477	\$7,212	\$5,199	\$5,738	\$6,116	\$5,845	\$5,876	\$4,914	\$4,791	\$5,567	\$5,792
2014	\$6,586	\$7,109	\$5,130	N/A	\$5,983	\$5,919	\$5,806	\$5,539	\$4,795	\$5,600	\$5,806

Source: CHDC305 (Efficiency)

Note: The annual gross fee subsidy cost has been normalized to reflect the mix of age groups and required staff ratios. A high cost result could reflect spaces that are being directly operated by a municipality as well as a higher cost of care in urban cities. Annual child care costs exclude any general operating grants distributed.

# 5 Clerks



## What is the Service?

The Office of the Clerk is responsible for a variety of corporate, administrative and legislative functions and coordination of all requests received under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Municipalities are subject to their local freedom of information legislation; and municipalities that have Health Information Custodians or act as agents on behalf of Health Information Custodians are subject to the Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA).

*Specific services include:*

- Legislative support to Councils, Standing Committees, sub-committee and volunteer committees
- Processing of official correspondence to and from Councils
- Coordination of all requests received under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
- Registration of Births and Deaths
- Issuance of marriage licenses
- Coordination of municipal elections (every four years )
- Serves as a general information office with respect to a broad range of inquiries from the public

## Influencing Factors

**Citizen Engagement:** State of interaction with citizens and the amount of citizen trust/distrust of the organization.

**Complexity:** Types and number of requests including files, email correspondence, text messages, etc.; amount of time required, issue, number of departments impacted, number of pages to be reviewed, number of 3<sup>rd</sup> parties involved, litigation involvement, requests for politicians records and files.

**Contentious Issues:** Whether there are prevailing major issues in the municipality, e.g. major construction projects, road widening, bids for international events, etc.

**Nature of Requests:** Media/special interest groups/individuals/businesses.

**Organizational:** Size, administrative structure (centralized vs. decentralized) and culture of the organization; and amount of training provided to Municipal staff who handle requests.

**Political Climate:** Related to availability of information from elected officials such as meeting calendars.


**Practices & Policies:** Responsiveness of the organization to requests; number of routine disclosure policies.

**Privacy Protection:** Growing trend to spend time assessing privacy concerns, e.g. software agreements, privacy breaches, increased focus on privacy being brought forward by PIC (Privacy and Information Commissioner).

# Clerks

## How many formal Freedom of Information requests are received between Jan 1 and Dec 31?

Fig 5.1 Number of Formal Freedom of Information Requests per 100,000 Population




2012	28	7	6	25	39	N/A	32	95	94	8	53	116	13	30
2013	29	12	7	27	39	444	30	75	101	6	57	124	16	30
2014	29	16	7	30	N/A	493	31	71	100	5	50	150	19	31

Source: CLKS270 (Service Level)

## What is the cost per formal Freedom of Information request?

Fig 5.2 Access and Privacy Program Operating Cost per Formal Request

(In Thousands)



2012	\$1,431	\$525	\$1,935	\$1,166	\$437	N/A	\$582	\$344	\$581	\$1,283	\$720	N/A	\$1,295	\$720
2013	\$1,094	\$525	\$1,556	\$990	\$612	\$209	\$636	\$444	\$596	\$2,151	\$794	N/A	\$1,005	\$715
2014	\$1,345	\$525	\$1,679	\$990	N/A	\$167	\$654	\$459	\$684	\$1,975	\$915	N/A	\$1,100	\$915


Source: CLKS370 (Efficiency)

Note: Complexity of requests varies from municipality to municipality in addition to the number of requests.

Comment: Winnipeg uses a decentralized model where departments manage respective FIPPA Requests, therefore Winnipeg cannot report on this measure.

## What is the percent of formal Freedom of Information requests handled within 30 days?

Fig 5.3 Percent of Regular Formal Freedom of Information Requests Handled within 30 Days




<b>2012</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>87%</b>

Source: CLKS470 (Customer Service)

## What percent of Freedom of Information requests, extensions and 3rd party notices are handled within legislated timelines?

Fig 5.4 Percent of Regular Formal Freedom of Information Requests, Extensions and 3rd Party Notices Handled within Legislated Timelines




<b>2012</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>93%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>94%</b>

Source: CLKS475 (Customer Service)



# 6 Culture



## What is the Service?

Culture Services is the municipal investment in local artists, culture and heritage organizations. Culture Services enriches quality of life, generates considerable benefits and greatly contributes to a community's ability to build wealth through innovation and creativity. Culture Services are provided to residents by creating and encouraging opportunities for the creative sector, such as local artists.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Display local culture
- Promote interest in cultural festivals and events
- Encourage development of the culture sector in each municipality
- Fund and support non-profit cultural organizations to provide arts and heritage programs across the community
- Promote and display local heritage through our museums and heritage initiatives

## Influencing Factors

**In-Kind Services:** Municipalities may not have reported the value of in-kind services and/or may not be able to quantify these services.

**Municipal Policy:** Whether a municipality has adopted a cultural policy or plan, i.e. public art, special events, etc. and how the municipality has defined its roles and responsibilities, may affect the way programs and services are delivered and the size of funding invested in the community.


**Non-Resident Use (Tourism):** Cultural services attract participants from beyond a municipality's boundary, and may serve as a key factor in tourists' decisions about whether to visit a particular community – a "per capita" denominator may overstate the cost of the services.



# Culture

## How much does each municipality give in Arts, Heritage and Festival Grants per resident?

Fig 6.1 Arts, Heritage and Festival Grants per Capita




2014	\$6.64	\$4.27	N/A	\$15.89	\$9.57	\$17.14	\$8.96	\$1.10	\$8.96
------	--------	--------	-----	---------	--------	---------	--------	--------	--------

Source: CLTR125 (Community Impact)

Note: The direct municipal investment in arts funding is relative to a city's service delivery model, size of its arts community and its funding envelope. For example, some municipalities provide funding to their "anchor" organizations, e.g. art gallery, community auditorium, theatre and symphony via grants versus municipally owned/operated facilities.

## What is the cost to provide Arts, Heritage and Festival Grants per resident?

Fig 6.2 Operating Cost for Arts, Heritage and Festival Grants per Capita




<b>2013</b>	<b>\$8.50</b>	<b>\$4.61</b>	<b>\$5.75</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$10.95</b>	<b>\$16.99</b>	<b>\$8.91</b>	<b>\$2.75</b>	<b>\$8.50</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>\$8.87</b>	<b>\$4.27</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$11.15</b>	<b>\$17.36</b>	<b>\$9.90</b>	<b>\$3.10</b>	<b>\$9.39</b>

Source: CLTR200 (Service Level)

## What is the total cost to provide culture services per resident?

Fig 6.3 Total Cost for Culture Services including Grants per Capita (includes amortization)



2012	\$22.61	\$41.78	\$13.75	N/A	\$30.23	\$19.74	\$30.00	\$10.47	\$22.61
2013	\$22.59	\$23.04	\$13.53	\$39.13	\$30.82	\$19.74	\$30.18	\$10.81	\$22.82
2014	\$22.37	\$27.17	N/A	\$36.31	\$34.06	N/A	\$32.63	\$8.33	\$29.90

Source: CLTR205T (Service Level)

Note: Measure represents the total cost of providing all cultural services including grants and the funding of cultural venues, eg. art galleries, historical sites, cultural centres and museums.

# 7 Emergency Hostels



## What is the Service?

The services provided through emergency hostels/shelters is seen (by some municipalities) as a key point of access to a broad range of social services. However, emergency hostels are not intended to serve as permanent housing.

The provision of emergency hostel services by a municipality is not mandatory. Municipalities may choose to offer emergency shelter services directly or through third-party contracts with community-based agencies.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Ensure individuals and families experiencing homelessness have access to temporary emergency shelter services that will help them stabilize their situations and move into appropriate accommodation in the community
- Provide safe and secure basic accommodations and meals for individuals and/or families experiencing homelessness

## Influencing Factors

**Immigration:** Federal immigration policies and processing times for Refugee claims.

**Information Systems:** Database systems used could impact reporting capabilities.

**Other Housing Services:** Availability of transitional and/or supported living housing in the community and supplementary support services.

**Political Climate:** Current and former local and provincial policies and support for homelessness impact service level provided i.e. is the climate conducive to support, fund and build/procure spaces.

**Supply vs. Demand:** Individuals in need may decide not to take up offers of shelter.


**Vacancy Rates in Rental Markets:** Housing availability and affordability.

**Weather Conditions:** Number of beds can vary by season. Natural disasters and weather related events increase occupancy and length of stay.

# Emergency Hostels

## What is the nightly supply of available beds?

Fig 7.1 Average Nightly Number of Emergency Shelter Beds Available per 100,000 Population




2012	14.4	14.0	61.5	97.3	43.0	105.6	150.1	31.8	9.5	10.4	37.4
2013	14.3	17.4	58.1	91.5	44.2	104.6	154.3	33.2	9.5	10.2	38.7
2014	14.2	17.0	59.4	N/A	43.0	103.7	158.6	35.2	9.5	10.0	35.2

Source: HSTL205 (Service Level)

Note: Results reflect various approaches to counting motel rooms in inventory.

## What is the nightly demand for available beds?

Fig 7.2 Average Nightly Bed Occupancy Rate of Emergency Shelters



<b>2012</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>138%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>115%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>87%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>138%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>120%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>145%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>92%</b>

Source: HSTL410 (Customer Service)

Note: Rooms can be occupied but at less than 100% capacity depending on the family size.

Comment: Ottawa and Waterloo's results reflect their use of overflow spaces, e.g. shelter mats and motel rooms above the contract supply.

## What is the average length of stay in days per admission type?

Fig 7.3 Average Length of Stay per Admission to Emergency Shelters

<b>Adult and Child Count</b>											
	DUR	HAL	HAM	LON	NIAG	OTT	TOR	WAT	WIND	YORK	MED
2012	12.4	16.9	8.8	12.7	9.8	10.5	18.2	14.2	5.2	11.6	12.0
2013	14.5	25.6	9.3	11.5	12.3	11.2	19.5	12.7	6.5	11.0	11.9
2014	12.7	18.8	8.9	N/A	11.7	12.2	19.4	10.0	7.5	12.3	12.2

Source: HSTL105

<b>Singles Count</b>											
	DUR	HAL	HAM	LON	NIAG	OTT	TOR	WAT	WIND	YORK	MED
2012	8.6	13.3	6.5	12.4	9.7	6.0	14.6	10.0	6.0	10.5	9.9
2013	10.6	16.5	7.1	11.2	12.1	6.7	15.6	9.6	7.4	9.8	10.2
2014	10.3	14.4	6.9	N/A	10.2	7.3	15.2	8.9	8.3	11.3	10.2


Source: HSTL110

<b>Families – Head of Household Count</b>											
	DUR	HAL	HAM	LON	NIAG	OTT	TOR	WAT	WIND	YORK	MED
2012	20.4	31.7	61.4	14.7	10.5	55.3	72.3	40.9	5.3	19.2	26.1
2013	34.8	40.2	55.9	13.9	13.1	57.5	86.4	41.3	5.2	22.7	37.5
2014	24.5	31.1	54.3	N/A	17.8	66.5	104.1	27.6	6.2	22.4	27.6

Source: HSTL115

## What is the combined provincial/municipal cost to provide an emergency shelter bed?

Fig 7.4 Hostels (Provincial/Municipal) Total Cost per Emergency Shelter Bed Night (includes amortization)



2012	\$49	\$53	\$57	\$53	\$52	\$47	\$91	\$51	\$67	\$96	\$53
2013	\$65	\$54	\$55	\$51	\$41	\$47	\$88	\$52	\$90	\$100	\$55
2014	\$57	\$54	\$65	N/A	\$41	\$48	\$77	\$63	\$89	\$114	\$63

Source: HSTL305T (Efficiency)

Note: In 2013, the Province of Ontario introduced changes to the funding model for Housing and Homelessness (including emergency hostels) programs, which allows for greater flexibility at the local (municipal) level to determine how funds are allocated to Emergency Hostels services, i.e. block, per diem, other types of programming. The comparability of pre-2013 results may vary as each municipality transitions to different funding models.

Comment: As of 2013, the City of Windsor receives enhancement funding for the single-male shelter.



# 8 Emergency Medical Services (EMS)



## What is the Service?

Emergency Medical Services (EMS), increasingly referred to as paramedic services, provides emergency care to stabilize a patient's condition, initiates rapid transport to hospitals, and facilitates both emergency and non-emergency transfers between medical facilities.

*Specific objectives include:*

- All citizens should have equal access to ambulance services
- Ambulance services are an integrated part of the overall emergency health care services
- Closest available and/or appropriate ambulance responds to a patient regardless of municipal boundaries
- Ambulance service operators are medically, operationally and financially accountable to provide service of the highest possible caliber
- Ambulance services must adapt to the changing health care, demographic, socio-economic and medical needs in their area

## Influencing Factors


**Community Services:** Community paramedicine, tactical teams, multi-patient transport units, bike and marine teams are examples of services being provided by municipalities to meet the needs of their community. System design and service delivery are impacted by the ratio of Advanced Care Paramedics vs. Primary Care Paramedics.

- **Demographics:** Age and health status of the population has an impact on the number and severity of calls. An older population can increase the demand for services, as can seasonal visitors and the inflow of workers from other communities during the day.
- **Dispatch:** The system, processes and governance of the dispatch impact the efficiency and effectiveness of the land ambulance operation. Local control or influence of dispatch operations has a direct influence on EMS operations. The majority of dispatch centers in Ontario are operated directly by the Ministry of Health.
- **Geography:** Mix of urban vs. rural geography can influence response time and cost factors. Traffic congestion can make navigating roads more difficult, resulting in longer response times. Large rural geographic areas can make it challenging to provide cost-effective, timely emergency coverage.
- **Governance:** All EMS operations are governed and regulated provincially pursuant to the Ambulance Act including minimum operational standards. Budgeted Resources, Local Response Times Standards and Deployment Plans are mandated by Council.
- **Hospital Delay:** Varying lengths of delays in the off-load of patients at local hospitals, can impact the resources required and availability to respond to calls.
- **Non Residents:** Visitors, workers, tourists and out of town hospital patients can increase the call volume; but are not reflected in the measures (population is that of municipality only).
- **Vehicle Mix:** Varying mixture of response vehicles which have different levels of staffing.

# Emergency Medical Services (EMS)

How many calls do EMS providers respond to for every 1,000 people?

Fig 8.1 Total EMS Responses per 1,000 Population




2012	86	71	103	102	111	119	197	126	64	133	113	62	107
2013	87	74	102	103	123	117	193	128	63	140	125	74	110
2014	87	78	105	N/A	128	125	202	133	74	139	121	77	121

Source: EMDS229 (Service Level)

## What percent of time do ambulances spend at the hospital?

Fig 8.2 Percent of Ambulance Time Lost to Hospital Turnaround




<b>2012</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>22.8%</b>	<b>23.1%</b>	<b>24.1%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>21.4%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>29.2%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>16.9%</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>25.6%</b>	<b>12.6%</b>	<b>19.7%</b>

Source: EMDS150 (Community Impact)

Note: Time spent in hospital includes the time it takes to transfer a patient, delays in transfer care due to lack of hospital resources (off-load delay), paperwork and other activities. The more time paramedics spend in the hospital process equates to less time they are available to respond to calls.

## How many hours of ambulance service are provided in the community for every 1,000 people?

Fig 8.3 EMS Weighted Vehicle In-Service Hours per 1,000 Population




2014	301	257	336	N/A	451	333	515	253	198	427	571	272	333
------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Source: EMDS226 (Service Level)

## What is the total cost to provide one hour of ambulance service?

Fig 8.4 EMS Total Cost per Weighted Vehicle In-Service Hour (includes amortization)



2014	\$213	\$210	\$217	N/A	\$182	\$247	\$194	\$254	\$209	\$213	\$148	\$220	\$213
------	-------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Source: EMDS306T (Efficiency)

Note: Hours refers to only the hours that vehicles are available for service. Costs include paramedic, administrative, medical supply, building, operating, supervision and overhead.

## What percent of time does an ambulance crew arrive on scene, within eight minutes of the time notice is received, to provide ambulance services to sudden cardiac arrest patients or other patients categorized as CTAS 1?

Fig 8.5 RTS CTAS 1

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>RTS CTAS 1</b>                      What percentage of time does an ambulance crew arrive on scene to provide ambulance services to sudden cardiac arrest patients or other patients categorized as CTAS 1, within <u>eight</u> minutes of the time notice is received respecting such services ?                      (EMDS431)</p>			
Municipality	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage 2013	Actual Percentage 2014
DUR	75%	77.70%	77.28%
HAL	75%	79.50%	73.50%
HAM	75%	76.60%	76.00%
LON	50%	85.71%	N/A
NIAG	80%	77.66%	72.10%
OTT	75%	83.60%	79.50%
TBAY	70%	81.00%	81.00%
TOR	75%	70.30%	77.40%
WAT	70%	75.00%	66.00%
WIND	75%	80.00%	77.00%
WINN	90%	64.37%	75.06%
YORK	75%	75.00%	76.00%
MED		77.68%	76.00%

Note: RTS CTAS 1 – Response Time Standard – Canadian Triage & Acuity Scale

The Canadian Triage & Acuity Scale is a standardized tool that enables emergency departments and Paramedic services to prioritize care requirements according to the type and severity of the presenting signs and symptoms. Patients are assigned a CTAS level between 1 – more severe, life threatening; and 5 – least severe.

Target Percentage: Each service is able to determine and set the percentage of compliance for this measure.

The response time is calculated based on the crew notified (T2) time of the first vehicle being notified of the call and the arrived scene (T4) time of the first vehicle to reach the scene.

Actual Percentage: The percentage of time that an ambulance crew has arrived on-scene to provide ambulance services to sudden cardiac arrest patients or other patients categorized as CTAS 1 within eight minutes of the time notice is received respecting such services.

## What percentage of time does a person equipped with a defibrillator arrive on scene within six minutes of the time notice is received from dispatch, to provide ambulance services to sudden cardiac arrest patient?

Fig 8.6 RTS SCA - Within Six Minutes

<b>RTS SCA – Within Six Minutes</b> What percentage of time does a person equipped with a defibrillator arrive on scene to a sudden cardiac arrest patient within <u>six</u> minutes of the time notice is received from dispatch? (EMDS430)			
Municipality	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage 2013	Actual Percentage 2014
DUR	60%	61.40%	66.67%
HAL	55%	64.40%	52.90%
HAM	75%	77.00%	74.00%
LON	50%	76.67%	N/A
NIAG	55%	59.12%	58.80%
OTT	65%	73.50%	63.00%
TBAY	50%	65.00%	69.00%
TOR	60%	75.50%	87.30%
WAT	50%	42.00%	39.00%
WIND	55%	51.00%	58.00%
WINN	90%	73.82%	73.33%
YORK	60%	60.00%	67.00%
MED		64.70%	66.67%

Note: RTS SCA – Response Time Standard – Sudden Cardiac Arrest

Target: Each service is able to determine and set the percentage of compliance for this measure. Any person with a defibrillator stops the clock on this measure so the paramedic (service) is required to capture the time of arrival for any defibrillator by a non-paramedic party. These times are reflected at procedure code 385 with a soft time (best estimate) provided by the attending paramedic. The response time is calculated based on the crew notified (T2) time of the first vehicle being notified of the call and the arrived scene (T4) time of the first vehicle to reach the scene.

Actual: The percentage of time that a person equipped to provide any type of defibrillation has arrived on-scene to provide defibrillation to sudden cardiac arrest patients within six minutes of the time notice is received from dispatch. Refer to Ministry Guidelines to see what is included /excluded.

Source: EMDS430 (Customer Service)

## How long does it take from the time a call is received and dispatched to EMS unit?

Fig 8.7 90<sup>th</sup> Percentile Response Time – EMS TO-2 Code 4 (AMPDS 1 and 2/DE, optional in C)

Municipality	EMS TO-2, Code 4, 90th Percentile Response Time (min:sec)		
	2012	2013	2014
DUR	2:29	No data available	3:07
HAL	2:53		2:49
HAM	3:10		2:59
NIAG	1:55		1:58
OTT	2:35		N/A
TBAY	2:18		2:50
TOR	2:59		3:04
WAT	3:50		3:53
WIND	3:27		N/A
WINN	N/A		2:41
YORK	2:41		2:57
MED	2:47		2:57

Source: 2014 - EMDS480; 2012 – EMDS419E (Community Impact)

Note: This data was not collected in 2013, therefore only two years of data is available.


The Ministry of Health and Long Term Care directly operates all land ambulance dispatch service in Ontario with the exception of Toronto and Niagara.

Dispatch time is the time from a phone call being received to the EMS unit being notified.

Code 4 refers to the highest priority calls.

90<sup>th</sup> Percentile means that 90% of all calls of the service have a dispatch time within the period reflected in the graph.

# 9 Facilities



## What is the Service?

Facilities Management delivers a variety of services that support municipal service delivery and provide a healthy, safe, barrier-free and comfortable environment for staff and citizens that visit municipally owned and/or operated properties.

*Services provided vary between municipalities, but may include:*

- Accessibility Design Standards
- General Repairs, Maintenance and Shipping and Receiving
- Space Planning
- Tenant Relations

*The range of municipal service areas and programs that Facilities Management may serve varies from municipality to municipality, including but are not limited to:*

- Arenas and Recreation Centres
- Emergency Medical Services
- Housing
- Long Term Care
- Museums
- Police Services
- Public Health Services

## Influencing Factors

**Building Stock:** Wide variety of buildings/facilities in each municipality with different sizes, ages, and use profiles can yield very different cost per square feet indicators.

**Capital:** Accounting policy/dollar threshold for capital expenditures impacts the types of maintenance activities included in operating costs.

**Organizational Form:** Extent to which asset management services are centralized or decentralized in each municipality can influence reported results.




# Facilities

## What is the total square footage of all buildings owned and leased by the Municipality?

Fig 9.1 Gross Square Footage All Buildings Owned and Leased by Municipality

(In Millions)



2012	N/A	4,104,750	1,049,366	3,010,569	3,373,835	N/A	2,196,673	13,454,823	2,487,412	27,636,306	6,428,711	3,144,076	7,631,552	5,000,000	3,739,293
2013	N/A	4,106,139	1,132,526	4,154,919	3,373,835	28,395,398	2,196,673	13,575,399	2,487,412	28,002,634	6,641,101	3,771,817	9,132,355	5,000,000	4,154,919
2014	N/A	5,094,995	1,132,526	4,234,560	N/A	28,524,025	2,203,661	13,649,044	2,502,157	27,669,749	6,695,588	3,885,970	9,397,521	5,908,743	5,501,869


Source: FCLT805 (Statistic)

Note: The sum of all floors of a building that are enclosed within the building envelope. The measurement is taken from the outside face of a building.

## What is the total square footage of the Municipal Headquarter Building?

Fig 9.2 Gross Square Footage of Headquarter Building

(In Thousands)




2012	802,591	354,000	283,290	167,995	188,200	N/A	195,310	344,885	43,500	636,215	259,593	66,300	206,572	452,302	259,593
2013	802,590	358,950	283,290	167,995	188,200	245,799	195,310	294,705	43,500	636,215	259,593	66,300	206,572	452,302	252,696
2014	802,590	358,950	283,290	167,995	N/A	245,562	195,310	294,705	43,500	636,215	259,593	66,300	206,572	452,302	259,593

Source: FCLT820 (Statistic)

## How much electricity and natural gas is used in a Municipal Headquarter Building?

Fig 9.3 Total Equivalent kWh Energy Consumption for Headquarter Building (HQ) per Square Foot of HQ Building




<b>2013</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>34.5</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>30.4</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>31.5</b>

Source: FCLT240 (Efficiency)

## What is the total cost to maintain a Municipal Headquarter Building?

Fig 9.4 Total Cost of Facility Operations for Headquarter Building (HQ) per Square Feet of HQ Building (includes amortization)




2013	N/A	\$13.33	\$9.17	\$23.87	\$9.72	\$15.74	\$6.89	\$14.20	\$12.74	\$18.51	\$9.08	\$6.94	\$13.11	\$10.94	\$12.74
2014	N/A	\$13.72	\$9.33	\$23.87	N/A	\$14.72	\$12.10	\$14.33	\$14.38	\$17.25	\$8.98	\$9.91	\$12.02	\$16.67	\$14.03

Source: FCLT335T (Efficiency)

Note: Generally all facility operating costs include four cost categories: internal and external facility repairs & maintenance, custodial, utilities and security costs.



# 10 Fire Services



## What is the Service?

The goal of Fire Services is to protect the life and property of citizens and businesses from fire and other hazards. There are three primary fire safety activities provided in communities.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Public education and fire prevention
- Fire safety standards and enforcement
- Emergency response



## Influencing Factors

**Collective Agreements:** Municipalities can be at different points in their cycle of collective agreements, which can lead to wage differences between fire services.

**Fire Prevention and Education:** Enforcement of the Fire Code, and the presence of working smoke alarms.

**Geography:** Topography, urban/rural mix, road congestion, fire station locations and travel distances from those stations.

**Nature and Extent of Fire Risk:** Type of building construction or occupancy, e.g. apartment dwellings vs. single family homes vs. institutions such as hospitals.

**Response Agreements:** Depending on response agreements between Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and hospital protocols, responses to medical calls can be a significant activity.

**Service Levels:** Set by municipal councils, based on local needs and circumstances (staffing, resources, response expectations, etc.) and in accordance with the Fire Protection & Prevention Act, Section 2(1)(b).

**Service Standards:** Service level standard is each municipality's 90th percentile response time standard (minutes and number of personnel) in the urban component of the municipality. These standards affect the number/locations of stations, vehicles and firefighters required.

**Staffing Models:** Use of full-time firefighters or composite models that include both full-time and part-time or volunteer firefighters.

### Additional Information

**Urban areas** is defined as those served by full-time firefighters stationed with their vehicles on a continuous basis.



**Rural areas** is defined as those served by volunteer firefighters who are engaged in other professions, but are on call to respond to emergencies as they arise.

The one OMBI exception to this is the City of Thunder Bay, which uses full-time firefighters to serve both urban and rural areas; therefore Thunder Bay's results have been summarized entirely as "urban" to improve the comparability with other municipalities served by full-time firefighters.

# Fire Services

## How many hours are staffed fire vehicles available to respond to emergencies?

Fig 10.1 Number of Staffed Fire In-Service Vehicle Hours per Capita (Urban and Rural)



<b>2012</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.65</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.66</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.68</b>

<b>6.55</b>	<b>5.28</b>	<b>5.92</b>
<b>6.49</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>5.69</b>
<b>6.76</b>	<b>4.85</b>	<b>5.81</b>

Source: FIRE230 – Urban (Service Level)

Source: FIRE232 – Rural (Service Level)

Note: Rural areas tend to have higher vehicle hours because a proportionately greater number of vehicles are necessary to adequately cover broader geographic service areas with an acceptable response time. Rural areas typically do not have fire hydrants, necessitating the use of water tanker vehicles that are not required in urban areas.

## How many injuries and fatalities resulted from residential fires?



Fig 10.2 Residential Fire Related Fatalities per 100,000 Population (Urban and Rural)

Municipality	Residential Fire Related Injuries per 100,000 Population Entire Municipality (FIRE105)			Residential Fire Related Fatalities per 100,000 Population Entire Municipality (FIRE110)		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014
CAL	1.79	0.78	1.67	0.27	0.43	0.42
HAM	7.85	7.22	4.95	0.19	0.19	0.18
LON	6.49	6.96	N/A	0.27	0.54	N/A
MTL	N/A	3.29	1.50	N/A	0.57	0.46
OTT	3.32	2.44	2.84	0.21	0.32	0.21
TBAY	6.41	3.66	7.38	2.75	0.00	0.00
TOR	4.67	4.00	5.48	0.40	0.40	0.32
WIND	13.28	21.81	13.75	0.95	0.95	0.95
WINN	22.49	13.30	11.70	1.02	0.72	0.14
MED	6.45	4.00	5.22	0.34	0.43	0.27

Source: FIRE105; FIRE110 (Community Impact)

## How many fires resulted in property loss?

Fig 10.3 Number of Residential Structural Fires with Losses per 1,000 Households (Urban and Rural)



<b>2012</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>

<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.9</b>
<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.0</b>

Source: FIRE116 – Urban (Community Impact)

Source: FIRE117 - Rural (Community Impact)

## How long does it take to respond to an emergency call from the time the station is notified to arrival on scene?

Fig 10.4 Actual 90th Percentile Fire Station Notification Response Time (min:sec) (Urban and Rural)


Municipality	Station Notification Response Time 90th Percentile (min:sec) Urban (FIRE405)			Station Notification Response Time 90th Percentile (min:sec) Rural (FIRE406)		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014
CAL	7:14	7:08	6:44			
HAM	6:36	6:45	6:55	12:57	13:20	13:06
LON	6:07	6:05	N/A			
MTL	N/A	5:39	6:20			
OTT	6:39	6:50	6:35	14:48	13:53	14:59
TBAY	6:27	6:40	6:46			
TOR	6:31	6:44	6:38			
WIND	6:31	6:58	7:15			
WINN	6:47	6:49	6:55			
MED	6:33	6:45	6:45	13:52	13:36	14:02

Source: FIRE405 – Urban; FIRE406 - Rural (Customer Service)

Note: Each municipality has a different mix of vehicle types and staffing modes, reflecting its fire and community risks. Hamilton and Ottawa are the only municipalities with both urban and rural components.

# What is the total cost per hour to have a front-line fire vehicle available in the urban and rural areas?

Fig 10.5 Total Fire Cost per In-Service Vehicle Hour (Urban and Rural) (includes amortization)




2012	\$312	\$318	\$315	N/A	\$298	\$204	\$330	\$324	\$227	\$314
2013	\$325	\$330	\$319	\$300	\$266	\$229	\$370	\$330	\$246	\$322
2014	\$347	\$339	N/A	\$298	\$323	\$264	\$444	\$341	\$242	\$331

\$24	\$14	\$19
\$25	\$16	\$21
\$24	\$16	\$20

Source: FIRE305T - Urban; FIRE304T - Rural (Efficiency)

Note: In order to respond to emergencies, each municipality has a different mix of vehicle types and staffing modes, reflecting its fire and community risks. The cost per vehicle hour for rural areas served by volunteer firefighters tend to be much lower than urban areas served by full-time firefighters because volunteer firefighters are paid only for the hours in which they are actively responding to emergencies.

Comment: Increase is due to new WSIB requirements under "unfunded liabilities".



## What is the Service?

Fleet Services is a group of professional Managers, Supervisors and Technicians responsible for the supply of vehicles and vehicle maintenance and repairs for municipal departments as well as a number of Public Agencies.

Fleet Services provide fleet management, fleet maintenance, fuel management and fabrication services to all municipal departments, other public agencies, and under special circumstances, such services may be provided to other commercial agencies.

Municipal fleets are diverse and the services provided by Fleet Services are broad and wide-ranging. They include preventative maintenance programs, inspections, towing, lubrications, auto body repair, accident damage, seasonal overhauls and rebuilding components.

This service is offered to ensure municipal departments, as well as public agencies that Fleet supports, have the vehicles and equipment they need to service the citizens of their respective municipalities.

## Influencing Factors

**Costs Basis:** Differences in what is being captured in the cost of the vehicle for initial purchase-conversion costs, equipment costs, make ready conversion costs and whether they are capitalized or not.

**Fleet Mix and Usage:** Each municipality's fleet, the number of vehicles in each class and their usage will affect the costs, i.e. light vehicles will incur less cost than heavy, etc. Inclusion of transit vehicles (Ottawa only) could lead to high overall costs. The average age of each municipality's fleet, number of hours used, the use of various vehicles (pure City use vs. highway use) and the environment in which it is used will affect the amount required to be spent in maintenance.

**Organizational Form:** Some fleet groups are centralized, i.e. responsible for all fleet costs; and others are decentralized, i.e. other departments pick-up some of the fleet costs.


**Policy and Processes:** Some municipalities chargeback for all costs; while others do not chargeback for such things as facilities, purchasing, IT, HR, etc.

# Fleet

## How many light, medium and heavy weight vehicles does a municipality own and maintain?

Fig 11.1 Total Number of Vehicles (Municipal Equipment)

(In Thousands)




<b>2012</b>	<b>2,197</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1,349</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>3,142</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>376</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>2,191</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1,391</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>3,239</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>969</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>363</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>1,936</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3,514</b>	<b>1,382</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>3,233</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>800</b>

Source: FLET226 (Statistic)

Note: Includes light vehicles less than 4,500 kg; medium vehicles greater than 4,500 kg & less than 9,000 kg and heavy vehicles greater than 9,000 kg.

## What is the operating cost per km travelled?

Fig 11.2 Operating Cost per Vehicle Km (Municipal Equipment)




2012	\$0.80	\$0.60	\$0.91	\$0.86	N/A	\$0.63	\$0.79	\$1.07	\$0.54	\$0.58	\$0.81	\$0.45	\$0.79
2013	\$0.95	\$0.50	\$0.84	\$0.89	N/A	\$0.74	\$0.85	\$1.06	\$0.56	\$0.58	\$0.62	\$0.46	\$0.74
2014	\$1.08	\$0.45	\$0.93	N/A	\$1.16	\$0.77	\$0.96	\$1.11	\$0.64	\$0.66	\$0.43	\$0.50	\$0.77

Source: FLET326 (Efficiency)

Note: Includes all municipal equipment.

## What is the hourly charge-out rate for vehicle repairs?

Fig 11.3 Door Rate




2012	\$103.00	\$91.61	\$96.00	\$85.27	N/A	\$77.62	\$76.00	\$84.63	\$100.23	\$92.33	\$82.00	\$112.30	\$91.61
2013	\$103.00	\$91.91	\$102.00	\$84.65	N/A	\$82.73	\$83.97	\$88.60	\$100.28	\$97.32	\$82.00	\$104.88	\$91.91
2014	\$104.73	\$92.05	\$102.00	N/A	\$97.00	\$83.49	\$83.92	\$92.94	\$99.89	\$88.40	\$88.00	\$133.45	\$92.94

Source: FLET347 (Efficiency)

Note: Door Rate refers to the in-house shop rate for vehicle maintenance, repairs, etc.

## What percentage of work performed on municipal fleet is not scheduled maintenance?

Fig 11.4 Service Request Rate - Percent of Non-Planned / Preventative Maintenance Work Order Hours




2012	76%	78%	64%	37%	N/A	55%	N/A	45%	77%	68%	84%	57%	66%
2013	77%	76%	68%	40%	N/A	57%	N/A	44%	78%	67%	85%	67%	68%
2014	81%	76%	71%	N/A	60%	54%	N/A	44%	78%	71%	85%	68%	71%

Source: FLET415 (Service Level)

Note: The measure represents the percentage of time a vehicle is being worked on in the shop for work related to any repairs, other than those associated with preventative maintenance work orders.



# 12 General Government



## What is the Service?

Governance and Corporate Management refers to the component of municipal government responsible for governing the municipality, providing direction and leadership to staff, and sustaining the organization.

*Corporate management activities may include:*

- Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) / City Manager (CM)
- Corporate Accounting
- Corporate Finance
- Debt Management & Investments
- Development Charges Administration
- Taxation
- Strategic Communications
- Protocol
- Real Estate and properties owned by the municipality but not used for service delivery

## Influencing Factors

**Council:** Full-time vs. Part-time Councils.


**Government Structure:** Different tiers of municipal government and the corresponding differences in responsibilities for service provision, e.g. responsibility for Court Services (POA), Property Assessment costs, property tax collection and write-offs and water and wastewater billing may differ from one municipality to another.

**Organizational Form:** Centralized vs. decentralized structure for administration services.

# General Government

## What percent of the total municipal cost is related to governance and corporate management?

Fig 12.1 Total Cost for Governance and Corporate Management as a Percent of Total Municipal Cost (includes amortization)



<b>2012</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>

<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>

Source: GEN901T (Efficiency)

# 13 General Revenue



## What is the Service?

General Revenue refers to support services for receivables owed to the municipality by citizens, businesses and other agencies doing business with the municipality. The goal of General Revenue is to ensure the municipality collects revenue to which it is entitled in a timely, accurate, and efficient manner in order to assist the municipality in exercising prudent fiscal management.

*Specific services may include:*

- Cash receipts
- Local improvement billing
- Special assessment billing
- Processing bill payments and collections
- Monitoring the performance of accounts receivable

## Influencing Factors

**Government Structure:** Different tiers of municipal government, i.e. single-tier or upper-tier, and the specific service each one offers will affect results.


**Policy and Practices:** Collection practices, terms and handling of delinquencies, accounts receivable costs and related FTE (full-time equivalent) counts will differ between municipalities and their revenue streams.

**Processes and Systems:** Type and quality of systems used to capture Accounts Receivable including uploads and automated billing.

# General Revenue

## What percent of all revenues are billed?

Fig 13.1 Total Percent of General Revenues Billed




<b>2012</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>17%</b>

Source: GREV210 (Service Level)

Note: Results are impacted by revenue sources (user fees, grants), accounting practices and management policies regarding the billing process.

## What percent of billed revenue is written off?

Fig 13.2 Bad Debt Write-off as a Percent of Billed Revenue




<b>2012</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

Source: GREV325 (Efficiency)

Note: Municipalities generally do not write-off bad debt, but in some cases Municipalities may approve specific write-offs in a given year.

## What is the operating cost to process and collect one invoice?

Fig 13.3 Operating Cost of Accounts Receivable Function per Invoice




2012	\$6.14	\$26.61	\$22.50	\$12.77	\$20.62	N/A	\$10.10	\$6.51	\$10.79	\$27.76	\$11.73	\$27.66	\$50.39	\$16.70
2013	\$7.15	\$26.60	\$22.00	\$12.30	\$21.88	\$50.21	\$10.52	\$6.11	\$9.74	\$30.22	\$11.28	\$24.96	\$47.65	\$21.88
2014	\$7.19	\$23.90	\$22.54	\$11.91	N/A	\$28.22	\$8.56	\$5.84	\$10.88	\$26.43	\$10.24	\$27.17	\$48.24	\$17.23

Source: GREV310 (Efficiency)

## What is the average collection period for invoices?

Fig 13.4 Average Collection Period (Days)




2012	34	N/A	32	50	55	N/A	61	29	48	48	30	58	111	48
2013	33	N/A	49	47	45	27	67	28	45	49	28	60	71	46
2014	33	N/A	32	53	N/A	32	60	33	58	48	29	63	72	48

Source: GREV335 (Efficiency)

## What percentage of bills, issued by the municipality, remain unpaid after 90 days at years end?

Fig 13.5 Percent of Billings Outstanding Over 90 Days at Year End




<b>2012</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>27.9%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>33.4%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>-0.2%</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>27.1%</b>	<b>32.8%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>30.3%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>30.6%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>

Source: GREV320 (Efficiency)

Comment: Calgary's variance in 2014 is due to a large invoice in litigation that is over 120 days old. The negative value in 2013 is due to funds received prior to yearend for invoices issued in the following year.

# 14 Human Resources



## What is the Service?

Human Resources provide services that contribute to the effective management of each municipality's human capital. Human Resources also encompass a Human Resources Planning function to address areas of organizational design as they relate to the growing and changing workforce of each municipality.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Labour Relations which promotes positive relations between management and unions
- Compensation and Benefits which oversees and administers the total rewards plans for all employees
- Training and Development which includes technical, legislative and soft skill training for employees, senior management and department heads
- Disability Management for Workers Compensation, illness and employee accommodation
- Health and Safety and Employee Wellness
- Recruitment and Retention
- Organizational Development and Effectiveness
- Employee Engagement

## Influencing Factors

**Degree of Unionization:** Labour relations and collective agreements directly impact the need for specialized Human Resources staff.

**Organizational Form:** Delivery of Human Resources (HR) service varies from one municipality to another.


**Staffing of Services:** In some service areas a significant number of seasonal and part-time staff is required, e.g. Parks and Recreation. As a result, these service areas tend to have higher turnover rates, which result in providing a higher level of service and directly impacts Human Resources costs.

# Human Resources

## What is the total cost of HR administration per T4 supported?

Fig 14.1 Total Cost for Human Resources Administration per T4 Supported (includes amortization)

(In Thousands)




<b>2013</b>	<b>\$1,507</b>	<b>\$1,072</b>	<b>\$1,275</b>	<b>\$830</b>	<b>\$716</b>	<b>\$1,805</b>	<b>\$940</b>	<b>\$924</b>	<b>\$573</b>	<b>\$1,319</b>	<b>\$952</b>	<b>\$932</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$946</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>\$1,489</b>	<b>\$1,152</b>	<b>\$1,265</b>	<b>\$864</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$1,712</b>	<b>\$785</b>	<b>\$913</b>	<b>\$577</b>	<b>\$1,484</b>	<b>\$952</b>	<b>\$1,052</b>	<b>\$948</b>	<b>\$1,365</b>	<b>\$1,052</b>

Source: HMRS305T (Efficiency)

## What is the employee turnover rate?

Fig 14.2 Overall Permanent Employee Turnover




2012	4.93%	4.56%	3.67%	5.13%	3.80%	N/A	4.71%	4.77%	6.80%	4.55%	4.10%	5.24%	N/A	2.94%	4.64%
2013	4.60%	4.43%	3.11%	4.51%	4.91%	3.83%	6.64%	3.14%	7.40%	3.91%	4.93%	4.96%	5.63%	3.26%	4.56%
2014	5.04%	4.72%	4.72%	5.66%	N/A	4.49%	5.77%	3.92%	7.85%	3.65%	4.76%	5.16%	5.68%	4.44%	4.76%

Source: HMRS406 (Community Impact)



# 15 Information Technology



## What is the Service?

Municipal Information Technology (IT) divisions plan, build and sustain the technology and information environments that support municipal service delivery.

Business, IT leaders and staff collaborate to develop portfolios of initiatives in alignment with the overall strategic goals of their organization; and meeting the service delivery objectives of each line of business. The IT service portfolio lists and describes the IT organization's services with their explicit value proposition to the consumers.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Providing reliable, secure service to residents, businesses and municipal staff across multiple channels including counter, call-centre and the wired and mobile internet
- Developing and supporting information and technology infrastructure
- Establishing best practices to monitor the efficacy of service delivery results and make solutions flexible enough to meet future demands

## Influencing Factors

**Devices:** Device numbers and types could be influenced by the types of services provided and or organizational culture.

**Government Structure:** Different tiers of municipal government, i.e. single-tier or upper-tier, and the specific service each one offers will affect results.

**IT Services:** Type of IT services provided may vary from one municipality to another, i.e. does IT include GIS, Telecommunications, etc.

**Organizational Form:** Extent to which IT services are centralized or decentralized can influence reported results, i.e. services may also be contracted out, directly impacting full-time equivalent (FTE) levels.

**Processes and Systems:** Database systems used could impact reporting capabilities.

### Additional Information


*Cost measure results may vary from previous years and between municipalities that are able to obtain the full costs of decentralized IT goods and services. Decentralized goods and services refer to IT costs that are outside of the IT department's budget. Total IT Costs = IT Operating Costs + Amortization.*

# Information Technology


## How often is the main municipal website visited?

Fig 15.1 Number of Visits to Municipal Website per Capita

Single-Tier



Upper-Tier



<b>2012</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>14.8</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>16.0</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>14.5</b>

<b>3.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<b>1.6</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>


Source: INTN105 (Community Impact)

Note: This measure reflects visits to the main municipal website only, e.g. [www.ottawa.ca](http://www.ottawa.ca), [www.hamilton.ca](http://www.hamilton.ca), etc.

Comment: Toronto introduced a new methodology in 2014 affecting the comparability of 2012 and 2013.

## What is the average number of technology devices in use?

Fig 15.2 Number of Information Technology Devices per Total Municipal FTE




2012	1.17	1.01	1.26	0.73	0.61	N/A	0.65	0.99	0.61	0.94	1.25	0.59	N/A	1.45	0.97
2013	1.48	0.81	1.34	0.75	0.68	0.85	0.68	1.10	0.67	0.98	1.13	0.62	0.77	1.52	0.83
2014	1.52	0.81	1.36	0.79	N/A	0.92	0.68	1.12	0.62	0.86	1.19	0.69	0.88	1.63	0.88

Source: INTN205 (Service Level)

## What is the total cost for Information Technology Services?

Fig 15.3 Total Cost for Information Technology per Municipal FTE (includes amortization)

(In Thousands)




2014	\$9,562	\$2,562	\$6,033	\$2,446	N/A	\$5,818	\$2,545	\$4,491	\$2,378	\$5,506	\$2,891	\$2,718	\$4,038	\$7,502	\$4,038
------	---------	---------	---------	---------	-----	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Source: INTN243T (Efficiency)

Note: The measure includes operating cost for IT plus amortization; and excludes annual capital investment related to IT assets.

# 16 Investment Management



## What is the Service?

Investment Management implements short and long term investment strategies for money market, bond and equity portfolios in accordance with provincial government legislation and the municipality's own investment policies.

## Influencing Factors


**Economic Conditions:** Local economy, unionization, state of assets (life expectancy); prevailing interest rates and shape of the yield curve; availability of product.

**Geography:** Population, density and land mass.

**Government Structure:** Single-tier or two-tier impacts level of expenditures.

**Organizational Form:** Reporting structure, levels within departments.


**Policy and Practices:** General accounting practices (terms utilized for various receivables and payments); investment policy objectives, i.e. risk tolerances, preservation of capital vs. growth; municipal life stage (growth vs. maturity); legislative investment policy constraints; cash inflows/outflows to portfolio.



# Investment Management

## What is the rate of return on the total investment portfolio?

Fig 16.1 Gross Percent Realized Return on the Total Investment Portfolio (based on the Average Adjusted Book Value)




<b>2012</b>	<b>2.22%</b>	<b>2.23%</b>	<b>4.90%</b>	<b>3.42%</b>	<b>1.85%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.13%</b>	<b>2.21%</b>	<b>4.10%</b>	<b>3.91%</b>	<b>4.04%</b>	<b>1.32%</b>	<b>1.60%</b>	<b>4.20%</b>	<b>3.13%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>1.97%</b>	<b>2.01%</b>	<b>4.47%</b>	<b>3.29%</b>	<b>1.81%</b>	<b>1.73%</b>	<b>2.67%</b>	<b>2.36%</b>	<b>3.61%</b>	<b>3.59%</b>	<b>3.09%</b>	<b>1.47%</b>	<b>1.60%</b>	<b>3.22%</b>	<b>2.52%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>2.12%</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>4.08%</b>	<b>3.48%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>2.72%</b>	<b>2.68%</b>	<b>4.28%</b>	<b>3.07%</b>	<b>2.64%</b>	<b>1.45%</b>	<b>1.28%</b>	<b>4.00%</b>	<b>2.68%</b>

Source: INVT310 (Efficiency)

## What is the rate of return on the internal investment portfolio?

Fig 16.2 Gross Percent Realized Return on the Total Internally Managed Investment Portfolio (based on the Average Adjusted Book Value)




<b>2012</b>	<b>1.29%</b>	<b>2.23%</b>	<b>4.90%</b>	<b>3.44%</b>	<b>1.40%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.13%</b>	<b>1.90%</b>	<b>3.91%</b>	<b>4.05%</b>	<b>1.34%</b>	<b>1.60%</b>	<b>4.26%</b>	<b>2.68%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>1.31%</b>	<b>2.01%</b>	<b>4.47%</b>	<b>3.31%</b>	<b>1.39%</b>	<b>1.73%</b>	<b>2.67%</b>	<b>1.83%</b>	<b>3.59%</b>	<b>3.10%</b>	<b>1.47%</b>	<b>1.60%</b>	<b>3.22%</b>	<b>2.01%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>1.35%</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>4.08%</b>	<b>3.24%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>2.72%</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>3.07%</b>	<b>2.65%</b>	<b>1.45%</b>	<b>1.28%</b>	<b>4.03%</b>	<b>2.40%</b>

Source: INVT312 (Efficiency)

Note: Thunder Bay does not have an internally managed portfolio, therefore they do not report on this graph.

## What is the rate of return on the external investment portfolio?

Fig 16.3 Gross Percent Realized Return on the Total Externally Managed Investment Portfolio (based on the Average Adjusted Book Value)




<b>2012</b>	<b>4.11%</b>	<b>0.66%</b>	<b>4.42%</b>	<b>4.59%</b>	<b>4.10%</b>	<b>1.81%</b>	<b>2.37%</b>	<b>3.24%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>3.22%</b>	<b>0.77%</b>	<b>3.99%</b>	<b>7.03%</b>	<b>3.61%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>	<b>3.20%</b>	<b>3.22%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>3.53%</b>	<b>26.70%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>12.74%</b>	<b>4.28%</b>	<b>1.12%</b>	<b>3.07%</b>	<b>3.91%</b>

Source: INVT314 (Efficiency)

Note: Durham, Halton, Montreal, Niagara, Toronto, Winnipeg and Windsor do not have an externally managed portfolio, therefore do not appear in this graph.

Comment: The City of Hamilton's year over year difference is related to the realization of capital gains in the One Fund holdings in 2014.



## What is the Service?

The goal of Legal Services is to provide responsive, cost effective legal support to Council, Boards and Agencies, and staff on strategic initiatives, legislative compliance, risk management and operations issues, using best efforts to ensure the actions undertaken by the municipality comply with applicable laws and have the desired legal effect.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Meeting the needs of Council, department heads and staff for timely, accurate and effective legal advice
- Protecting, advocating for, and advancing, the legal interests of the municipality and the public interest
- Providing efficient and cost effective representation of the municipality before the courts and board/tribunals
- Preparing, negotiating and reviewing contracts and agreements effectively to protect the municipality's interests
- Overseeing the delivery of services under the Provincial Offences Act (POA) consisting of administrative, prosecutorial and court support functions

## Influencing Factors

**Demand Drivers:** Demand for specific types of legal services differs from municipality to municipality and/or from year to year, e.g. increased hearings activity (municipal zoning By-laws and official plans), one-of-a-kind or significant litigation, contracts, projects and collective bargaining processes can impact hours worked and costs associated with in-house and/or external lawyers.

**Organizational Form:** Single-tier and Upper-tier municipalities provide different services, i.e. whether all legal costs are controlled centrally; mix of external vs. in-house lawyers.


**Policy and Practices:** Different services can demand varying levels of legal support. Reimbursement of Legal Fees Indemnification By-laws are handled differently by municipalities.



# Legal

## What is the in-house legal operating cost for every \$1,000 a municipality spends?

Fig 17.1 In-House Legal Operating Cost per \$1,000 Municipal Operating and Capital Expenditures




2012	\$3.57	\$1.92	\$2.88	\$2.80	\$1.75	N/A	\$0.88	\$1.37	\$4.36	\$1.43	\$2.57	N/A	\$2.89	\$2.57
2013	\$3.51	\$1.93	\$3.12	\$2.88	\$1.93	\$3.21	\$1.34	\$1.27	\$4.45	\$1.55	\$2.50	\$1.66	\$2.90	\$2.50
2014	\$3.37	\$1.88	\$2.94	\$2.71	N/A	\$3.38	\$1.28	\$1.18	\$5.53	\$1.45	\$2.73	\$1.60	\$3.07	\$2.72

Source: LEGL252 (Efficiency)

## How much do municipalities spend for an hour of in-house legal service?

Fig 17.2 In-House Legal Operating Costs per In-House Lawyer Hour




2012	\$134	\$148	\$182	\$147	\$137	N/A	\$152	\$98	\$170	\$119	\$115	N/A	\$174	\$147
2013	\$144	\$156	\$185	\$139	\$144	\$157	\$192	\$107	\$181	\$121	\$117	N/A	\$183	\$150
2014	\$143	\$151	\$189	\$140	N/A	\$152	\$202	\$97	\$195	\$132	\$127	N/A	\$186	\$151

Source: LEGL315 (Efficiency)



# 18 Libraries



## What is the Service?

Libraries are an important resource to meet the changing needs of individuals and communities. They foster literacy, life-long learning and support a love of reading in people of all ages. Libraries also provide support for newcomers and job seekers and build diverse communities.

*Specific services include:*

- Collection of books, periodicals, magazines and articles
- Reference and referral services to provide information and advice
- Access to technology and digital content
- Individual study space as well as community meeting rooms
- Outreach and partnerships initiatives

These services are delivered within the library and beyond through the virtual library and collaborative resource sharing networks.



## Influencing Factors

**Access:** Number and size of branches and the hours of operation, i.e. municipalities with lower population densities may offer more physical library branches and service hours to provide residents with services within a reasonable distance. Also, public meeting rooms within branches and other service delivery models, like bookmobiles, may be offered.

**Collections:** Size and mix, as well as number, of languages supported.

**Collections:** Investment in both physical and technology based collections and resources, including the number of languages supported.

**Demographics:** Socio-economic and cultural make-up of the population served.

**Use Types:** Mix, variety and depth of services offered (uses) and the resources available to track the different (physical and electronic) uses.

# Libraries

## How many times are libraries used per person?

Fig 18.1 Annual Library Uses per Capita


Municipality	Annual Library Uses per Capita (PLIB105M)			Electronic Library Uses per Capita (PLIB106)			Non-Electric Library Uses per Capita (PLIB107)		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014
HAM	32.2	32.1	30.5	10.2	10.8	11.3	22.0	21.3	19.3
LON	40.4	37.4	N/A	18.0	16.5	N/A	22.4	20.9	N/A
MTL	N/A	17.1	17.7	N/A	4.1	4.7	N/A	12.9	12.9
OTT	34.9	33.5	35.0	15.6	15.0	17.1	19.3	18.5	17.9
TBAY	30.5	29.8	30.4	14.5	14.5	14.8	16.0	15.3	15.6
TOR	35.5	35.0	35.7	13.7	14.1	15.8	21.8	20.9	20.0
WAT	18.1	17.4	23.7	6.6	6.9	13.6	11.5	10.5	10.1
WIND	22.3	20.5	19.5	9.3	8.5	8.3	13.0	11.9	11.1
WINN	19.4	28.4	30.4	5.4	15.2	17.7	13.9	13.1	12.6
MED	31.4	29.8	30.4	12.0	14.1	14.2	17.7	15.3	14.3

Source: PLIB105M; PLIB106; PLIB107 (Community Impact)

Comment: Winnipeg's increase in 2013 reflects the capture of electronic uses not reported in previous years.

## How many holdings do libraries have?

Fig 18.2 Number of Library Holdings per Capita




2012	2.4	2.4	N/A	2.5	2.8	3.9	3.6	3.5	2.1	2.7
2013	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.8	4.0	4.1	2.6	1.8	2.6
2014	2.1	N/A	2.5	2.4	2.5	3.8	3.0	2.7	1.8	2.5

Source: PLIB205 (Service Level)

Note: Library holdings come in print form (reference collections, circulating/borrowing collections and periodicals); and electronic media (CDs/DVDs, MP3 materials, audio books and eBooks)

## What is the total cost for each library use?

Fig 18.3 Total Cost per Library Use (includes amortization)




2012	\$1.75	\$1.48	N/A	\$1.64	\$1.82	\$1.96	\$2.26	\$2.25	\$2.05	\$1.89
2013	\$1.71	\$1.57	\$3.51	\$1.71	\$1.91	\$2.04	\$2.43	\$2.25	\$1.43	\$1.91
2014	\$1.87	N/A	\$3.26	\$1.58	\$1.94	\$1.98	\$1.88	\$2.41	\$1.37	\$1.91

Source: PLIB305T (Efficiency)

Comment: In 2013, Winnipeg's decrease in cost per use reflects the capture of electronic uses not reported in previous years.

## How many times is each item borrowed from a library?

Fig 18.4 Average Number of Times in Year Circulating Items are Borrowed (Turnover)




2012	7.0	5.0	N/A	4.7	2.9	5.3	1.8	2.4	4.0	4.4
2013	6.8	4.8	2.7	4.7	2.8	5.0	1.6	2.4	4.3	4.3
2014	6.2	N/A	2.8	4.7	2.5	5.3	2.4	2.2	4.1	3.5

Source: PLIB405 (Customer Service)



# 19 Licensing



## What is the Service?

Licensing programs for businesses and taxi services help protect the health and safety of the public and the integrity of the businesses. Administrative and enforcement staff carry-out key functions:

*Specific services include:*

- Issuing licenses to businesses that meet the standards set by the By-laws
- Ensuring the standards are maintained
- Investigating complaints and any non-compliant issues.

Licensing programs seek to enrich businesses by promoting public confidence, assisting with fair competition and ensuring a degree of consumer protection is in place.

The numbers and types of businesses which are regulated through a municipal licensing program vary extensively throughout OMBI municipalities, as do the methods and approaches for carrying out these basic requirements.

## Influencing Factors

**Municipal By-laws:** Administration, inspection and regulation process used and the sophistication of the municipal By-law regulations will differ.

**Policy and Practices:** Cost is dependent on the number of categories of business licenses in the municipality and the number and types of licenses used.


**Processes and Systems:** Type and quality of systems used to track complaints, inspections and other data.



# Licensing

## How many licenses are issued?

Fig 19.1 Number of Licenses Issued per 100,000 Population



<b>2012</b>	<b>3,836</b>	<b>1,516</b>	<b>1,806</b>	<b>1,415</b>	<b>1,033</b>	<b>1,902</b>	<b>164 *</b>	<b>1,433</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>1,475</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>3,863</b>	<b>1,431</b>	<b>2,119</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>1,936</b>	<b>180 *</b>	<b>1,790</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>1,650</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>3,744</b>	<b>1,642</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1,451</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>1,992</b>	<b>179 *</b>	<b>1,713</b>	<b>798</b>	<b>1,642</b>


Source: LICN205 (Service Level)

Note: Results include taxi driver licenses, taxi plate holder licenses and business licenses.

\*The Region of Waterloo issues taxi-cab, vehicle for hire, salvage yard and second hand shop licenses; and they do not issue business licenses. Therefore, Waterloo's results have been removed from the median for comparability purposes.

## How much did the municipality spend on business, taxi driver and taxi plate holder licenses based on population?

Fig 19.2 Total Cost for Licenses per 100,000 Population (includes amortization)



2012	\$587,099	\$327,510	\$171,362	N/A	\$191,470	\$695,813	\$403,650	\$403,650	\$469,658	\$403,650
2013	\$653,860	\$323,819	\$177,017	N/A	N/A	\$718,295	\$424,108	\$430,250	\$417,965	\$424,108
2014	\$651,843	\$392,361	N/A	N/A	\$98,495	\$560,998	\$402,531	\$412,700	\$292,557	\$402,531


Source: LICN225T (Service Level)

Note: Results include taxi driver licenses, taxi plate holder licenses and business licenses.

\*The Region of Waterloo issues taxi-cab, vehicle for hire, salvage yard and second hand shop licenses only; and they do not issue business licenses. Therefore, Waterloo's results have been removed from the median for comparability purposes.

## What is the total cost per license issued?

Fig 19.3 Total Cost per License Issued (includes amortization)



2012	\$153	\$216	\$95	N/A	\$185	\$366	\$232	\$282	\$511	\$216
2013	\$169	\$226	\$84	N/A	N/A	\$371	\$180	\$240	\$484	\$233
2014	\$174	\$239	N/A	N/A	\$107	\$282	\$177	\$241	\$366	\$240

Source: LICN305T (Efficiency)

Note: Results include taxi driver licenses, taxi plate holder licenses and business licenses.

\*The Region of Waterloo issues taxi-cab, vehicle for hire, salvage yard and second hand shop licenses only; and they do not issue business licenses. Therefore, Waterloo's results have been removed from the median for comparability purposes.

# 20 Long Term Care



## What is the Service?

Long Term Care (LTC) Services provide quality resident-focused care within municipal LTC homes and offer programs that meet the needs of individuals who are no longer able to live independently. The goal is to maximize quality of life and safety for residents.

Each municipality is required by legislation to operate a LTC home. Operators can also include charitable and private sector organizations. All LTC operators are provincially funded and governed by the same legislation and standards set by the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care (MOHLTC).

Some municipalities provide community programs, e.g. adult day services, homemakers and meals on wheels, which provide support to clients and family caregivers. These services enable many clients to remain independent in their own homes.

*Specific services include:*

- Provision of 24-hour nursing and personal care
- Proper dietary and nutritional assessments
- Stimulating recreational and social activities
- Quality housekeeping and environmental services

## Influencing Factors

**Costs:** The LTC Home costs can be a misleading efficiency measure unless costs are weighted and adjusted for acuity levels, wage differentials, funding changes, qualitative outcomes and service levels. For the purpose of reporting OMBI data costs are adjusted for acuity levels only.

**Location/Supply:** Municipal and District homes in Northern communities hold a significant proportion of the LTC beds provided in the area. Without municipal participation, some areas of the province would have limited access to LTC services. Conversely, Municipal and District homes in some southern and urban communities make up a smaller proportion of overall LTC beds given the significant number of LTC beds operated by other provider types. As a result, this may lead to greater choice of long term care homes in these communities.

**Municipal LTC Home Mix:** Some municipalities administer LTC homes while others have a mix of homes, supportive housing, and community and day programs. These are distinct services with significantly different cost structures.


**Provincial Standards:** Ministry imposed funding reduction if LTC home occupancy levels fall below 97% for long stay beds.

**Staffing Mix:** Costs are affected by staffing levels, the ratio of registered vs. non-registered staff and the case mix index (CMI).

# Long Term Care

## How many citizens aged 75 and over have access to long term care?

Fig 20.1 Percent of LTC Community Need Satisfied




<b>2012</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>

Source: LTCR105 (Community Impact)

Note: The need for Long Term Care beds is influenced by the availability of other services, e.g. hospital beds, complex continuing care, other community care services, supportive housing, adult day spaces, etc. These services are designed to work together to provide a continuum of health care for citizens.

## How many municipal bed days are available for citizens 75 years of age or over?

Fig 20.2 Municipal Long Term Care Facility Bed Days per Population 75 Years of Age and Over




<b>2013</b>	<b>8.66</b>	<b>6.58</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>8.88</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>17.03</b>	<b>4.59</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>4.92</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>4.68</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>8.59</b>	<b>6.58</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>8.72</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>17.03</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>4.88</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>4.75</b>

Source: LTCR219 (Service Level)

Note: Northern communities tend to hold a significant proportion of the long term care beds provided in the area. Without municipal participation, some areas of the province would have limited access to LTC beds.

## How much does it cost to provide one long term care bed for a day?

Fig 20.3 LTC Facility Operating Cost (CMI Adjusted) per LTC Facility Bed Day (Source: MOHLTC Annual Return)




2012	\$263	\$244	\$235	\$215	\$184	\$216	\$197	\$212	\$225	\$279	\$260	\$225
2013	\$268	\$246	\$243	\$222	\$186	\$220	\$202	\$215	\$224	\$275	\$268	\$224
2014	\$270	\$254	\$243	N/A	\$192	\$220	\$207	\$218	\$239	\$263	\$276	\$241

Source: LTCR305 (Efficiency)

Note: Results are based on calculations using the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care Annual Report data. Many municipalities contribute additional resources to their LTC operations to maintain standards of care that exceed provincial requirements.

## How satisfied are residents and family members with municipal long term care services?

Fig 20.4 Long Term Care Resident/Family Satisfaction



<b>2012</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>95%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>96%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>97%</b>

Source: LTCR405 (Customer Service)

Note: Residents and/or their family members are typically surveyed annually to ensure their needs are understood and services are provided to meet those needs.



# 21 Parking



## What is the Service?

Parking Services provides parking operations, maintenance and enforcement services for residents, businesses and visitors of the municipality. The goal of Parking Services is to ensure that parking is available in an equitable, affordable and safe manner.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Affordable on-street parking rates with hours of use conducive to turnover and to the needs of the business
- Supporting business, commercial, institutional and entertainment patrons by optimizing the availability of on-street parking for short visits, and providing supplemental, off-street parking for longer visits
- Balancing the availability of residential street parking between the needs of the residents, and the needs of the greater community
- Equitable enforcement of parking By-laws to ensure compliance and safety for the community

## Influencing Factors

**Location:** Cross border traffic, proximity to the GTA and location of public parking relative to retail/commercial/entertainment facilities.

**Operating Standards and Policies:** Cost recovery policies, service hours (24/7 availability, or restricted access) maintenance standards (for line painting, lighting replacement, garbage collection, etc.).

**Processes and Systems:** Type and quality of technology used to manage operations and enforcement, i.e. handheld devices vs. written; ticket management systems; meters vs. pay and display machines, level of automation at parking surface lots vs. parking garage structures.

**Service Delivery Model:** Level of automation at parking lots; staff vs. contracted attendants, mix of on-street and off-street parking spaces.

**Structural Issues:** Use of parking structures/garages in a parking portfolio vs. surface lots, age of facilities/equipment.


**Utilization Levels:** Use of variable-rate pricing structures, the availability of public transit/public transit utilization rate and the proximity of parking alternatives (free public parking, private lots) will impact utilization levels.

# Parking

## How many parking spaces do municipalities provide?

Fig 21.1 Number of Paid Parking Spaces Managed per 100,000 Population

(In Thousands)



2012	1,325	1,327	815	N/A	726	2,903	1,548	2,134	714	1,326
2013	1,305	1,320	807	1,485	714	3,131	1,568	2,026	704	1,320
2014	1,254	1,303	N/A	1,460	699	3,122	1,544	2,178	750	1,382


Source: PRKG205 (Service Level)

Note: The number of available parking spaces can be impacted by road construction in any given year and/or the opening or closing of parking structures.

## How much revenue does one parking space generate?

Fig 21.2 Gross Parking Revenue Collected per Paid Parking Space

(In Thousands)




2012	\$3,596	\$1,413	\$1,181	N/A	\$2,695	\$463	\$3,038	\$667	\$1,666	\$1,540
2013	\$3,614	\$1,410	\$1,188	\$6,496	\$2,921	\$468	\$2,993	\$611	\$1,607	\$1,607
2014	\$3,792	\$1,446	N/A	\$6,594	\$2,712	\$483	\$2,961	\$805	\$1,549	\$2,131

Source: PRKG305 (Efficiency)

## What is the total cost for a municipality to maintain one parking space?

Fig 21.3 Total Cost per Paid Parking Space Managed (includes amortization)

(In Thousands)




2012	\$1,845	\$1,488	\$452	N/A	\$1,310	\$466	\$1,561	\$838	\$1,481	\$1,396
2013	\$1,965	\$1,535	\$501	\$2,357	\$1,270	\$447	\$1,511	\$890	\$1,082	\$1,270
2014	\$1,998	\$1,477	N/A	\$2,296	\$1,578	\$516	\$1,565	\$847	\$1,085	\$1,521

Source: PRKG320T

Comment: Winnipeg closed one structure in 2012 with accompanying write-down and major refit carried out on second structure resulting in a higher cost in 2012.

## What is the revenue to cost ratio for parking services?


Fig 21.4 Revenue to Cost Ratio (RC Ratio): On-street and Off-street Parking Spaces



2012	2.68	1.07	2.73	N/A	2.50	1.17	2.18	1.09	1.68	1.93
2013	2.42	1.04	2.51	2.96	2.82	1.21	2.23	0.94	1.69	2.23
2014	2.51	1.11	N/A	3.11	2.23	1.09	2.12	1.29	1.76	1.94

Source: PRKG340 (Efficiency)





## What is the Service?

Parks Services supports the recreational and leisure needs of the community. Parkland, both maintained and natural, enhances quality of life, economic, cultural, environmental well-being of the community; and is a key component in sustainability plans.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Clean, safe, welcoming parks and natural spaces for all residents to enjoy
- Opportunities for physical activity including both recreational and competitive sports



## Influencing Factors

**Demographics and Community Use:** Community/Resident demand for parks usage has increased in recent years particularly for large, social gatherings and various cultural activities (i.e. specialty fields, cultural gardens, community gardens, dogs-off-leash areas, special events etc.). While these activities increase parks usage, they also translate into higher maintenance and signage costs, as well as increased staff training requirements. Operating costs related to these contemporary activities vary across municipalities; and are not captured separately.

**Geography:** Varying topography affects the number of hectares, e.g. size of escarpment, number of lakes, transportation networks.

**Maintenance Levels:** Level of management applied to natural areas in parks, e.g. ecological restoration projects, community naturalization projects.

**Mix of Maintained and Natural Parkland:** Maintained parks can include a number of amenities and usually involve turf maintenance programs, all of which typically are more costly on a per hectare basis than the costs of maintaining forests or other natural areas.


**Service Standards:** Differences between municipalities in the amenities available (greenhouses, washrooms, playgrounds), as well as the standards to which those parks are maintained, such as the frequency of grass cutting. There can also be differences in the costs of maintaining certain sports fields i.e. Class A, B, C and D class fields (soccer, football, baseball).

**Weather Conditions:** Weather conditions and the length of growing seasons affect all municipalities differently, however as we continue to experience more frequent and intense weather changes, operating costs are impacted.

# Parks

## What percent of the municipality is parkland?

Fig 22.1 All Parkland in Municipality as a Percent of Total Area of Municipality



<b>2012</b>	<b>9.20%</b>	<b>2.40%</b>	<b>6.00%</b>	<b>1.50%</b>	<b>6.20%</b>	<b>12.70%</b>	<b>6.50%</b>	<b>6.10%</b>	<b>6.15%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>9.20%</b>	<b>2.40%</b>	<b>6.00%</b>	<b>1.50%</b>	<b>6.20%</b>	<b>12.70%</b>	<b>6.50%</b>	<b>6.10%</b>	<b>6.15%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>9.30%</b>	<b>2.40%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1.50%</b>	<b>5.70%</b>	<b>12.80%</b>	<b>6.80%</b>	<b>6.10%</b>	<b>6.10%</b>

Source: PRKS125 (Community Impact)

Note: Municipalities with a predominant urban form may find it more difficult to establish new or expand existing parks within the developed core area.

## How much parkland is available per 100,000 population?


Fig 22.2 Hectares of Maintained and Natural Parkland in Municipality per 100,000 Population

Municipality	Maintained Parkland (PRKS205)			Natural Parkland (PRKS210)			Total Parkland (PRKS215)		
	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014	2012	2013	2014
CAL	325	319	291	368	361	366	693	680	657
HAM	271	269	268	232	230	229	504	499	497
LON	281	281	N/A	404	404	N/A	686	685	N/A
OTT	231	229	230	212	206	205	443	435	434
TBAY	278	278	256	1,602	1,602	1,478	1,880	1,880	1,733
TOR	160	158	156	135	133	131	295	292	288
WIND	251	251	260	203	203	204	454	454	464
WINN	271	267	263	151	151	150	421	418	412
MED	271	268	260	222	218	205	479	476.5	464

Source: PRKS205; PRKS210; PRKS215 (Service Level)

## What is the cost to operate parks per person?

Fig 22.3 Operating Cost of Parks per Person




<b>2012</b>	<b>\$74.21</b>	<b>\$36.31</b>	<b>\$27.31</b>	<b>\$45.24</b>	<b>\$87.80</b>	<b>\$56.49</b>	<b>\$78.02</b>	<b>\$34.30</b>	<b>\$50.87</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>\$76.98</b>	<b>\$43.76</b>	<b>\$28.10</b>	<b>\$48.49</b>	<b>\$96.43</b>	<b>\$66.04</b>	<b>\$84.77</b>	<b>\$36.26</b>	<b>\$57.27</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>\$82.72</b>	<b>\$45.93</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$53.25</b>	<b>\$89.24</b>	<b>\$63.49</b>	<b>\$80.72</b>	<b>\$36.88</b>	<b>\$63.49</b>

Source: PRKS230M (Service Level)

## What is the cost to operate parks per hectare?

Fig 22.4 Operating Cost per Hectare of Maintained and Natural Parkland



<b>2012</b>	<b>\$10,702</b>	<b>\$7,211</b>	<b>\$5,523</b>	<b>\$10,209</b>	<b>\$5,828</b>	<b>\$19,166</b>	<b>\$17,174</b>	<b>\$8,144</b>	<b>\$9,177</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>\$11,314</b>	<b>\$8,769</b>	<b>\$4,103</b>	<b>\$11,145</b>	<b>\$6,235</b>	<b>\$22,532</b>	<b>\$18,662</b>	<b>\$8,680</b>	<b>\$9,957</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>\$12,594</b>	<b>\$9,238</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$12,258</b>	<b>\$6,365</b>	<b>\$21,897</b>	<b>\$17,387</b>	<b>\$8,947</b>	<b>\$12,258</b>

Source: PRKS315 (Efficiency)

Note: It is more costly per hectare to provide maintained parkland vs. natural parkland. In addition, differences in service standards established for maintained parks and variations in level of management applied to natural areas affect the results.



# 23 Payroll



## What is the Service?

Payroll Services administer payroll activities in accordance with union agreements, Council policies and relevant legislation. The primary goal of payroll services is to ensure that all employees are paid accurately and on-time, with the correct withholdings and deductions, and to remit withholdings and deductions within specified deadlines.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Production of Pay – Calculate and process one time and on-going payments and deductions to employees
- Balancing General Ledger – Prepare journals and reconcile gross/net pay to payroll registers
- Payment and Reconciliation of Payroll Liabilities – Statutory tax withholdings and voluntary/mandatory deductions
- Internal and External Reporting – Management reports, Records of Employment, T4/T4A
- Auditing Payroll Data – Reconcile gross to net pay calculations
- Payroll Technical Systems Configuration – Setup and maintain payroll system

## Influencing Factors

**Organizational Form:** Centralized vs. Decentralized. Costs related to time and data entry have been excluded for comparability. Any costs associated with benefits administration and employee master data maintenance have been excluded from these results and are included in those of Human Resources.

**Policy and Practices:** In-house vs. externally contracted out services, and differences in payroll structure and responsibilities.

**Processes and Systems:** Differences in the number of pay periods, e.g. weekly vs. bi-weekly, etc.; multiple pay schedules for various groups within the organization; number of manual cheques issued for adjustments and reversals and/or multiple direct deposits and payments and/or adjustments made under separate advice.

**Staff Mix:** Salary vs. hourly rate and/or part-time vs. full time complement and the corresponding demand for support.


**Unionization:** Number of unions, union contract settlements resulting in retroactive payments, complexity of the Collective Bargaining Agreement terms, and Corporate Policies may be a factor in the creation of replacement payments and demand for service.

# Payroll

## How many payroll direct deposits and cheques are processed?

Fig 23.1 Number of Payroll Direct Deposits and Cheques per Finance Payroll FTE

(In Thousands)




2012	28,763	28,467	20,675	29,211	13,369	N/A	17,528	15,687	27,439	24,281	24,576	11,434	N/A	21,203	22,742
2013	29,073	31,247	21,081	27,255	14,960	17,437	15,477	16,379	27,835	24,074	24,981	11,044	25,621	22,357	23,216
2014	30,818	28,716	21,877	30,157	N/A	18,663	17,538	16,346	26,556	24,230	26,048	16,306	24,439	23,482	24,230

Source: FPRL317A (Efficiency)

Comment: The City of Windsor took over processing Transit Windsor's payroll (approximately 260 employees) effective January 1, 2014 which contributes to the 47.6% increase.

## What is the operating cost to process a payroll direct deposit or cheque?

Fig 23.2 Operating Cost per Payroll Direct Deposit and Cheques



2012	\$4.37	\$3.45	\$7.29	\$3.45	\$2.78	N/A	\$4.10	\$5.99	\$2.84	\$5.65	\$4.58	\$7.15	N/A	\$3.69	\$4.24
2013	\$4.26	\$3.74	\$7.52	\$4.01	\$2.83	\$4.01	\$4.51	\$5.86	\$2.88	\$5.97	\$4.67	\$6.59	\$3.01	\$3.67	\$4.14
2014	\$4.28	\$3.40	\$7.52	\$3.76	N/A	\$4.82	\$4.70	\$5.96	\$3.18	\$5.34	\$4.08	\$6.12	\$4.02	\$3.64	\$4.28

Source: FPRL306A (Efficiency)

Comment: Halton outsources part of their payroll processing to a third party provider.



# 24 Planning



## What is the Service?

Municipalities manage growth and physical form through their planning processes. The goal of planning services is the efficient and effective management of land and resources to ensure healthy and sustainable communities; economically, socially, and environmentally.

*Specific services may include:*

- Overseeing the creation and management of a municipality's Official Plan (the master planning document required under Ontario's Planning Act)
- Processing development applications received for specific projects; applications are reviewed and processed with regard to provincial legislation, Council -approved policies, and By-laws
- Leading municipal strategic planning, including environmental initiatives, urban design, transportation planning, area studies and policy development
- Providing Geographic Information Services (GIS) or mapping information

## Influencing Factors

**Application Variables:** Type, mix and complexity (in terms of scope and magnitude) of applications received and the nature of applications under applicable legislation, may include applications that are not under The Planning Act.

**Complexity:** Scope and magnitude of application.

**Government Structure:** Single-tier vs. two-tier local government structures can influence comparisons between municipalities, since upper-tier municipalities do not process all types of applications.

**Legislation:** Differences or variations in the applicable legislation and policy may impact application volumes, time spent on applications and the number of appeals. Examples might include: Planning Act, Places to Grow, Greenbelt, Niagara Escarpment Planning Area.

**Organizational Form:** Differing models can affect both the application review process, i.e. departments outside of Planning, and the number of activities beyond application processing including growth management.


**Timing:** Average time to process a given type of application, scope of participation over and above the requirements of the Planning Act and regulations under the Municipal Act, and the involvement of other commenting and approval authorities.

# Planning


## What is the total cost for planning services per resident?

Fig 24.1 Total Cost for Planning per Capita (includes amortization)

Single-Tier



Upper-Tier



2012	\$30.62	\$27.76	\$22.33	\$38.79	\$29.78	N/A	\$18.81	\$7.01	\$27.76
2013	\$31.52	\$30.87	\$21.86	N/A	\$24.07	\$19.49	\$19.98	\$7.15	\$21.86
2014	\$35.38	\$31.07	N/A	\$33.63	\$26.30	\$21.35	\$19.32	\$7.30	\$26.30

\$8.78	\$11.34	\$7.42	\$14.02	\$2.89	\$8.78
\$8.09	\$15.05	\$10.90	\$13.76	\$4.26	\$10.90
\$8.06	\$15.55	\$13.19	\$9.32	\$4.28	\$9.32


Source: PLNG250T (Service Level)

Note: The amount spent on planning-related activities and application processing can vary significantly from municipality to municipality based on the types of applications. This reflects the different organizational structures and priorities established by local Councils.

Comment: Niagara's increase in external transfers for program expenses: Lakefront Enhancement, Water Smart and Development Charge Grants

## How many development applications are processed within the legislated timeframe?

Fig 24.2 Percent of Development Applications Meeting Planning Act Timeframes (Single-Tier Only)



<b>2012</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>94%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>96%</b>


Source: PLNG450 (Customer Service)

Note: Timeframe calculations may vary by municipality. Factors such as the volume and complexity of applications will affect results, as well as revisions, additional information and/or study requirements during consideration of applications received.

Toronto does not track this data; and the Ontario Planning Act timelines are not applicable to Calgary, Montreal and Winnipeg.



# 25 POA (Court Services)



## What is the Service?

In 2001, the Province of Ontario transferred the responsibility for the administration and prosecution of provincial offences to municipalities. In administering the Provincial Offences Act (POA), staff is responsible for setting trials, prosecuting certain Provincial Offence matters, recording court proceedings, and receiving fine payments resulting from charges laid by the various police forces and enforcement agencies operating within the municipality. Municipalities also uphold the decisions of the court by pursuing collection of unpaid POA fines.

*Provincial offences are minor (non-criminal) offences that include, but are not limited to:*

- Speeding, careless driving, or not wearing your seat belt – Highway Traffic Act
- Failing to surrender your insurance card or possessing a false or invalid insurance card – Compulsory Automobile Insurance Act
- Being intoxicated in a public place or selling alcohol to a minor – Liquor License Act
- Entering prohibited premises or failing to leave premises after being directed to do so – Trespass to Property Act
- Violations of the Occupational Health and Safety Act and environmental legislation
- Noise, taxi and animal care By-laws

## Influencing Factors

**Charges & Cost Structures:** Parking vs. non-parking charges; costs that might be unique to some municipalities (e.g. interpreter costs, night court program—deleted from Toronto program June 2008) and ability to account for the true cost of delivering the service can affect the results.

**Enforcement:** Based upon the enforcement agencies staffing complement and the prioritization of their resources, this varies from year-to-year; and is beyond the control of Court Administration.


**Geographic Location:** Municipalities that experience seasonal swings between permanent and seasonal residents (i.e. cottage country), border towns or those with 400 series highways going through them, have offences disproportionate to population or local demographics.

**Judiciary Controls:** No transparent rationale for allocation of court time to municipal courts, i.e. Court Administration units are assigned Justices of the Peace and, based on the priorities of the day, Justices of the Peace are reassigned. This has the effect of reducing their availability to POA Court. Justices of the Peace are not accountable to Court Administration for efficient utilization of allocated court time.

# POA (Court Services)

## How many charges are filed?

Fig 25.1 Number of Charges Filed per Capita




<b>2012</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.13</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.13</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.13</b>

Source: PCRT215 (Service Level)

## How many charges does a Court Administration Clerk handle/process?

Fig 25.2 Number of Charges Filed per Court Administration Clerk

(In Thousands)




2012	6,506	9,881	7,115	6,408	6,557	7,962	6,721	6,566	7,429	6,721
2013	7,262	10,148	7,335	4,144	6,699	6,718	6,654	6,190	6,887	6,718
2014	6,852	9,628	N/A	3,817	5,737	5,043	5,683	5,091	8,547	5,710

Source: PCRT222 (Service Level)

## What is the total cost of POA services per charge filed?

Fig 25.3 Total Cost of POA Services per Charge Filed (includes amortization)




2012	\$81.44	\$35.40	\$69.28	\$66.95	\$61.13	\$46.31	\$63.25	\$84.14	\$86.27	\$66.95
2013	\$74.88	\$35.33	\$68.56	\$51.97	\$68.89	\$62.34	\$68.31	\$81.05	\$86.78	\$68.56
2014	\$79.42	\$36.49	N/A	\$59.97	\$77.76	\$76.77	\$67.75	\$99.18	\$81.25	\$77.27

Source: PCRT305T (Efficiency)

## What is the fine collection rate?

Fig 25.4 Collection Rate




<b>2012</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>47%</b>

Source: PCRT310 (Efficiency)



# 26 Police Services



## What is the Service?

Municipalities are responsible for the provision of adequate and effective Police Services to ensure the safety and security of citizens, businesses and visitors. To fulfill this mandate, each municipality and police agency creates and implements strategies, policies and business models that meet the specific needs and priorities of their local communities.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Crime prevention
- Law enforcement
- Victims' assistance
- Maintenance of public order
- Emergency response services

## Influencing Factors

**Demographic Trends:** Socio-economic composition of a municipality's population.

**Non-Residents:** Degree of daily inflow and outflow of commuters, tourists, seasonal residents and attendees at cultural, entertainment or sporting events who require police services are not captured in population based measures.

**Officer/Civilian Mix:** Differing policies regarding the type of policing work that may be done by civilian staff in one municipality vs. uniform staff in another.

**Public Support:** Willingness of the public to report crimes and to provide information that assists police services in the solving of crimes.

**Reporting:** Available police resources, departmental priorities, policies and procedures and enforcement practices may all influence the number of reported criminal incidents (unreported crime is not included in crime rates).

**Specialized Services:** Additional policing may be required at airports, casinos, etc.


### Additional Information

*The Crime rates included in this report may differ from those in Statistics Canada's publications due to the use of more current population estimates provided by the OMBI municipalities.*

# Police Services

## How many police officers and civilian staff serve the municipality?

Fig 26.1 Number of Total Police Staff (Officers and Civilians) per 100,000 Population




<b>2012</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>215</b>

Source: PLCE215 (Service Level)

## What is the total cost of police services per capita?

Fig 26.2 Total Cost for Police Services per Capita (includes amortization)



2012	\$264.94	\$252.69	\$290.14	\$281.11	N/A	\$326.83	\$290.02	\$330.02	\$382.49	\$255.43	\$463.20	\$337.34	\$248.28	\$290.08
2013	\$273.85	\$263.82	\$290.89	\$282.43	\$423.05	\$362.64	\$298.26	\$360.20	\$386.86	\$266.64	\$459.54	\$357.12	\$268.48	\$298.26
2014	\$277.59	\$259.47	\$292.25	N/A	\$425.84	\$363.01	\$303.07	\$372.72	\$394.86	\$289.75	\$450.19	\$365.35	\$272.37	\$333.04

Source: PLCE227T (Service Level)


Note: Costs include police services, prisoner transportation and court security. Since staffing costs make up the overwhelming majority of Policing costs, there is a strong correlation between those jurisdictions with higher levels of police staff (Figure 26.1 – PLCE215) and those with higher police costs reflected in this graph.

Comment: The total 2014 costs for Waterloo Regional Police Services (WRPS) show a significant increase due to the inclusion of liabilities of WRPS's self-insured long term sick leave salary and employee group benefits continuation plan which were not previously reported. An actuarial evaluation was conducted in 2014 and this previously unreported liability added \$7.1M to total 2014 costs, leading to a year over year increase of 8.6%. Excluding the provision for this liability, total costs increased by 3.8% from 2013 to 2014."

## What is the total crime rate?

Fig 26.3 Reported Number of Total (Non-Traffic) Criminal Code Incidents per 100,000 Population

(In Thousands)




2012	3,094	2,399	5,002	6,630	N/A	4,474	3,918	7,175	3,884	4,361	6,492	6,693	2,205	4,418
2013	2,892	2,112	4,409	6,140	4,750	3,981	3,442	6,595	3,660	4,158	6,003	5,619	2,042	4,158
2014	2,802	1,931	4,122	N/A	4,636	4,104	3,306	6,574	3,564	4,045	5,830	5,676	1,959	4,075

Source: PLCE120M (Community Impact)

Note: The total crime rate includes violent crime, property crime and other Criminal Code offences (excluding traffic), as defined by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistic (CCJS). Actual incidents of reported crime are based on the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Survey. Sourced from CANSIM.

## What is the total crime severity index?

Fig 26.4 Total Crime Severity Index



2012	45	29	71	83	N/A	64	57	88	65	59	88	102	36	65
2013	41	26	65	76	78	57	52	83	58	57	82	83	32	58
2014	38	24	60	N/A	77	57	45	92	56	55	78	83	31	57


Source: PLCE180 (Community Impact)

Note: The Crime Severity Index (CSI) includes violent crime, property crime, other Criminal Code offences, as well as traffic, drug violations and all Federal Statutes, as defined by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistic (CCJS). The CSI takes into account not only the change in volume but the relative seriousness of the crime. Sourced from CANSIM.

## What is the violent crime rate?

Fig 26.5 Reported Number of Violent - Criminal Code Incidents per 100,000 Population

(In Thousands)




2012	695	416	1,039	1,004	N/A	812	542	1,489	1,111	881	1,320	1,368	524	943
2013	674	386	899	916	1,027	833	584	1,622	1,007	820	1,239	1,168	476	899
2014	613	359	915	N/A	963	786	552	1,558	987	728	1,150	1,138	469	851

Source: PLCE105 (Community Impact)

Note: The violent crime rate includes the category of violent offences which involve the use of force or threat against a person, as defined by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistic (CCJS). Actual incidents of reported violent crime are based on the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Survey. Sourced from CANSIM.

## What is the violent crime severity index?

Fig 26.6 Violent Crime Severity Index




2012	56	24	77	72	N/A	54	58	118	116	62	90	162	39	67
2013	51	20	73	65	105	49	56	115	98	58	85	120	34	65
2014	40	18	68	N/A	106	41	50	144	93	51	80	116	32	60

Source: PLCE170 (Community Impact)

Note: The violent crime severity index (CSI) includes all violent offences which involve the use of force or threat against a person, as defined by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistic (CCJS). The Violent CSI takes into account not only the change in volume but the relative seriousness of the crime. Sourced from CANSIM.

## What percent of violent crime is solved in a calendar year?

Fig 26.7 Clearance Rate - Violent Crime




<b>2012</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>72%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>72%</b>

Source: PLCE405 (Customer Service)

Note: The clearance rate represents the proportion of criminal incidents solved by the police. Police can clear an incident by charge or the accused is processed by other means for one of many reasons, as defined by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistic (CCJS). Sourced from CANSIM.

## How many non-traffic criminal code incidents does each police officer handle?

Fig 26.8 Number of Criminal Code Incidents (Non-Traffic) per Police Officer



2012	23	19	34	41	N/A	32	27	39	19	32	31	37	16	32
2013	22	17	30	38	20	25	24	35	18	30	28	32	15	25
2014	21	16	28	N/A	19	26	24	30	18	30	28	32	15	25

Source: PLCE305 (Efficiency)

Note: Although this measure is an indication of an officer's workload, it is important to note it does not capture all of the active aspects of policing such as traffic or drug enforcement, nor does it incorporate proactive policing activities such as crime prevention initiatives or the provision of assistance to victims of crime. A number of factors can affect these results, including the existence of specialized units or the use of different models to organize officers in a community. For example, some jurisdictions have a collective agreement requirement that results in a minimum of two officers per patrol car during certain time periods. In these cases, there could be two officers responding to a criminal incident whereas in another jurisdiction only one officer might respond.



# 27 Purchasing



## What is the Service?

Purchasing Services is responsible for the acquisition of supplies, services, and construction in support of the operations of the Municipality and will work to procure the necessary quality and quantity of Goods and/or Services in an efficient, timely and cost effective manner, while maintaining the controls necessary for a public agency.

Purchasing Services encourages an open and competitive bidding process for the acquisition and disposal of Goods and/or Services and the objective and equitable treatment of all vendors to ensure the best value of an acquisition is obtained. This may include, but not be limited to, the determination of the total cost of performing the intended function over the lifetime of the task, acquisition cost, installation, disposal value, disposal cost, training cost, maintenance cost, quality of performance and environmental impact.

## Influencing Factors

**Economic Conditions:** Fluctuations in economic conditions could impact year-over-year comparisons of measures that incorporate the number of bids received and the costs of goods and services received.

**Geographic Location:** Parts of the Province may limit the number of bids as there may be an absence of specialized contractors and/or service providers.

**Government Form:** Single-tier municipalities have a unique purchasing environment, i.e. more layers of policy, more complex processes and diverse goods and services purchased.

**Organizational Form:** Municipal purchasing departments in Ontario do not look after all the same services or customers, i.e. some are responsible for stores/inventory operation, warehousing, insurance, mail room and/or a combination, while others are not; and some are responsible for procurement for Police, Emergency Services, Transit, Development and Social Services and others are not.

**Policy and Practices:** Time spent on the procurement process can differ based on the approval process in the municipality. It also differs on which department can conduct the process or a portion of the process which may or may not be based on dollar value of purchase. Progressive procurement practices that benefit the municipality, e.g. multi-year tenders, procurement cards, will also skew the results and may result in measures that appear less efficient.

**Processes and Systems:** Extent to which municipalities have authorized the implementation of procurement cards, blanket orders, contracts, etc.


**Provincial/Federal Policies:** Federal and Provincial grant programs may impact the level of spending in any given year. Changes and differences in provincial tax policies may impact the costs of goods and services received.

**Supply and Demand:** Buying off season or when goods and services are in high demand will impact the cost of goods and services received.

# Purchasing

## What percentage of goods and services are purchased through a procurement process?

Fig 27.1 Percent of Goods and Services Purchased (Operating and Capital) through a Procurement Process



<b>2013</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>54.0%</b>	<b>70.1%</b>	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>42.3%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>77.6%</b>	<b>75.7%</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>47.4%</b>	<b>39.6%</b>	<b>21.7%</b>	<b>56.9%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>69.9%</b>	<b>82.2%</b>	<b>117.0%</b>	<b>38.9%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>32.1%</b>	<b>72.9%</b>	<b>78.4%</b>	<b>62.5%</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>61.3%</b>


Source: FPUR107 (Community Impact)

Note: The thresholds regarding formal procurement processes within individual municipal purchasing policies and timing of large multi-year contracts will have an impact on the results.

Comment: Halton's 2014 data reflects a timing difference between the award of two large multi-year capital projects in 2014 and the actual payment for these contracts which will occur in subsequent years. If the 2014 data were to be adjusted for these two capital projects, the result would be 74.6% instead of 117%.

## What is the operating cost of the centralized purchasing division?

Fig 27.2 Centralized Purchasing Division Operating Cost per \$1,000 Municipal Purchases (Operating and Capital) for Goods and Services




2014	\$5.19	N/A	\$2.51	\$5.00	N/A	\$18.91	\$2.13	\$3.74	\$5.23	\$5.66	\$5.37	\$5.06	\$3.12	\$5.06
------	--------	-----	--------	--------	-----	---------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Source: FPUR362 (Efficiency)

Note: The results for this measure can be impacted by fluctuations in annual operating purchases; as well as the award and/or completion of contracts for large multi-year capital projects.

## What is the average number of bids received per bid call?

Fig 27.3 Average Number of Bids per Bid Call




2012	5.5	4.7	5.9	5.2	5.1	N/A	N/A	5.7	2.8	4.3	4.3	4.6	5.3	5.1
2013	6.0	3.8	5.8	5.5	4.2	4.2	N/A	5.7	2.8	5.0	5.4	4.1	5.2	5.1
2014	5.4	3.2	5.1	7.0	N/A	4.3	N/A	5.1	3.1	4.6	4.8	5.6	4.7	4.8

Source: FPUR415 (Customer Service)

Note: The types of bids issued and general economic conditions can impact the number of bids received.

# 28 Roads



## What is the Service?

Roads services provide affordable, well-managed and safe traffic flow for pedestrians, cyclists, drivers, public transit and commercial traffic while contributing to the environment and the quality of community life. A municipality's transportation system affects the economic vitality and quality of life of residents.

Transportation infrastructure generally includes roads, bridges, culverts, sidewalks, traffic control systems, signage and boulevards. In addition to constructing and repairing infrastructure, roads services include clearing the transportation network of snow and debris to ensure that it is safe and convenient to use.



## Influencing Factors

**Capitalization Policy:** Dollar thresholds for the capitalization of roads expenditures differ. In one municipality, an activity could be considered an operating expenditure while in another municipality, it could be considered as capital.

**Economic Conditions:** Inflationary increases in the cost of asphalt, concrete, fuel and contract services can reduce the amount of maintenance done with a given level of funding.

**Level of Government:** Single-tier municipalities are responsible for maintaining all types of roads, including arterial, collector and local roads and, in some cases, expressways and laneways. Upper-tier governments are not responsible for maintenance of local roads.

**Maintenance Standards:** Different standards, set by their respective municipal councils, can have an impact on costs and affect municipal backlog of roads rated in poor condition and general levels of service.

**Traffic Volumes & Urban Form:** Traffic volumes can accelerate the rate at which roads deteriorate and increase the frequency and costs of road maintenance. Traffic congestion, narrow streets, additional traffic signals and after-hour maintenance can also lead to higher costs.


**Utility Cut Repairs:** Cost of utility cuts can vary significantly from one year to another.

**Weather Conditions:** Frequency and severity of weather events can impact operation and maintenance costs, each municipality's service threshold for responding to weather incidents, and service standards for road conditions.

# Roads

## What is the volume of traffic on our main roads?

Fig 28.1 Vehicle Km Traveled per Lane Km (Major Roads)



2012	1,208,190	1,460,844	1,852,330	1,701,920	2,362,910	N/A	1,347,412	1,467,372	1,321,395	2,200,159	1,506,116	1,965,028	1,848,673	1,713,125	1,701,920
2013	1,273,059	1,326,084	1,797,976	1,712,038	1,852,877	1,502,488	1,360,952	1,417,763	1,336,375	2,193,428	1,512,929	1,815,361	1,833,007	1,483,307	1,507,709
2014	1,341,766	1,241,319	1,827,649	1,720,598	N/A	1,485,565	1,282,862	1,411,522	1,336,375	2,192,307	1,513,979	1,795,127	1,808,530	1,521,583	1,513,979


Source: ROAD112 (Community Impact)

Note: The measure indicates the number of times a vehicle travels over each lane Km of road; and demonstrates road congestion.

## How much does it cost to maintain one Km of paved road?


Fig 28.2 Total Cost for Paved "Hard Top" Roads per Lane Km (includes amortization)

Single-Tier (In Thousands)



2013	\$5,327	\$12,187	\$12,758	N/A	\$7,918	\$12,575	\$9,955	\$11,522	\$9,429	\$10,739
2014	\$6,126	\$12,521	N/A	\$27,988	\$7,355	\$11,349	\$9,860	\$11,263	\$8,838	\$10,562

Upper-Tier (In Thousands)





\$17,876	\$19,485	\$9,249	\$18,333	\$16,217	\$17,876
\$16,680	\$19,851	\$9,097	\$18,920	\$18,350	\$18,350

Source: ROAD307T (Efficiency)

# What is the total cost to maintain our roads per lane Km?

Fig 28.3 Total Cost for Roads per Lane Km – All Functions (includes amortization)



2012	\$12,798	\$22,145	\$18,233	N/A	\$22,491	\$18,682	\$31,947	\$22,162	\$22,164	\$22,154
2013	\$12,804	\$22,395	\$20,928	N/A	\$25,246	\$19,661	\$36,137	\$23,764	\$25,289	\$23,080
2014	\$15,259	\$25,145	N/A	\$50,148	\$27,381	\$20,118	\$33,575	\$22,943	\$26,680	\$25,913

\$37,546	\$45,577	\$29,833	\$29,398	\$32,464	\$32,464
\$35,217	\$35,565	\$28,272	\$30,544	\$27,522	\$30,544
\$33,389	\$35,723	\$20,161	\$31,966	\$33,625	\$33,389


Source: ROAD308T (Efficiency)

Note: Total cost per lane Km is impacted by the disposal of capital assets associated with the expansion of existing road assets to meet growth.


## How much does it cost to maintain our roads in winter?

Fig 28.4 Total Cost for Winter Maintenance of Roadways per Lane Km Maintained (includes amortization)

Single-Tier (In Thousands)



Upper-Tier (In Thousands)




2013	\$2,600	\$4,194	\$3,379	N/A	\$6,614	\$2,900	\$6,190	\$2,139	\$6,279	\$3,787
2014	\$3,605	\$4,823	N/A	\$14,196	\$5,813	\$3,133	\$6,582	\$3,345	\$7,715	\$5,318

\$5,478	\$5,266	\$6,620	\$4,310	\$5,286	\$5,286
\$4,741	\$5,009	\$5,394	\$4,355	\$4,675	\$4,741

Source: ROAD309T (Efficiency)

## What percent of paved roads are rated good to very good?

Fig 28.5 Percent of Paved Lane Km where the Condition is Rated as Good to Very Good




<b>2012</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>54%</b>

Source: ROAD405M (Customer Service)

## What percent of bridges, culverts and viaducts are rated good to very good?

Fig 28.6 Percent of Bridges, Culverts and Viaducts where the Condition is Rated as Good to Very Good



<b>2012</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>69%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>71%</b>

Source: ROAD415M (Customer Service)



# 29 Social Assistance



## What is the Service?

Municipalities provide mandated employment and financial assistance to eligible residents under the provincial Ontario Works (OW) program.

Basic financial assistance helps with the cost of food and shelter, drugs and other exceptional needs. Employment assistance helps participants in obtaining skills that support progress toward sustainable employment and includes assisted job search, volunteering, job-specific skills training, self-employment activity and employment placement. The province assists with the cost of client benefits and program administration.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Basic needs for food and shelter
- Employment and training-related supports
- Health-related supports (e.g. basic dental, prescription medication, vision care)

### Additional Information

*2014 results are sourced from the SDMT system using 10 months of data (January – October).*

## Influencing Factors

**Client Profile:** Nature of a caseload includes transient clients, those clients moving on and off the caseload from precarious work situations, as well as clients who are receiving assistance for extended periods of time. Caseload turnover significantly impacts administrative support provided to meet program demand.

**Demographics:** Populations with limited or no English language skills, and the case mix and size of families vs. individuals, all impact service needs and cost.

**Economic Conditions:** Economic conditions impact all measures. The cost of living, between municipalities, will affect a number of measures.

**Employability:** Clients with one or more barriers to employment including lack of education and skills, little or no work experience and/or no Canadian work experience. Systemic barriers also impact some individual's ability to find and sustain employment (e.g., pardons, affordable transportation).


**Organizational Form:** Staff caseloads and the degree of support provided that differ between municipalities. Functions of direct client services may be contracted out in some municipalities.

**Urban Form:** Office location, the availability of public transit, and the method of accessibility i.e. the availability of an intake screening unit (ISU) or a telephone application centre.

# Social Assistance

## How long does it take to determine eligibility for assistance?

Fig 29.1 Social Assistance Response Time to Client Eligibility (Days)



<b>2012</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>6.9</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>7.5</b>


Source: SSIM405 (Customer Service)

Note: Staffing allocations, funding, caseload and intake levels and/or a combination may impact the length of time it takes to determine a client's eligibility.

## How many households received social assistance?

Fig 29.2 Monthly Social Assistance Case Load per 100,000 Households

(In Thousands)




2012	4,037	1,131	6,340	6,648	5,855	4,439	8,627	4,606	6,782	1,906	5,231
2013	3,915	1,016	5,939	6,626	5,729	4,356	8,067	4,457	6,499	1,818	5,093
2014	3,965	951	5,788	N/A	5,751	4,396	7,493	4,367	6,914	1,688	4,396

Source: SSIM206 (Service Level)

Note: The measure provides an indication of the economic and social well-being of a community. The highest concentration of caseloads remains in large urban areas.

## What is the average length of time that clients receive social assistance?

Fig 29.3 Average Time on Social Assistance (Months)




<b>2012</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>15.0</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>15.3</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>15.3</b>

Source: SSIM105 (Community Impact)

## What is the cost per case?

Fig 29.4 Monthly Social Assistance Operating Cost (Administration and Benefit) per Case

(In Thousands)



2012	\$980	\$947	\$898	\$916	\$818	\$967	\$1,013	\$930	\$881	\$997	\$939
2013	\$974	\$956	\$899	\$914	\$831	\$944	\$1,035	\$913	\$871	\$1,015	\$929
2014	\$975	\$971	\$910	N/A	\$855	\$962	\$1,067	\$928	\$833	\$1,042	\$962


Source: SSIM315 (Efficiency)

Note: Administration Cost represents the average cost to deliver and administer the programs and services. The administration cost per case can be influenced by the caseload size and demographics, services provided and local labour costs. Administration costs are cost-shared 50:50 with the Province.

Benefits Cost represents the average cost of benefits paid to social assistance clients. This cost can vary based on the caseload mix (single and family) and the types of benefits required. The Province mandates eligibility criteria and benefit amounts. Currently benefits are cost shared 88.6% Provincial, 11.4% Municipal. Benefits provided by the municipality beyond this mandate are funded 100% by the Municipality.

## What is the cost per case by type?

Fig 29.5 Monthly Social Assistance Administration Operating Cost per Case




2012	\$264.22	\$238.10	\$183.58	\$202.70	\$142.34	\$256.31	\$224.35	\$200.88	\$163.88	\$247.50	\$213.53
2013	\$270.92	\$266.54	\$194.56	\$208.87	\$150.29	\$260.99	\$241.77	\$213.31	\$175.54	\$291.64	\$227.54
2014	\$272.81	\$281.85	\$212.55	N/A	\$150.13	\$259.74	\$254.35	\$201.80	\$170.99	\$319.85	\$254.35

Source: SSIM305 (Efficiency)

Note: Administration Cost represents the average cost to deliver and administer the programs and services. The administration cost per case can be influenced by the caseload size and demographics, services provided and local labour costs. Administration costs are cost-shared 50:50 with the Province.

## What is the cost per case per type?

Fig 29.6 Monthly Social Assistance Benefit Operating Cost per Case




2012	\$715.59	\$708.77	\$714.51	\$713.46	\$676.00	\$710.28	\$788.71	\$729.50	\$716.75	\$749.80	\$715.05
2013	\$703.17	\$689.04	\$704.83	\$704.91	\$680.84	\$682.70	\$792.78	\$699.96	\$695.11	\$723.42	\$701.57
2014	\$702.28	\$689.27	\$697.93	N/A	\$704.87	\$702.04	\$812.39	\$726.53	\$662.26	\$721.89	\$702.28

Source: SSIM310 (Efficiency)

Note: Benefits Cost represents the average cost of benefits paid to social assistance client. This cost can vary based on the caseload mix (single and family) and the types of benefits required. The Province mandates eligibility criteria and benefit amounts. Currently benefits are cost shared 88.6% Provincial, 11.4% Municipal. Benefits provided by the municipality beyond this mandate are funded 100% by the Municipality.



# 30 Social Housing



## What is the Service?

Social Housing Services provide affordable homes for individuals whose income makes it challenging to obtain adequate housing in the private rental market.

The Housing Services Act defines the role of the municipality as a “Service Manager” and provides a legislative framework that ensures the efficient and effective administration of social housing programs.

*Available housing types include:*

- Municipally owned and operated housing (through a department or municipally owned housing corporation)
- Non-profit housing that is owned and operated by community based non-profit corporations governed by a board of directors
- Co-operative housing that is owned and operated by its members
- Rent supplement, where a private or non-profit landlord provides units to households at a rent-geared-to-income (RGI) and the municipality subsidizes the difference between that rent and the market rent for the unit

## Influencing Factors

**Client Type:** Different portfolios may experience different mobility rate, i.e. seniors projects may be more stable for long periods, whereas families and singles tend to move more often. Portfolios for families and singles tend to cost more than portfolios for seniors.

**Economic Conditions:** Increased demand for affordable housing can increase waitlist pressure (high growth versus declining growth).

**Historical Funding:** Community take-up of senior level government program funding.

**Infrastructure:** Complexity, condition, age and supply (both private and municipal) of the housing stock.

**Legislation:** Prescribed standards in legislation oblige minimum base level of program funding and performance.

**Portfolio Mix:** Program portfolio mix affects subsidy levels, i.e. Urban Native and Aboriginal programs call for heavy subsidy, while Rent Supplement requires basic subsidy.

**Service Area:** Geographic area served may affect cost and service delivery models.


### Additional Information

*Part of the Social Housing Subsidy is the mortgage costs. The mortgage value of the land and buildings were determined at the time of development. In larger areas, the mortgage value could be higher than surrounding areas as well as earlier years land costs could be lower than newer built projects.*

# Social Housing

## How many social housing units are available per 1,000 households?

Fig 30.1 Number of Social Housing Units per 1,000 Households




<b>2012</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>39</b>

Source: SCHG210 (Service Level)

Note: Units include Rent-Geared-to-Income (RGI) units, market rent units and rent supplement units that were available in the year reported.

## What percent of the waiting list is housed annually?

Fig 30.2 Percent of Social Housing Waiting List Placed Annually



<b>2012</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>49.2%</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>39.4%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>14.1%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>24.9%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>

Source: SCHG110 (Community Impact)


Note: Units include rent-geared-to-income (RGI) units, market rent units and rent supplement units that were available in the year reported

Comment: In 2013, London and Windsor both experienced an increase in applications and decreased turnover resulting in fewer placements.

## How much does it cost to provide a social housing unit?

Fig 30.3 Social Housing Operating Cost (Administration and Subsidy) per Housing Unit

(In Thousands)



2012	\$6,647	\$5,784	\$4,758	\$4,021	\$5,960	\$5,248	\$5,139	\$5,579	\$4,608	\$6,759	\$5,414
2013	\$6,334	\$5,720	\$4,482	\$3,984	\$6,013	\$5,106	\$4,828	\$5,679	\$4,118	\$6,448	\$5,393
2014	\$6,275	\$6,014	\$4,619	N/A	\$5,408	\$5,299	\$4,726	\$6,062	\$4,128	\$6,386	\$5,408

Source: SCHG315 (Efficiency)

Note: Includes annually adjusted subsidy provided by the municipality, administration costs and any one-time grants, e.g. emergency capital repairs.

# 31 Sports and Recreation



## What is the Service?

Sports and Recreation Services deliver quality programs and maintain facilities in order to enhance quality of life, and promote a healthier and active citizen. It is a developer of citizen and community participation.

*Specific programs offered may include:*

- Registered programs where residents register/commit to participate in structured activities such as swimming lessons, dance or fitness classes or day camps; some municipalities also include house leagues, e.g. baseball, basketball, hockey, soccer
- Drop-in programs where residents are not required to register and are able to participate in structured or unstructured sports and recreation activities such as public swimming or skating, basketball, fitness or open access to gyms with the option of obtaining memberships to access these activities
- Permitted programs where residents and/or community organizations obtain permits for short-term rental of sports and recreation facilities such as sports fields, meeting rooms and arenas



## Influencing Factors

**Demographics:** Needs of different ethnic groups, socio-economic factors and changes in Provincial legislation, e.g. Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA), Health & Safety requirements.

**Facilities:** Number of facilities, mix of facility types, age of facilities, access to Board of Education facilities, e.g. gymnasiums.

**Partnerships:** Degree to which the Municipality utilizes partnerships with external entities (3<sup>rd</sup> party, community groups contracted service providers) can influence the level of participation reported for directly provided registered and drop-in programs.

**Programming:** Variety of recreation programs offered, class length, mix of instructional vs. drop-in vs. permitted, number and extent of age groups with targeted programs, number of program locations, frequency and times of program offerings impacts available capacity, course fees and the cost of providing programs. Municipal program delivery is also influenced by the activities of other service providers in the market place.

**Staff Mix:** Unionized vs. non-unionized work environment, full-time vs. part-time vs. seasonal staff; and the availability of certified and qualified staff.


**User Fees:** Fees are impacted by Council decisions on user Fee Policy and Subsidy Programs and can influence the decision of residents to register and how often.

**Weather Conditions:** Weather conditions can impact both participation levels and operating costs of recreation opportunities.

# Sports and Recreation

## What percent of the population participates in municipally provided registered programs?

Fig 31.1 Annual Number of Unique Users for Directly Provided Registered Programs as a Percent of Population




<b>2012</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>

Source: SREC140 (Community Impact)

Note: Unique Users are classified as individuals who may register for more than one program; however they are only counted once. The result does not include those who use drop-in, permit based, or programming provided by alternate sports and recreation service providers.

## How frequently are registered programs being used per resident?

Fig 31.2 Number of Participant Visits per Capita - Directly Provided Registered Programs




<b>2012</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.2</b>

Source: SREC110 (Community Impact)

Note: Measure includes the number of registered program participant visits to programs directly provided by municipal staff and utilized by the public.

## What is the capacity for registered programs per person?

Fig 31.3 Overall Participant Capacity for Directly Provided Registered Programs Per Capita




<b>2012</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>4.77</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.62</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>1.78</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>1.68</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>1.68</b>

Source: SREC210 (Service Level)

Note: Results can be influenced by variations in program delivery and partnership models.

## What percent of registered program capacity is used?

Fig 31.4 Utilization Rate for Directly Provided Registered Programs



<b>2012</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>74%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>


Source: SREC410 (Customer Service)

Note: Measure indicates the level of participation in directly provided recreation programs relative to the program capacity.

Comment: Thunder Bay's decrease in 2014 reflects a change in how community centre participation was reported.

## What is the total cost of providing sports and recreation programming for each participant?


Fig 31.5 Total Cost for Recreation Programs and Facilities per Participant Visit Based on Usage (includes amortization)



2012	\$19.22	\$11.13	\$11.33	\$18.11	\$17.99	\$5.22	\$8.25	\$13.01	\$12.17
2013	\$18.78	\$11.50	\$12.28	\$14.72	\$22.74	\$6.29	\$8.81	\$12.46	\$12.37
2014	\$20.21	\$11.53	N/A	\$15.73	\$20.39	\$7.42	\$8.87	\$13.71	\$13.71

Source: SREC310T (Efficiency)

## 32 Taxation



### What is the Service?

Taxation services provide the efficient and effective collection of all taxes owing to the municipality. Municipalities are mandated by provincial legislation to levy and collect property taxes for municipal and education purposes. It is the municipal portion of the property tax bill that provides municipalities with the major source of revenue they require to operate on a day-to-day basis.

Property tax revenue is based on the total assessed value of all properties within the municipality. Municipal tax rates are set by municipal Council each year based on their budgetary requirements while the Province sets the education tax rates.

*NB: The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) is responsible for determining the current value assessment and tax class for all properties in Ontario.*



### Influencing Factors

**Economic Conditions:** High growth municipalities may require additional billing processes, i.e. supplementary and omit bills, interim and final runs. The strength of a local economy may also impact tax arrears, collections, penalty and interest charges.

**Local Economy:** Local conditions may influence measures related to receivables, collections and other.


**Government Policy:** Ministry required standardized billing and changes in capping methodology requires municipalities to continually upgrade software systems to maintain compliance with legislation.

**Policies and Practices:** Differences in how each municipality defines a bill, administration of pre-authorized payment plans, internet-based payment options, collection processes; and the number and treatment of Payment in Lieu (PIL) accounts.

# Taxation

## What percentage of current year taxes is outstanding?

Fig 32.1 Current Year's Tax Arrears as a Percent of Current Year Levy




<b>2012</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>

Source: TXRS135 (Community Impact)

Note: The strength of a local economy may also impact tax arrears, collections and penalty and interest charges.

## What percent of prior year's tax arrears were not collected in the current year?

Fig 32.2 Percent of Prior Year's Tax Arrears Not Collected in the Current Year as a Percent of the Current Year Levy




<b>2012</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>

Source: TXRS140 (Community Impact)

## What percent of accounts use pre-authorized payment plans?

Fig 32.3 Percent of Accounts (All Classes) Enrolled in a Pre-Authorized Payment Plan




<b>2012</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>41%</b>

Source: TXRS405 (Customer Service)

Note: The number of installments/due dates may impact the enrollment in pre-authorized payment plans.

## How much does it cost to maintain a tax account?

Fig 32.4 Operating Cost to Maintain Property Tax Accounts per Property Tax Account Serviced




2012	\$9.76	\$14.25	\$13.88	N/A	\$16.90	\$9.67	\$16.11	\$16.17	\$11.47	\$14.07
2013	\$9.37	\$13.74	\$13.06	\$21.14	\$17.87	\$8.30	\$15.97	\$15.78	\$10.72	\$13.74
2014	\$11.59	\$14.20	N/A	\$18.92	\$15.63	\$8.27	\$15.08	\$15.62	\$10.57	\$14.64

Source: TXRS310 (Efficiency)

Note: Costs related to the preparation and mailing of all billings, including interim, final and supplementary bills, payment processing and collection, are included in this calculation. Results may be impacted by the extent to which processes are automated.





## What is the Service?

Transit Services provide citizens with a safe, reliable, efficient and affordable means of traveling to work, school, home or play. Greater use of public transit systems in a community eases traffic congestion and improves air quality.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Providing mobility options for all residents to ensure access to work, education, health care, shopping, social and recreational opportunities
- Providing affordable transit for everyone in the community, while being fiscally responsible to taxpayers and supporting the goal of improving the environment
- Ensuring services and costs reflect and encourage residential and commercial growth



## Influencing Factors

**Demographics:** Average household income, auto ownership rates, age of population and communities with higher immigrant levels impact transit market share.

**Economic Conditions:** Fare increases, fluctuations in commodity and energy prices, foreign exchange rates, magnitude of external contracting and contractual obligations with labour.

**Environmental Factors:** Topography and climate.

**Nature of Transit:** Diversity and number of routes, proximity and frequency of service, service coverage and hours of operation, automated fare systems, GPS, advance and delay traffic signals and the use of dedicated bus lanes. Subway system infrastructure can be costly to maintain.

**Non-Residents:** Catchment area for transit riders may extend beyond municipal boundaries.


**Size of Service Area:** Higher costs per capita to service large geographic areas with small populations. Higher density development corridors and contiguous development contribute to a lower cost per capita. Service and costs are also affected by type of development, topography, density and total population.

**Transit System and Vehicles:** Loading standards of vehicles, composition of fleet (bus, subway or LRT) diesel versus natural gas, high floor versus low floor accessible and age of fleet.

# Transit

## How often do people use public transit?

Fig 33.1 Number of Regular Service Passenger Trips per Capita in Service Area




<b>2013</b>	<b>93.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>212.5</b>	<b>115.1</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>185.9</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>50.5</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>92.3</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>45.4</b>	<b>215.3</b>	<b>113.2</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>190.4</b>	<b>49.7</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>73.8</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>49.7</b>

Source: TRNT106 (Community Impact)

Note: The population used in this measure is based on the service area population as per CUTA (Canadian Urban Transit Association).

## How many hours are public transit vehicles in service per capita?

Fig 33.2 Revenue Vehicle Hour per Capita in Service Area




2012	2.12	0.80	1.52	N/A	2.21	1.37	3.46	1.23	1.18	2.04	1.00	1.45
2013	2.12	0.91	1.46	3.56	2.20	1.28	3.53	1.47	1.32	2.10	1.14	1.47
2014	2.10	0.93	1.49	3.49	2.19	1.33	3.66	1.54	1.10	2.07	1.23	1.54

Source: TRNT210 (Service Level)

Note: The population used in this measure is based on the service area population as reported in CUTA (Canadian Urban Transit Association).

## What is the total cost to operate a transit vehicle for each hour the vehicle is in service?


Fig 33.3 Total Cost (Expenses) per Revenue Vehicle Hour (includes amortization)



<b>2013</b>	<b>\$193.97</b>	<b>\$143.94</b>	<b>\$103.64</b>	<b>\$182.35</b>	<b>\$182.86</b>	<b>\$111.10</b>	<b>\$176.11</b>	<b>\$130.59</b>	<b>\$101.41</b>	<b>\$107.37</b>	<b>\$159.41</b>	<b>\$143.94</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>\$195.78</b>	<b>\$150.68</b>	<b>\$108.51</b>	<b>\$186.80</b>	<b>\$185.08</b>	<b>\$109.84</b>	<b>\$182.51</b>	<b>\$134.32</b>	<b>\$105.16</b>	<b>\$114.41</b>	<b>\$171.67</b>	<b>\$150.68</b>

Source: TRNT220T (Efficiency)

# 34 Waste Management



## What is the Service?

Waste Management includes a wide range of collection, disposal, diversion and processing activities for the majority of residential households, and a portion of these services may be provided to businesses. The goal of Waste Management is to reduce and/or divert the amount of waste ending up in landfill sites, and to lessen the detrimental impact on the environment.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Minimizing the impact on the environment and maximize landfill capacity by providing a variety of waste diversion programs to the residential, and industrial, commercial and institutional sectors (ICI)
- Providing efficient and economical waste collection, waste diversion and disposal services that meet the needs of the community and regulatory bodies
- Increasing awareness of waste management issues and promote waste reduction through education



## Influencing Factors

**Diversion Efforts:** Nature and extent of a municipality's diversion efforts, i.e. enforcement of various programs, impacts the type and amount of material included in waste collection.

**Education:** How municipalities promote, manage and enforce garbage collection, disposal, recycling and diversion programs and services.

**Geography:** Urban/rural population, seasonal population, socio-economic factors and the mix of single-family residences and multi-unit residential buildings that impact service provision.

**Government Structure:** Services can be provided by a single-tier or a two-tier system (combination of Regional and Municipal service).


**Infrastructure:** Distance to transfer facilities; accessibility of local landfill sites with available capacity; number of active landfill sites; soil conditions on the landfill site(s) and surrounding sites; and the number of sites under perpetual care.

**Organizational Form:** Different service levels and standards; difference in the age of infrastructure; frequency of pick-ups; hours of operations; average number of people per household; residential vs. commercial and industrial service.

# Waste Management

## How many tonnes of residential waste are collected per household?

Fig 34.1 Tonnes of all Material Collected per Household - Residential




<b>2012</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.92</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.92</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.90</b>

Source: SWST205 (Service Level)

Note: The measure includes organics, blue box, leaf and yard, municipal hazardous or special waste, other recyclable materials such as wood, metal and tires, as well as construction and demolition materials.

## What is the total cost to collect a tonne of waste?

Fig 34.2 Total Cost for Garbage Collection per Tonne - All Property Classes (includes amortization)



2012	\$139	\$86	\$132	\$157	\$92	N/A	\$101	\$95	\$142	\$69	\$119	\$75	\$73	N/A	\$98
2013	\$147	\$88	\$153	\$165	\$91	\$170	\$97	\$93	\$192	\$69	\$115	\$77	\$80	N/A	\$97
2014	\$148	\$88	\$153	\$180	N/A	\$147	\$102	\$91	\$87	\$79	\$120	\$82	\$76	N/A	\$97


Source: SWST311T (Efficiency)

Note: All Property Classes includes residential and ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) locations.

Comment: York Region operates a two-tier system and although it is not responsible for curbside collection, the Region is responsible for all processing. Therefore, York is able to report the total tonnes collected (see Fig 34.1 – SWST205); however York does not report the Total Cost.

## How many tonnes of residential waste are disposed of per household?

Fig 34.3 Tonnes of Solid Waste Disposed per Household - Residential




2012	0.66	0.50	0.48	0.52	0.51	N/A	0.48	0.52	0.88	0.35	0.46	0.61	0.71	0.50	0.51
2013	0.69	0.50	0.46	0.53	0.51	0.66	0.48	0.46	0.85	0.35	0.48	0.62	0.61	0.45	0.51
2014	0.70	0.50	0.45	0.58	N/A	0.62	0.48	0.47	0.82	0.43	0.47	0.58	0.61	0.39	0.50

Source: SWST220 (Service Level)

Note: Given the life expectancy of several landfills and the number of diversion programs and services in place, there is still a high volume of waste going to landfills.

## What is the total cost to dispose of a tonne of garbage?

Fig 34.4 Total Cost for Solid Waste Disposal per Tonne - All Property Classes (includes amortization)



2012	\$43	\$157	\$91	\$118	\$33	N/A	\$337	\$91	\$40	\$116	\$147	\$107	\$18	\$124	\$107
2013	\$44	\$135	\$66	\$83	\$24	\$99	\$25	\$65	\$54	\$100	\$95	\$80	\$24	\$115	\$73
2014	\$41	\$157	\$66	\$79	N/A	\$90	\$149	\$76	\$23	\$138	\$155	\$159	\$31	\$114	\$90


Source: SWST325T (Efficiency)

Note: All Property Classes includes residential and ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) locations. In addition, declining landfill capacities typically result in increased landfill rates. Other impacts such as additional costs of transporting waste outside a community, aging infrastructure, capital costs, the cost associated with the incineration of garbage, service agreements, increase in leachate treatment and fluctuating fuel costs also impact the results.

These results can be impacted significantly due to the recording of post-closure landfill liability costs.

## How many tonnes of residential waste are diverted per household?

Fig 34.5 Tonnes Solid Waste Diverted per Household - Residential




<b>2012</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.40</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>0.41</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.48</b>

Source: SWST235 (Service Level)

## What is the total cost to divert a tonne of garbage?

Fig 34.6 Total Cost for Solid Waste Diversion per Tonne - All Property Classes (includes amortization)




2012	\$289	\$178	\$150	\$220	\$122	N/A	\$137	\$258	\$82	\$318	\$126	\$125	\$214	\$123	\$150
2013	\$309	\$205	\$167	\$199	\$124	\$273	\$131	\$218	\$138	\$325	\$162	\$113	\$240	\$119	\$183
2014	\$332	\$199	\$159	\$175	N/A	\$257	\$142	\$194	\$126	\$413	\$175	\$108	\$238	\$128	\$175

Source: SWST330T (Efficiency)

Note: "All Property Classes" includes residential and ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) locations.

## What percent of residential waste is diverted away from landfills?

Fig 34.7 Percent of Residential Solid Waste Diverted –Single and Multi- Residential




<b>2012</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>2013</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>47%</b>

Source: SWST105M (Community Impact)

Note: The measure demonstrates the percent of residential waste diverted away from landfills and incineration through programs such as organics, blue box, leaf and yard, municipal hazardous or special waste and other recyclable materials, e.g. wood, metal, tires.

# 35 Wastewater



## What is the Service?

The goal of Wastewater Services is the safe and effective collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater. Treatment standards established by provincial and federal agencies ensure that the impact of wastewater treatment on the natural environment is minimized.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Efficient and effective collection of wastewater from customers via the municipal sewage systems, operation of wastewater treatment facilities and disposal of wastewater in accordance with federal and provincial regulation
- Maintaining adequate capacity for existing communities and future developments

Wastewater services are provided to residential and Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector customers. The quality of wastewater discharged into the municipal sewage system is controlled through municipal sewer-use By-laws. Funding for wastewater services is generally through municipal water rates, which usually include a sewer surcharge based on water usage to recover the costs of wastewater collection and treatment.

## Influencing Factors

**Age of Infrastructure:** Age and condition of wastewater collection system and frequency of maintenance costs.

**Government Structure:** Single-tier service providers with jurisdiction over the wastewater system vs. two-tier system where the responsibility for wastewater service is divided between the local municipalities and the Regional municipality.

**Policy and Practices:** Frequency of wastewater collection system maintenance activities, collection system age, condition and the type of pipe material.

**Supply and Demand:** Respective volume of wastewater generated relative to the total system demand. The quantity of wastewater flows from ICI sectors relative to residential demand.


**Treatment Plants:** Number, size and complexity of the wastewater collection systems and treatment plants operated.

**Urban Density:** Proximity of pipes to other utilities increases the cost for infrastructure repair and replacement.

# Wastewater

## How much wastewater bypasses treatment?

Fig 35.1 Percent of Wastewater Estimated to have Bypassed Treatment



2012	N/A	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.01%	N/A	2.85%	0.20%	1.26%	0.56%	1.83%	0.31%	N/A	0.00%	0.31%
2013	N/A	0.00%	0.13%	3.67%	0.33%	0.61%	4.30%	0.17%	0.00%	0.99%	1.81%	1.70%	N/A	0.00%	0.47%
2014	N/A	0.00%	0.17%	2.34%	N/A	1.01%	3.04%	0.45%	0.00%	0.61%	0.17%	1.71%	N/A	0.00%	0.45%


Source: WWTR110M (Community Impact)

Note: Frequency and severity of weather events can have a significant negative impact on results.


## How much wastewater is treated in each municipality?

Fig 35.2 Megalitres of Treated Wastewater per 100,000 Population

Integrated Systems (In Thousands)



Two-Tier Systems (In Thousands)



2012	15,272	12,517	16,778	21,762	18,347	N/A	15,641	21,636	14,282	31,269	13,076	16,210
2013	15,222	13,241	17,426	24,134	20,380	45,225	16,450	29,218	15,051	34,464	12,775	17,426
2014	12,633	13,189	16,610	23,109	N/A	44,857	16,668	28,940	14,591	30,301	14,360	16,639

N/A	11,482	11,836	11,659
N/A	12,627	11,444	12,036
20,778	13,915	10,624	13,915

Source: WWTR210 (Service Level)


Note: Refer to additional information regarding integrated vs. two-tier systems. Calculations include residential and ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) sectors.

**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all wastewater activities including collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal.

**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of wastewater activities, e.g. Niagara, Waterloo and York are responsible for all components with the exception of collection which is the responsibility of local municipalities within their boundaries.

## What is the number of wastewater main back-ups relative to the average age of wastewater pipes?

Fig 35.3 Average Age of Wastewater Pipe and Number of Wastewater Main Back-ups per 100 Km of Wastewater Main



Source: WWTR105 (Statistic); WWTR405M (Customer Service)


*Note: Average Age of Wastewater Pipe: Older wastewater pipes are often in poor condition and contain cracks, leaking joints and broken sections, contributing to increased pipe blockages and/or an inflow of groundwater into the system causing increased flow. These factors result in an increased frequency of wastewater main back-ups relative to newer systems that do not have such deficiencies and result in higher maintenance costs for older systems.*

*The annual number of wastewater backups is directly related to the design of the wastewater pipe and the design of the wastewater collection system, i.e. the extent to which storm sewers are connected to or combined with sanitary sewers resulting in increased flow. Design criteria, age and condition of the wastewater collection infrastructure combined with localized major precipitation events can result in flows that exceed system capacity and result in wastewater backups.*


## What is the total cost of wastewater collection and conveyance?

Fig 35.4 Total Cost of Wastewater Collection / Conveyance per Km of Pipe (includes amortization)

Integrated Systems (In Thousands)



Two-Tier Systems (In Thousands)



2012	\$9,781	\$16,705	\$17,551	\$25,904	\$13,543	N/A	\$16,645	\$10,512	\$19,968	\$8,921	\$14,748	\$15,697
2013	\$10,214	\$16,023	\$17,245	\$21,071	\$14,726	\$19,673	\$20,379	\$12,922	\$22,627	\$9,059	\$15,050	\$16,023
2014	\$10,751	\$16,629	\$18,330	\$21,143	N/A	\$18,794	\$20,189	\$12,129	\$24,757	\$9,454	\$16,248	\$17,480

N/A	\$21,540	\$99,177	\$60,359
N/A	\$23,683	\$131,552	\$77,618
\$47,262	\$23,691	\$136,736	\$47,262

Source: WWTR305T (Efficiency)

Note: Refer to additional information regarding integrated vs. two-tier systems. The amortization cost component can vary significantly from year to year depending on the type of infrastructure, capital fund expenditures, etc.


**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all wastewater activities including collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal.

**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of wastewater activities, e.g. Niagara, Waterloo and York are responsible for all components with the exception of collection which is the responsibility of local municipalities within their boundaries.


# What is the total cost for the treatment and disposal of wastewater?

Fig 35.5 Total Cost for Treatment/Disposal per Megalitre Treated (includes amortization)

## Integrated Systems



## Two-Tier Systems



2012	\$401	\$533	\$572	\$218	\$515	N/A	\$267	\$641	\$448	\$344	\$492	\$470
2013	\$383	\$514	\$629	\$191	\$474	\$163	\$215	\$396	\$429	\$323	\$480	\$396
2014	\$466	\$598	\$582	\$215	N/A	\$157	\$273	\$527	\$461	\$398	\$453	\$457

N/A	\$579	\$517	\$548
N/A	\$510	\$537	\$524
\$579	\$516	\$621	\$579

Source: WWTR310T (Efficiency)

Note: Refer to additional information regarding integrated vs. two-tier systems. The amortization cost component can vary significantly from year to year depending on the type of infrastructure, additions and disposals of capital assets, capital fund expenditures, etc.


**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all wastewater activities including collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal.

**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of wastewater activities, e.g. Niagara, Waterloo and York are responsible for all components with the exception of collection which is the responsibility of local municipalities within their boundaries.


## What is the total cost for the collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal of wastewater?

Fig 35.6 Total Cost of Wastewater Collection/Conveyance and Treatment/Disposal per Megalitre (includes amortization)

Integrated Systems (In Thousands)



Two-Tier Systems



2012	\$651	\$997	\$966	\$644	\$779	N/A	\$615	\$871	\$724	\$460	\$881	\$752
2013	\$642	\$937	\$999	\$502	\$730	\$254	\$620	\$618	\$732	\$432	\$886	\$642
2014	\$765	\$1,040	\$986	\$540	N/A	\$247	\$668	\$737	\$801	\$531	\$837	\$751

N/A	\$593	\$744	\$669
N/A	\$524	\$864	\$694
\$761	\$530	\$970	\$761

Source: WWTR315T (Efficiency)

Note: Refer to additional information regarding integrated vs. two-tier systems. The amortization component can vary significantly from year to year depending on the type of infrastructure, additions and disposals of capital assets, capital fund expenditures, etc.

**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all wastewater activities including collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal.

**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of wastewater activities, e.g. Niagara, Waterloo and York are responsible for all components with the exception of collection which is the responsibility of local municipalities within their boundaries.



## What is the Service?

Water Services include the treatment and distribution of potable (drinking) water from the water supply source to the customer. The goal of water services is to ensure a clean, affordable and adequate supply of water is available to meet demand from both existing communities and from future development. Provincial and municipal policies ensure water supply is readily available for emergency purposes, such as fire protection and to meet peak demand conditions.


To ensure the drinking water from your tap is safe and of high quality, it undergoes monitoring and testing during the treatment process. The distribution system is also monitored frequently. Annual water quality reports are available from your municipal water provider, showing compliance with provincial and federal water quality regulations.

*Specific objectives include:*

- Treatment of source water at water treatment plants to ensure drinking water meets or exceeds regulatory requirements
- Distribution of drinking water to customers through systems of water mains, water pumping stations and storage reservoirs
- Ensuring adequate capacity is maintained for both existing communities and future development

Water services are provided to residential and Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector customers. These services are generally funded through Municipal water rates.

# 36 Water



## Influencing Factors

**Age of Infrastructure:** Age and condition of water distribution system, the type of water distribution pipe material and the frequency of maintenance activities.

**Conservation Programs:** Extent of municipal water conservation programs can impact water consumption.

**Provincial Standards:** Specific municipal water quality requirements may exceed provincial regulations.

**Supply and Demand:** Cost is impacted by the water source (ground water or surface water), the resulting treatment costs and the number of independent water supply/distribution systems operated, and size of the geographic area serviced. Variation in the supply to ICI and residential sectors, relative to total system demand.

**Treatment Plants:** Number, size and complexity of a municipality's water treatment plants.

**Urban Density:** Proximity of pipes to other utilities increases the cost for infrastructure repair and replacement.


**Weather Conditions:** Negative impacts associated with more severe and frequent extreme weather events.

# Water


## How much water is treated in each municipality?

Fig 36.1 Megalitres of Treated Water per 100,000 Population

Integrated Systems (In Thousands)



Two-Tier Systems (In Thousands)



2012	14,688	10,967	13,825	15,641	13,516	N/A	12,619	14,228	14,105	19,252	12,114	13,965
2013	14,448	10,614	12,484	15,170	12,756	33,330	11,745	13,400	13,542	18,216	10,633	13,400
2014	13,004	10,526	12,042	16,656	N/A	32,544	12,533	13,568	13,319	16,818	10,863	13,162

N/A	10,322	12,057	11,190
N/A	10,086	11,304	10,695
18,824	10,137	10,785	10,785

Source: WATR210 (Service Level)


Note. Calculation includes residential and ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) sectors.

**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all water activities including treatment, transmission, storage and local distribution.

**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of water activities such as water treatment, water transmission and major water storage facilities; and whereas local municipalities are responsible for local water distribution systems and storage facilities.

## What is the number of watermain breaks relative to the average age of water pipe?

Fig 36.2 Average Age of Water Pipe and Number of Watermain Breaks per 100 Km of Water Distribution Pipe (excluding connections and hydrant leads)




Source: WATR120 (Statistic); WATR410M (Customer Service)

Note: Age of Water Distribution Pipe - Old pipes are usually in poor condition as a result of pipe corrosion, pipe materials (susceptible to fractures), leakage at pipe joints and service connections which contributes to an increased frequency of watermain breaks relative to newer systems that do not have such deficiencies.


# What is the total cost for the distribution and transmission of drinking water?

Fig 36.3 Total Cost for the Distribution/Transmission of Drinking Water per Km of Water Distribution Pipe (includes amortization)

Integrated Systems (In Thousands)



Two-Tier Systems (In Thousands)



2012	\$16,495	\$18,287	\$19,180	\$16,815	\$23,970	N/A	\$28,284	\$16,743	\$22,142	\$11,608	\$12,068	\$17,551
2013	\$16,578	\$18,401	\$19,630	\$18,009	\$23,153	\$33,396	\$22,207	\$16,491	\$24,540	\$12,402	\$12,682	\$18,401
2014	\$17,516	\$17,986	\$23,065	\$20,122	N/A	\$33,034	\$25,394	\$18,835	\$25,414	\$12,912	\$17,479	\$19,479

N/A	\$73,837	\$73,837
N/A	\$80,515	\$80,515
\$21,201	\$103,808	\$62,505

Source: WATR305T (Efficiency)

Note: Municipalities providing service over a broad geographic area generally have higher operating costs due to the number and type of water treatment facilities operated and the distance between the individual systems. This has an impact on the daily operating costs for both the treatment and distribution of drinking water. The amortization cost component can vary significantly from year to year depending on the type of infrastructure, capital fund expenditures, etc.

**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all water activities including treatment, transmission, storage and local distribution.


**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of water activities such as water treatment, water transmission and major water storage facilities; and whereas local municipalities are responsible for local water distribution systems and storage facilities.

Comment: Waterloo is not responsible for distribution or transmission, therefore results are not available for this measure.


## What is the total cost for the treatment of drinking water?

Fig 36.4 Total Cost for the Treatment of Drinking Water per Megalitre of Drinking Water Treated (includes amortization)

### Integrated Systems



### Two-Tier Systems



2012	\$277	\$369	\$488	\$270	\$242	N/A	\$344	\$695	\$161	\$293	\$442	\$319
2013	\$282	\$394	\$276	\$288	\$218	\$122	\$426	\$627	\$184	\$296	\$494	\$288
2014	\$301	\$404	\$443	\$260	N/A	\$126	\$517	\$528	\$177	\$327	\$482	\$366

N/A	\$641	\$493	\$567
N/A	\$655	\$509	\$582
\$464	\$688	\$466	\$466

Source: WATR310T (Efficiency)

Note: Refer to additional information regarding integrated vs. two-tier systems. Costs include operation and maintenance of treatment plants as well as quality assurance and laboratory testing to ensure compliance with regulations. The amortization cost component can vary significantly from year to year depending on the type of infrastructure, capital fund expenditures, etc.


**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all water activities including treatment, transmission, storage and local distribution.

**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of water activities such as water treatment, water transmission and major water storage facilities; and whereas local municipalities are responsible for local water distribution systems and storage facilities.


## What is the total cost for the treatment, distribution and transmission of drinking water?

Fig 36.5 Total Operating Cost for the Treatment and Distribution / Transmission of Drinking Water per Megalitre of Drinking Water Treated (includes amortization)

Integrated Systems (In Thousands)



Two-Tier Systems



2012	\$742	\$1,033	\$1,128	\$709	\$1,014	N/A	\$1,129	\$1,522	\$506	\$551	\$833	\$924
2013	\$753	\$1,091	\$976	\$769	\$1,000	\$347	\$1,084	\$1,493	\$579	\$586	\$961	\$961
2014	\$825	\$1,087	\$1,274	\$747	N/A	\$356	\$1,279	\$1,505	\$590	\$644	\$1,104	\$956

N/A	\$690	\$690
N/A	\$734	\$734
\$580	\$762	\$671

Source: WATR315T (Efficiency)

Note: The amortization cost component can vary significantly from year to year depending on the type of infrastructure, capital fund expenditures, etc. Waterloo is responsible for treatment only; therefore results are not available for this total cost measure.

**Integrated Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have full responsibility for all water activities including treatment, transmission, storage and local distribution.

**Two-Tier Systems:** The term applies to municipalities that have responsibility for components of water activities such as water treatment, water transmission and major water storage facilities; and whereas local municipalities are responsible for local water distribution systems and storage facilities.

## For More Information

If you have specific questions regarding the results presented in this report, please contact your Municipal Lead or the OMBI Program Office.

City of CALGARY	Nicole Ufoegbune	nicole.ufoegbune@calgary.ca
	Kathleen O'Yeung	kathleen.o'yeung@calgary.ca
Region of DURHAM	Mary Simpson	mary.simpson@durham.ca
	Michelle MacDonald	michelle.macdonald@durham.ca
HALTON Region	Kate Johnston	Kate.Johnston@halton.ca
City of HAMILTON	Patti Tomalin	patti.tomalin@hamilton.ca
City of LONDON	Jon-Paul McGonigle	jmcgonig@london.ca
City of MONTREAL	Simon Cloutier	simon.cloutier@ville.montreal.qc.ca
	Nathalie Hamel	nathalie.hamel@ville.montreal.qc.ca
NIAGARA Region	Kristen DeLong	kristen.delong@niagararegion.ca
City of OTTAWA	Malaka Hendela	malaka.hendela@ottawa.ca
	Steve Dickie	steve.dickie@ottawa.ca
City of THUNDER BAY	Don Crupi	dcrupi@thunderbay.ca
	John Tyson	JTyson@thunderbay.ca
City of TORONTO	Ilja Green	igreen@toronto.ca
Region of WATERLOO	Cheryl Braan	cbraan@regionofwaterloo.ca
	Chris Wilson	ChWilson@regionofwaterloo.ca
City of WINDSOR	Natasha Couvillon	ncouvillon@citywindsor.ca
City of WINNIPEG	Janice Sim	jsim@winnipeg.ca
YORK Region	Andrea Reid	andrea.reid@york.ca

## Program Office

Program Manager	Connie Wheeler	connie.wheeler@hamilton.ca	905-540-5779
Administrative Coordinator	Sue Buchanan	sue.buchanan@hamilton.ca	905-546-2424 ext. 5949
Technical Advisor	Steve Dickie	steve.dickie@ottawa.ca	

## Mailing Address

Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI), c/o City of Hamilton, 71 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5



PARTNERING FOR SERVICE EXCELLENCE

