



City of North Bay Municipal Performance Measurement Program Results for the year ending December 31, 2001

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, pursuant to Section 83.1 of the Municipal Act, requires all Ontario municipalities to provide information to their taxpayers on specific performance related measures by September 30, 2002. This reporting requirement, known as the Municipal Performance Measure program (MPMP), is part of the Province's effort to "balance greater municipal authority with better accountability".

2001 was the first reporting year for the program (based on 2000 data) and involved a total of 16 measures in areas including local government, fire, police, roads, transit, wastewater/sewage, water, solid waste management/garbage and land-use planning. This year, municipalities will be obliged to report a total of 25 measures for the same nine service areas (using 2001 data). Measures reflect data collected on both the efficiency (the dollar cost per unit of service) and effectiveness (indicators of how well desired objectives were met) of these programs and services.

Over time, the MPMP program will help the City to develop a common set of data to compare our performance and costs year to year in an effort to continuously improve. The City supplements the data collected under the MPMP program with a set of its own internal performance measures that cover the full range of programs and services we offer to the public.

However, it should be remembered that local conditions do vary. Accordingly, the performance measurement data reported by the City, or any other municipality may also vary, reflecting differences that may not be included in the report. It may be helpful to look at the "Notes" following each reported measure for explanations of how the data was derived or why a variance may have occurred.

As examples, here are some factors that might influence a reported result:

- Geography (northern versus southern locations)
- Age of the infrastructure (sewer and water pipe systems, roadways, equipment)
- Population (rural versus urban)
- Community priorities and service levels (e.g., frequency of a service or the amount of a service to be provided)
- Organization form (centralized versus decentralized administration, small versus large organization, use of volunteers/part-time versus full-time employees)
- Accounting and reporting practices

The Centre for Ontario Municipal Best Practices in performance Measurement was appointed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs & Housing in the early summer of 2002, and represents a partnership between the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and the Province. Using the results of MPMP as well as other sources, the Centre will analyse and showcase municipal best practices in service delivery, then actively encourage the use of these practices in municipal operations throughout Ontario.

For further information on this report, please contact Mr. Jeff Celentano, Manager, Organization Development & Policy at 474-0626 Ext. 401 or by email (jeff.celentano@cityofnorthbay.ca)

Local Government

1a. OPERATING COSTS General government support	1b. OPERATING COSTS Governance and political support, and corporate management support
$\frac{\text{Operating costs for general government support}}{\text{Total Municipal Operating Costs}} \times 100$	$\frac{\text{Operating costs for governance and political support, and corporate management and support}}{\text{Total Municipal Operating Costs}} \times 100$
0.0% of total municipal operating costs	4.66% of total municipal operating costs
<p>Efficiency Measure General government support as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal administration.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal management.</p>
<p>Notes See Measure 1b.</p>	<p>Notes The City provides centralized corporate support services such as payroll, accounting and information technology for all departments and several local boards such as the District of Nipissing Social Services Administration Board, North Bay Police Services Board, the North Bay Public Library, the North Bay-Mattawa Conservation Authority, Cassellhome and the North Bay & District Health Unit.</p>

Fire Services

2. OPERATING COSTS
$\frac{\text{Operating costs for Fire Services}}{\text{(Total assessment / 1,000)}}$
\$2.35 per \$1,000 of assessment
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal fire services.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Large geographic area of City (1/3 urban, 2/3 rural) influences cost of providing service. 2) Requirement to provide airport-related emergency response service contributes to overall costs. 3) All firefighting staff are full-time. 4) Modest increase over 2000 reflects one significant fire incident in the downtown area.

Police Services

3. OPERATING COSTS	4a. TOTAL CRIME RATE / 1,000	4b. TOTAL CRIME RATE / 100,000
<u>Operating costs for Police Services</u> Total households	Total # of actual incidents for violent crime, property crime and other Criminal Code offences Population / 1,000	Total # of actual incidents for violent crime, property crime and other Criminal Code offences Population / 100,000
\$415.05 per household	69.41 crimes per 1,000 persons	00.00 crimes per 100,000 persons
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for police services per household.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient municipal police services.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic).</i></p> <p><i>Note that the Statistics Canada definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Safe communities.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Total crime rate per 100,000 persons (Criminal Code, excluding traffic).</i></p> <p><i>Note that the Statistics Canada definition used refers to Criminal Code crimes, excluding traffic.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Safe communities.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>Operating costs include 9-1-1, court security, fleet and all other policing costs.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>Property crime and violent crime both reduced from previous 5-year average.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>See Measure 4a</p>

Road Services

5. OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS	6. OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS
<u>Operating costs for paved roads</u> Total paved lane kilometres	<u>Operating costs for unpaved roads</u> Total unpaved lane kilometres
\$8,897.73 per paved lane kilometre	\$4,155.35 per unpaved lane kilometre
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>City maintains 706 km of paved roadway. In 2001, there were reduced funds spent on asphalt resurfacing and road reconstruction.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>City maintains 31 km of unpaved roadway.</p>

Road Services

7. OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL	8. CONDITION OF ROADS
$\frac{\text{Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways}}{\text{Total lane kilometres maintained in winter}}$	$\frac{\text{Number of paved lane kilometres rated as good to very good}}{\text{Total number of paved lane kilometres tested}} \times 100$
\$1,724.88 per lane kilometre	Not Applicable
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient winter control operation.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of paved lane kilometres where condition is rated as good to very good.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</i></p>
<p>Notes The City maintains a total of 737.6 lane kilometres. Rural roadways tend to be widely dispersed and many are dead-end roads, which contribute to higher winter maintenance costs. Most of the rural roadways are school bus routes, which require a higher level of service.</p>	<p>Notes City does not record pavement condition at present.</p>

Road Services

9. WINTER EVENT RESPONSES
$\frac{\text{Number of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards}}{\text{Total number of winter events}} \times 100$
Not Applicable
<p>Effectiveness <i>Percentage of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Provide appropriate winter response.</i></p>
<p>Notes City provides 24-hour patrol by a sander/salt truck during the winter maintenance season. Additional staff and equipment are called in as required. Normal response time is usually 1 hour or less.</p>

Transit Services

10. OPERATING COSTS	11. PUBLIC TRANSIT USE
<u>Operating costs for conventional transit</u> Total number of regular service passenger trips	<u>Total number of conventional transit passenger trips in service area in a year</u> Population of service area
\$2.10 per regular service passenger trip	39.16 trips per capita
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.</p> <p>Objective Efficient municipal transit services.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.</p> <p>Objective Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>City Transit provided over 2.1 million rides and travelled over 1.8 million kilometres. Operating costs experienced a modest increase in 2001 due to increased maintenance costs associated with an aging fleet.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>Modest decrease in ridership may reflect more accurate record keeping methods. Comprehensive transit review being undertaken in 2002.</p>

Wastewater

12a. OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION	12b. OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL
<u>Operating costs for collection of wastewater</u> Total kilometres of wastewater main	<u>Operating costs for treatment and disposal of wastewater</u> Total megalitres of wastewater treated
\$0.00 per kilometre of main	\$00.00 per megalitre
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater collection services.</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</p> <p><i>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p>Objective Efficient water treatment and disposal services.</p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>See 12c</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>See 12c</p>

Wastewater

12c. OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL	13. MAIN BACKUPS
$\frac{\text{Operating costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater treated}}$	$\frac{\text{Total number of backed up wastewater mains}}{\text{Total kilometres of wastewater mains /100}}$
\$00.16 per megalitre	1.1730 per 100 kilometres of main
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</i></p> <p><i>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient wastewater services.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Prevention of human and environmental health hazards.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>These costs include the costs for the Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA) to treat and dispose of wastewater.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>The City maintains 180 km of Sanitary mains. Backups can occur due to factors such as pipe age and condition, severe frost conditions and activity near (or above) the main itself, or foreign objects introduced into the sanitary sewers or manholes.</p>

Wastewater

14. TREATMENT BYPASS
$\frac{\text{Estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater}}{\text{Total megalitres of wastewater, including treated and untreated}} \times 100$
0.0%
<p>Effectiveness Measures <i>Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.</i></p> <p><i>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Effective wastewater and treatment and disposal services.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>There were no bypasses recorded in 2001.</p>

Water Services

15a. OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT	15b. OPERATING COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION	15c. OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION
<p><u>Operating costs for treatment of water</u> Total megalitres treated</p>	<p><u>Operating costs for distribution of water</u> Total kilometres of distribution pipe</p>	<p>Operating costs for treatment and <u>distribution of water</u> Total megalitres treated</p>
<p>\$00.00 per megalitre</p>	<p>\$00.00 per kilometre of distribution pipe</p>	<p>\$00.28 per megalitre</p>
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment of water per megalitre.</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres, or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient production of potable water.</p> <p>Notes See 15c</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the distribution of water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.</p> <p>Objective Efficient distribution of water.</p> <p>Notes See 15c</p>	<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of water per megalitre (Integrated System).</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres, or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient production and distribution of water.</p> <p>Notes In 2001, the City treated water with chlorine, fluoride and adjusted Ph with soda ash. Treatment services are managed by OCWA. Costs include services provided by OCWA as well as City staff.</p>

Water Services

16. BREAKS IN WATER MAINS	17. BOIL WATER ADVISORIES
<p><u>Number of breaks in water mains</u> Total kilometres of water main pipe / 100</p> <p>0.1783 breaks per 100 kilometres of main</p>	<p>Summation of: number of boil water advisory days <u>times the number of affected connections</u> Total connections in service area</p> <p>12 days a year</p>
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</p> <p>Objective Improve system reliability and minimize water loss and operational costs.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the Medical Officer of Health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.</p> <p>Objective Water is safe and meets local needs.</p>
<p>Notes The City maintains 230 km of water mains. Main breaks can be influenced by factors such as age of the pipe in the system, severe frost conditions and activity near (or above) the main itself.</p>	<p>Notes A Boil Water Advisory was placed as a precautionary measure due to high levels of turbidity in the raw water. Treated water during this time period showed no evidence of bacterial contamination.</p>

Solid Waste

18a. OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION	18b. OPERATING COSTS FOR DISPOSAL
<u>Operating costs for solid waste collection</u> Total tonnes received from all property classes OR total households	<u>Operating costs for solid waste disposal</u> Total tonnes disposed from all property classes OR total households
\$00.00 per tonne or household	\$42.69 per tonne
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient collection services without adverse affect on environment.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient disposal of solid waste.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>See 18b</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>Figure is based upon all costs associated with collection for residential, commercial, industrial and institutional sectors. Costs include all expenses related to operation of landfill site. 44,140 tonnes were disposed of in 2001, along with an additional 10,249 tonnes diverted.</p>

Solid Waste

19. OPERATING COSTS FOR DIVERSION	20. OPERATING COSTS FOR INTEGRATED SYSTEM
<u>Operating costs for solid waste diversion</u> Total tonnes diverted OR total households	<u>Operating costs for solid waste management</u> Total tonnes disposed of and total tonnes diverted OR total households
\$00.00 per tonne or household	\$120.33 per household
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne or per household.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.</i></p>	<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Efficient solid waste management programs.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>See 20</p> <p>Waste diversion programs include Blue Box, Household Hazardous Waste Depot, organic program, tire disposal, electronic and white goods recycling.</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>Figure accounts for all waste management costs in Measures 18 and 19 on a per household basis.</p>

Solid Waste

21a. FACILITY COMPLIANCE	21b. NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES	22. COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION
Total number of days per year MOE compliance order was in effect	Total number of waste management sites	<u>Number of Complaints</u> Total Households / 1,000
0 days	2 sites	13.69 complaints per 1,000 households
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of days per year when a Ministry of Environment compliance order for remediation concerning an air or groundwater standard was in effect for a solid waste management facility, by site.</p> <p>Objective Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse affect on environment.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Total number of solid waste management sites owned by municipality.</p> <p>Objective Effective management of solid waste.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of solid waste and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p> <p>Objective Effective waste management services.</p>
Notes	<p>Notes</p> <p>City has sites on Marsh Drive (closed) and Merrick Twp. (opened in 1994).</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>This figure is based on calls received by the City's contractor and City staff.</p>

Solid Waste

23a. DIVERSION OF SOLID WASTE	23b. DIVERSION OF SOLID WASTE (RESIDENTIAL AND OTHER)
$\frac{\text{Total tonnes of residential waste diverted}}{\text{Total tonnes of residential solid waste disposed of and total tonnes diverted}} \times 100$	$\frac{\text{Total tonnes of solid waste diverted from all property classes}}{\text{Total tonnes of solid waste disposed of and total tonnes diverted from all property classes}} \times 100$
33.53% of solid waste	0.0% of solid waste
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of residential solid waste diverted.</p> <p>Objective Municipal waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.</p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of residential solid waste diverted (based on combined residential, industrial, commercial and institutional tonnage).</p> <p>Objective Municipal waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.</p>
Notes	<p>Notes</p> <p>See 23a</p>

Land Use Planning

24. GROWTH AND SETTLEMENT PATTERN

Number of new lots, blocks and / or units with final approval which are located within the settlement area x100
 Total number of new lots, blocks and / or units with final approval within entire municipality

75.0% of new development

Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of new development with final approval which is located within settlement areas.

Objective

New lot creation is occurring in settlement areas.

Notes

Limited lot creation in rural area of City strictly controlled through comprehensive Official Plan policies.

Land Use Planning

25a. PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN REPORTING YEAR

25b. CHANGE IN NUMBER OF DESIGNATED HECTARES IN REPORTING YEAR

Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2001 X100
 Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2001

Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during 2001.

Not Applicable

Not Applicable

Effectiveness Measure

Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was preserved during 2001.

Effectiveness Measure

Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during 2001.

Objective

Preserve agricultural land.

Objective

Preserve agricultural land.

Notes

There is no Class 1,2 or 3 Agricultural Land in the City, nor are there any lands designated for Agricultural use in the Official Plan.

Notes

See 25a

Land Use Planning

25c. AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO BASE YEAR	25d. REDESIGNATED AGRICULTURAL LAND
$\frac{\text{Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2001}}{\text{Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2000}} \times 100$	Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses relative to base year.
Not applicable	0 hectares
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was preserved relative to base year of 2000.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>	<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p> <p>See 25a</p>	<p>Notes</p> <p>See 25a</p>