Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Jim Brown	Phone: (519) 485-0120
Title: Treasuer	
Email: jim.brown@ingersoll.ca	

Local Government

	1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
1.1 a)	Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	12.1%	10.5%	10.7%	10.9%	9.4%			
1.1 b)	Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	11.2%	9.9%	10.0%	10.3%				
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient local government.								
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERS Starting in 2013 in excess of \$100,000 wa			ed landfill site in	the County.				

Fire Services

	2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY										
			2013		2012		2011		2010		2009
2.1 a)	Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$	0.80	\$	0.91	\$	0.97	\$	1.08	\$	0.89
2.1 b)	Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$	0.89	\$	1.01	\$	1.08	\$	1.19		
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient fire services.			I				I			
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:										
	In 2013 costs amounting to \$63,000 of shared with OPP facility costs were removed from from firhall facility costs. This was not done in prior years.							ts. This			

	2.2 & 2.3 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED INJURIES – EFFECTIVENESS									
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
2.2	Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.000				
2.3	Number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.098	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.381				
	OBJECTIVE: Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.									

	2.4 & 2.5 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED FATALITIES - EFFECTIVENESS									
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
2.4	Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000				
2.5	Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000				

Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.

2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES – EFFECTIVENESS							
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	
2.6	Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	0.784	2.175	2.272	0.000	1.852	
	OBJECTIVE: Minimize the number of residential struct	ural fires.					

Police Services

	3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY										
			2013		2012		2011		2010		2009
3.1 a)	Operating costs for police services per person.	\$	237.65	\$	232.48	\$	243.47	\$	271.73	\$	253.93
3.1 b)	Total costs for police services per person.	\$	238.09	\$	232.72	\$	243.72	\$	272.01		
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient police services.										

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
3.2 Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.	8.6	9.3	9.7	13.6	15.9			
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.								

	3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
3.3	Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.	30.6	32.0	32.7	41.5	43.0			
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.								

	3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
3.4	Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (<i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	44.6	46.9	47.8	62.5	65.4			
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.								

	3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
3.5	Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	10.4	13.8	15.2	18.4	32.5			
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.								

Building Permits & Inspection Services

	4.2 REVIEW OF COMPLE	TE BUILDING I	PERMIT APPI	LICATIONS -
		2013	2012	2011
	Median number of days to review a comp permit or not issue a permit, and provide			and issue a
(: 	Category 1: Houses (houses not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres). Reference: provincial standard is 10 working days.	10	7	5
	Category 2: Small Buildings (small commercial/industrial not exceeding 3 storeys/600 square metres). Reference: provincial standard is 15 working days.	15	12	7
i	Category 3: Large Buildings (large residential/commercial/ industrial/ institutional). Reference: provincial standard is 20 working days.	20	15	9
	Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications). Reference: provincial standard is 30 working days.	25	25	25

			Catego	ry 1: Houses	ices - Effectiv) square metre	
			2013			
4.3 a)	The number and percentage of building permit applications which are submitted and accepted by the	#	44			
4.3 a)	municipality as complete applications.	%	100%			
4.3 b)	The number and percentage of building permit applications which are submitted and accepted by the	#				
4.3 b)	municipality as incomplete applications.	%				
4.3 c)	The subtotal for the number of complete and incomplete building permit applications.	#	44			
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					

	4.3 Building Small Buildings (small co		ermits and Ins Cat nercial/indust
			2013
4.3 a)	The number and percentage of building permit applications which are submitted and accepted by the	#	3
4.3 a)	municipality as complete applications .	%	100%
4.3 b)	The number and percentage of building permit applications which	#	
4.3 b)	are submitted and accepted by the municipality as incomplete applications .	%	
4.3 c)	The subtotal for the number of complete and incomplete building permit applications.	#	3
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.		

	4.3 Building Large Buildings		Cat	spection Servi tegory 3: al/commercial/		
			2013			
4.3 a)	The number and percentage of building permit applications which are submitted and accepted by the	#	1			
4.3 a)	municipality as complete applications .	%	100%			
4.3 b)	The number and percentage of building permit applications which are submitted and accepted by the	#				
4.3 b)	municipality as incomplete applications.	%				
4.3 c)	The subtotal for the number of complete and incomplete building permit applications.	#	1			
	DBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					

4.3 Building Permits and Inspection Services - Effectiveness Category 4: Complex buildings (post disaster buildings, including hospitals, power/water, fire/police/EMS, communications) 2013 4.3 a) The number and percentage of # 0 building permit applications which are submitted and accepted by the 4.3 a) municipality as complete 0, applications. The number and percentage of 4.3 b) building permit applications which # are submitted and accepted by the 4.3 b) municipality as incomplete applications. 4.3 c) The subtotal for the number of complete and incomplete building # 0 permit applications. OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.

		2013		
4.4	The total number of building permit applications submitted and accepted by the municipality (all categories)	48		
	OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.			

Roads

	,	5.1	PAVED RC	DAC	OS – EFFIC	IEN	ICY		
			2013		2012		2011	2010	
5.1 a)	Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. ¹	\$	9,229.02	\$	11,690.31	\$	9,382.69	\$ 13,681.00	
5.1 b)	Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$	17,192.65	\$	18,303.38	\$	16,080.53	\$ 19,651.00	
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient maintenance of paved roads.								

	5.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY					
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.2 a)	Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	na	na	na	na	na
5.2 b)	Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	na	na	na	na	
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.					

5.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFICIENCY									
			2013		2012		2011	2010	2009
5.3 a)	Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$	53.42	\$	25.22	\$	25.13	\$ 30.50	
5.3 b)	Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	\$	632.64	\$	298.65	\$	297.56	\$ 361.23	
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient maintenance of bridges and cul	verts.				1			

	5.4 WINTER	R M/		ICE	OF ROAD) S –	EFFICIEN	ICY		
			2013		2012		2011		2010	2009
5.4 a)	Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$	1,966.11	\$	1,305.97	\$	1,994.92	\$	1,561.98	\$ 1,718.58
5.4 b)	Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$	2,165.83	\$	1,507.38	\$	2,198.65	\$	1,795.71	
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient winter maintenance of roads.									

	5.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS – EFFECTIVENESS						
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	
5.5	Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	50%	51%	100%	100%	100%	
	OBJECTIVE: Pavement condition meets municipal obje	ectives.					

	5.6 ADEQUACY		AND CULVER	TS – EFFECT	VENESS	
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
5.6	Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	100%	68%	59%	59%	n/a
	OBJECTIVE: Safe bridges and culverts.					

	2013	2012	2011	2010	200
ercentage of winter events where ne response met or exceeded locally etermined municipal service levels or road maintenance.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	e response met or exceeded locally etermined municipal service levels or road maintenance.	e response met or exceeded locally etermined municipal service levels 100%	te response met or exceeded locally etermined municipal service levels 100% 100% or road maintenance.	te response met or exceeded locally etermined municipal service levels or road maintenance.	te response met or exceeded locally etermined municipal service levels or road maintenance.

Conventional Transit

	6.1 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT – EFFICIENCY								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
6.1 a)	Operating costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
6.1 b)	Total costs for conventional transit per regular service passenger trip.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient conventional transit services.								
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERS	STANDING RES	ULTS:						
	There is no convential transit service in the	e Town.							

	6.2 CONVENTIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP – EFFECTIVENESS								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
6.2	Number of conventional transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
	OBJECTIVE: Maximum utilization of municipal transit services.								

Wastewater (Sewage)

7.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION/CONVEYANCE – EFFICIENCY									
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
7.1 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
7.1 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal wastewater collection/conveyance.									
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDER	STANDING RES	SULTS:							
The Town does not provide wastewater s	service it is suppl	lied by the Coun	ity.						

7.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
7.2 a) Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
7.2 b) Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal wastewater treatmer	nt and disposal.							

	7.3 WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
7.3 a)	Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
7.3 b)	Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal wastewater system (in	tegrated system	ı).	l	1				

7.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS – EFFECTIVENESS								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
7.4 Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
OBJECTIVE:								

Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.

	7.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT – EFFECTIVENESS								
2013 2012 2011 2010 2									
7.5	Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
	OBJECTIVE: Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.								

Storm Water

	8.1 URBAN STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY							
			2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	
8.1 a)	Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$	1,962.74	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
8.1 b)	Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	\$	6,108.81	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient urban storm water management.							
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDER	STA	NDING RE	SULTS:				
	Prior to 2013 the measure was not tracke	ed.						

	8.2 RURAL STORM WATER MANAGEMENT – EFFICIENCY								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
8.2 a)	Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
8.2 b)	Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient rural storm water management.								
	NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERS	TANDING RESUL	TS:						
	There is no rural area in the Town.								

Drinking Water

9.1 DRINKING WATER TREATMENT – EFFICIENCY								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
perating costs for the treatment of inking water per megalitre.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
tal costs for the treatment of inking water per megalitre.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
JECTIVE: ficient municipal water treatment services	<u> </u>	I						
	hking water per megalitre. tal costs for the treatment of hking water per megalitre.	erating costs for the treatment of n/a n/a tal costs for the treatment of n/a tal costs for the treatment of nking water per megalitre. n/a	erating costs for the treatment of n/a n/a n/a tal costs for the treatment of n/a n/a spectrum n/a n/a hking water per megalitre. n/a n/a hking water per megalitre.	erating costs for the treatment of nking water per megalitre.n/an/atal costs for the treatment of nking water per megalitre.n/an/asJECTIVE:N/aN/aN/a	erating costs for the treatment of nking water per megalitre.n/an/an/atal costs for the treatment of nking water per megalitre.n/an/an/asJECTIVE:			

9.2 DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION/TRANSMISSION – EFFICIENCY								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
9.2 a) Operating costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
9.2 b) Total costs for the distribution/ transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal water distribution/transm	ission services.	ï	ï					

9.3 DRINKING WATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009		
9.3 a) Operating costs for distribution/transm water per megalitr system).	•	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
9.3 b) Total costs for the distribution/transm water per megalitr system).	ission of drinking	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal	water system (integrated	system).						

9.4 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES – EFFECTIVENESS										
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
9.4	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.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	OBJECTIVE:									
	Water is safe and meets local needs.									

	9.5 BREAKS IN WATER MAINS – EFFECTIVENESS										
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
9.5	Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.										
	OBJECTIVE: Improve system reliability.										

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

10.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY										
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
10.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. (Specify)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
10.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. (Specify)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a						
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal garbage collection ser	OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal garbage collection services. NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:									
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDER										
Garbage collection is a County service.										

10.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY										
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
10.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. (Specify)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
10.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. (Specify)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a						
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.										

10.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY										
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
10.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household.(Specify)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
10.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household. (Specify)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a						
OBJECTIVE: Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) s	services.									

10.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY										
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
10.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household. (Specify)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
 10.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household. (Specify) 	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a						
OBJECTIVE: Efficient solid waste management (integrated system).										

	10.5 COMPLAINTS – COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS EFFECTIVENESS										
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
10.5	Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
	OBJECTIVE: Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.										

10.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS										
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
10.6 Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
OBJECTIVE: Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.										

			5	-	 - ,	r.	-		-	

10.7	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 municipally owned solid waste management facility, by facility.									
FIR line #	Facility Name	Days 2013	Days 2012	Days 2011	Days 2010	Days 2009				
3553	3 n/a n/a n/a n/a									
	List facilities in the order they appear in the 2013 Financial Information Return (FIR).									
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.										

10.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE EFFECTIVENESS										
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
10.8	Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.										

(Based on Co	10.9 DIVERSION OF RES ombined Residential and Inc EFFECT			onal Tonnage)	
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
0.9 Percentage of residential s diverted for recycling (base combined residential and l tonnage).	ed on	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Parks and Recreation

11.1 PARKS – EFFICIENCY									
		2013		2012	2011		2010		2009
11.1 a) Operating costs for parks per person.	\$	59.63	\$	36.79	\$ 35.83	\$	45.29	\$	44.39
11.1 b) Total costs for parks per person.	\$	68.72	\$	44.98	\$ 43.34	\$	55.00		
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of parks.									

11.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY										
		2013		2012		2011		2010		2009
11.2 a) Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	\$	142.18	\$	130.71	\$	126.28	\$	139.16	\$	147.67
11.2 b) Total costs for recreation programs per person.	\$	142.18	\$	130.71	\$	126.28	\$	139.16		
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation program	ns.				1					

11.3 RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY										
		2013		2012		2011		2010		2009
11.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$	106.27	\$	126.85	\$	114.35	\$	126.27	\$	128.32
11.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$	133.48	\$	155.80	\$	144.52	\$	157.21		
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation facilities			1							

	11.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL) EFFICIENCY											
			2013		2012		2011		2010		2009	
11.4 a)	Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal).	\$	248.46	\$	257.57	\$	240.63	\$	264.43	\$	275.99	
11.4 b)	Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal).	\$	275.67	\$	288.51	\$	270.80	\$	296.37			
	OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation program	s and	facilities.	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		<u> </u>				

11.5 TRAILS – EFFECTIVENESS									
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
11.5	Total kilometres of trails.	5	5	4	4	4			
11.5	Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons.	0.41	0.41	0.33	0.38	0.38			
	OBJECTIVE: Trails provide recreation opportunities.	·							

	11.6 OPEN SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS									
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
11.6	Hectares of open space (municipally owned).	61	61	53	53	53				
11.6	Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	5.0	5.0	4.4	5.0	5.0				
	OBJECTIVE: Open space is adequate for population.									

	11.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS										
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009					
11.7	Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	99,791.0	108,561.0	106,272.0	106,615.0	140,628.0					
OBJECTIVE: Recreation programs serve needs of residents.											

	11.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS									
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
11.8	Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally owned).	5,364	5,364	5,364	5,364	5,364				
11.8	Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	441.6	441.6	441.6	510.3	510.3				
	OBJECTIVE: Indoor recreation facility space is adequat	e for population.								

	11.9 OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS									
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
11.9	Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space (municipally owned).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
11.9	Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	OBJECTIVE: Outdoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.									

Libraries

12.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY									
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
12.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
12.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
OBJECTIVE: Efficient library services.									
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:									
The library is a County function.									

12.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY									
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009				
12.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use. ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
12.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a					
OBJECTIVE: Efficient library services.									

12.3 LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS							
2013 2012 2011 2010							
^{12.3} Library uses per person. ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
OBJECTIVE: Increased use of library services.							

12.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS							
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009		
12.4 Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.							

	12.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS							
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009		
12.5	Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
	OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.							

Land Use Planning

13.1 LOCATION OF NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – EFFECTIVENESS							
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	
13.1	Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
	OBJECTIVE:						

New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.

	13.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
13.2	Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
	OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.								

	13.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
13.3	Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
	OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.					I			

13.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
13.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	0	0	0	0	0			
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.	i							

	13.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000 EFFECTIVENESS								
		2013	2012	2011	2010	2009			
13.5	Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	0	0	0	0	0			
	OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.								