

Local Government

1a. OPERATING COSTS General government support	
$\frac{\text{Operating costs for general government support}}{\text{Total Municipal Operating Costs}} \times 100$	
Total municipal operating costs	
2005	2006
5.3%	5.2%
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>General government support as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</i></p>	
<p>Objective <i>Efficient municipal administration.</i></p>	
<p>Notes The Municipality's general administration provides all departments with central administrative functions such as payroll, accounting, information technology and secretarial.</p>	

Fire Services

2. OPERATING COSTS	
<u>Operating costs for Fire Services</u> (Total assessment / 1,000)	
Per \$1,000 of assessment	
2005	2006
\$0.80	\$0.67
<p><i>Efficiency Measure</i> <i>Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Objective</i> <i>Efficient municipal fire services.</i></p>	
<p>Notes The Nation Municipality has five fire brigades. All the firefighters are volunteers.</p>	

Police Services

3. OPERATING COSTS		4a. TOTAL CRIME RATE / 1,000	
<p><u>Operating costs for Police Services</u> Total households</p>		<p>Total # of actual incidents for violent crime, <u>property crime and other Criminal Code offences</u> Population / 1,000</p>	
<p>Per household</p>		<p>Crimes per 1,000 persons</p>	
<p>2005</p>	<p>2006</p>	<p>2005</p>	<p>2006</p>
<p>\$222.26</p>	<p>\$227.31</p>	<p>25.784</p>	<p>23.342</p>
<p>Efficiency Measure <i>Operating costs for police services per household.</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>Efficient municipal police services.</i></p>		<p>Objective <i>Safe communities.</i></p>	
<p>Notes The total operating costs for the services of the O.P.P. were \$854,686</p>		<p>Notes</p>	

This measure is reported where the population is less than 100,000.

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	
Per paved lane kilometre		Per unpaved lane kilometre	
2005	2006	205	2006
\$273.54	\$393.27	\$898.46	\$683.59
<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 The total operating costs for maintenance and paved roads were \$252,089. The total kilometres of highways (road lanes) paved equals 641km. The expenses for the vehicles' fleet are included in the operating costs.</p>		<p>Notes The total operating costs for maintenance of unpaved roads were \$324,706. The total kilometre of unpaved roads was 475km. The expenses for the vehicles' fleet are included in the operating costs.</p>	

Road Services

7. OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER CONTROL		8. CONDITION OF ROADS	
<p><u>Operating costs for winter control maintenance of roadways</u> Total lane kilometres maintained in winter</p>		<p><u>Number of paved lane kilometers rated as good to very good x100</u> Total number of paved lane kilometers tested</p>	
<p>Per lane kilometre</p>		<p>Percentage of lane kilometres</p>	
<p>2005</p>	<p>2006</p>	<p>2005</p>	<p>2006</p>
<p>\$540.14</p>	<p>\$453.96</p>	<p>92.50%</p>	<p>75%</p>
<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</p> <p>The total costs for the winter control were \$484,374. The expenses for the vehicles' fleet are included in the operating costs.</p>		<p>Notes</p> <p>The total number of paved lane kilometres rated as good to very good is 481 and the total number of paved lane kilometres tested was 641.</p> <p>Please note that in 2006 we have revised the total number of kilometres of paved lane.</p>	

Road Services

9. WINTER EVENT RESPONSES

Number of winter event responses
that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards
x100

Total number of winter events

100% of winter event responses

Effectiveness

Percentage of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards.

Objective

Provide appropriate winter response.

Notes

The numbers of winter event responses that met or exceeded municipal road maintenance standards were 75.

The total numbers of winter events were 75.

Wastewater

12c. OPERATING COSTS FOR COLLECTION TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL		13. MAIN BACKUPS	
<u>Operating costs for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal</u>		<u>Total number of backed up wastewater mains Total kilometres of wastewater mains /100</u>	
Per megalitre		Per 100 kilometres of main	
2005	2006	2005	2006
\$591.64	\$557.53	8.333	0
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>Objective Efficient wastewater services.</p>		<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p>There was no backed up in 2006</p> <p>Objective Prevention of human and environmental health hazards.</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The treatment and distribution operating costs were 376,166. The total megalitres was 674 for the year 2006</p>		<p>Notes</p>	

This measure is reported only if the municipality is responsible for wastewater collection and wastewater treatment and disposal.

Municipalities with integrated systems may also report the individual measures for collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater.

Wastewater

14. TREATMENT BYPASS
<p>Estimated megalitres of untreated wastewater x100</p>
<p>0.0% of wastewater</p>
<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>

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>Summation of: number of boil water advisory days <u>times the number of affected connections</u> Total connections in service area</p>					
<p>Breaks per 100 kilometres of main</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3.7037</td> <td>8.1081</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2005	2006	3.7037	8.1081	<p>0 days a year</p>	
2005	2006						
3.7037	8.1081						
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Number of breaks in water mains per 100 kilometres of water main pipe in a year.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Improve system reliability and minimize water loss and operational costs.</i></p>		<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>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.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Water is safe and meets local needs.</i></p>					
<p>Notes The total number of breaks in water mains were 3.</p>		<p>Notes</p>					

Solid Waste

20. OPERATING COSTS FOR INTEGRATED SYSTEM
<p><u>Operating costs for solid waste management</u> Total per household</p>
<p>\$214.64 per household</p>
<p><i>Efficiency Measure</i> Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household.</p> <p><i>Objective</i> Efficient solid waste management programs.</p>
<p>Notes The operating costs for solid waste management were \$814,362.</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	$\frac{\text{Number of Complaints}}{\text{Total Households}} / 1,000$	
0	5 sites	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>	2005	2006
		31.892	27.412
<p>Notes</p>	<p>Notes The municipality only has 3 waste management sites in operation.</p>	<p>Notes The total number of complaints received in the year were 104.</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	
Percentage of new development	
2005	2006
69.5%	6.9%
<p><i>Effectiveness Measure</i> <i>Percentage of new development with final approval, which is located within settlement areas.</i></p> <p><i>Objective</i> <i>New lot creation is occurring in settlement areas.</i></p>	
<p>Notes</p>	

Land Use Planning

25a. PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN REPORTING YEAR	25b. CHANGE IN NUMBER OF DESIGNATED HECTARES IN REPORTING YEAR
<p>Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes <u>in the Official Plan as of December 31, 2005</u> X100 Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2005</p>	<p>Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes, which was re-designated for other uses during 2005.</p>
<p>100% of agricultural land (reporting year)</p>	<p>0 hectares</p>
<p>Effectiveness Measure <i>Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes, which was preserved during 2005.</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 during 2005.</i></p> <p>Objective <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p>	<p>Notes</p>

Land Use Planning

25c. AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO BASE YEAR	25d. REDESIGNATED AGRICULTURAL LAND
<p>Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes <u>in the Official Plan as of December 31,</u> <u>2005</u> X100 Hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in the Official Plan as of January 1, 2000</p>	<p>Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses relative to base year.</p>
<p>100% of agricultural land (relative to base year)</p>	<p>0 hectares</p>
<p><i>Effectiveness Measure</i> <i>Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes, which was preserved relative to base year of 2000.</i></p> <p><i>Objective</i> <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>	<p><i>Effectiveness Measure</i> <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><i>Objective</i> <i>Preserve agricultural land.</i></p>
<p>Notes</p>	<p>Notes</p>