

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Questions about MPMP results should be addressed to:

Name: Crystal-Ann Roy	Phone: 705-867-2032 ext 206
Title: Corporate Services Manager	
Municipality: Corporation of the Municipality of St.-Charles	
Email: crystalann.roy@stcharlesontario.ca	

Related documents and links:

Local Government

CONTACT PERSON FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT: Theresa Niemi

1.1 GENERAL GOVERNMENT - EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
1.1 a) Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.	17.6%	14.5%
1.1 b) Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.	18.0%	

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient local government.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Fire Services

CONTACT PERSON FOR FIRE SERVICES: Royal Lafleur

2.1 FIRE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
2.1 a) Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 1.05	\$ 1.05	
2.1 b) Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.	\$ 1.22		

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient fire services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

2.2 & 2.3 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED INJURIES – EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	
2.2 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	
2.3 Number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.	0.000	0.000	

OBJECTIVE:

Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

2.4 & 2.5 CIVILIAN FIRE RELATED FATALITIES - EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
2.4 Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000 persons.	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	
OBJECTIVE: Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

2.6 NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURAL FIRES – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
2.6 Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	0.000	0.000	
OBJECTIVE: Minimize the number of residential structural fires.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Police Services

CONTACT PERSON FOR POLICE SERVICES:

3.1 POLICE SERVICES – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
3.1 a) Operating costs for police services per person. ¹	\$ 144.24	\$ 144.51	
3.1 b) Total costs for police services per person.	\$ 144.24		

OBJECTIVE:

Efficient police services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
3.2 Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	7.5	12.2	
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
3.3 Property crime rate per 1,000 persons. ¹	38.5	12.2	
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
3.4 Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (<i>Criminal Code</i> offences, excluding traffic).	49.3	28.5	38.3	37.3	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

3.5 YOUTH CRIME RATE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
3.5 Youth crime rate per 1,000 youths.	433.3	22.2	xxx	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Safe communities.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Roads

CONTACT PERSON FOR ROADS: Royal Lafleur

4.1 PAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2010
4.1 a) Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre. ¹	n/a
4.1 b) Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	n/a

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient maintenance of paved roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

4.2 UNPAVED ROADS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
4.2 a) Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	n/a	\$ 4,030.78
4.2 b) Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	n/a	

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

4.3 BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
4.3 a) Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	n/a	n/a
4.3 b) Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.	n/a	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		

4.4 WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
4.4 a) Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	n/a	\$ 193.50
4.4 b) Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	n/a	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient winter maintenance of roads.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

4.5 ADEQUACY OF PAVED ROADS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.5 Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
OBJECTIVE: Pavement condition meets municipal objectives.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

4.6 ADEQUACY OF BRIDGES AND CULVERTS – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
4.6 Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good. ¹	n/a	n/a	
OBJECTIVE: Safe bridges and culverts.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

4.7 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
4.7 Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance.	2%	3%	100%	41%	48%
OBJECTIVE: Response to winter storm events meets locally determined service levels for winter road maintenance.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

- Financial Information Return: 91 2203 35 (Operating costs measure) and 91 2203 45 (Total costs measure).

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Wastewater (Sewage)

CONTACT PERSON FOR WASTEWATER: Royal Lafleur

6.1 WASTEWATER COLLECTION/CONVEYANCE – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
6.1 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	n/a	\$ 9,629.33
6.1 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	n/a	

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient municipal wastewater collection/conveyance.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

6.2 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
6.2 a) Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	n/a	n/a
6.2 b) Total costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.	n/a	

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient municipal wastewater treatment and disposal.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

6.3 WASTEWATER INTEGRATED SYSTEM – EFFICIENCY			
	2010	2009	
6.3 a) Operating costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	n/a	n/a	
6.3 b) Total costs for the collection/conveyance, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (integrated system).	n/a		
OBJECTIVE: Efficient municipal wastewater system (integrated system).			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

6.4 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.4 Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	n/a	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

6.5 WASTEWATER BYPASSES TREATMENT – EFFECTIVENESS						
		2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
6.5	Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment.	n/a	n/a	xxx	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Municipal sewage management practices prevent environmental and human health hazards.						
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:						

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Solid Waste Management (Garbage)

CONTACT PERSON FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT:

9.1 GARBAGE COLLECTION – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
9.1 a) Operating costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ 30.68	\$ 27.27	
9.1 b) Total costs for garbage collection per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ 56.64		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient municipal garbage collection services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

9.2 GARBAGE DISPOSAL – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
9.2 a) Operating costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ 128.99	\$ 77.30	
9.2 b) Total costs for garbage disposal per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ 131.73		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient municipal garbage disposal services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.3 SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING) – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
9.3 a) Operating costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ -	\$ 62.39
9.3 b) Total costs for solid waste diversion per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ -	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		

9.4 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT (INTEGRATED SYSTEM) – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
9.4 a) Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ -	\$ 166.96
9.4 b) Average total costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household. (Specify)	\$ -	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient solid waste management (integrated system).		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.5 COMPLAINTS – COLLECTION OF GARBAGE AND RECYCLED MATERIALS EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.5 Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.	10.5	2.2	53.0	xxx	1.1
OBJECTIVE: Improved collection of garbage and recycled materials.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

9.6 NUMBER OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.6 Total number of solid waste management facilities owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment certificate of approval.	1	1	1	1	1
OBJECTIVE: Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.7 FACILITY COMPLIANCE – EFFECTIVENESS

9.7 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 2010	Days 2009	Days 2008	Days 2007	Days 2006
3553	St.-Charles Landfill - 515 Beauparlant Rd					
3554						
3555						
3556						
3557						
3558						
3559						
3560						
3561						
3562	Please delete unused rows.					

List facilities in the order they appear in the 2010 Financial Information Return (FIR).

OBJECTIVE:

Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse impact on environment.

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

9.8 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.8 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.	10%	20%	24%	12%	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

9.9 DIVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE (Based on Combined Residential and Industrial/Commercial/Institutional Tonnage) EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
9.9 Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling (based on combined residential and ICI tonnage).	n/a	n/a	xxx	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Municipal solid waste reduction programs divert waste from landfills and/or incinerators.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Parks and Recreation

CONTACT PERSON FOR PARKS AND RECREATION: Claude Roy

10.1 PARKS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
10.1 a) Operating costs for parks per person.	\$ 9.23	\$ 10.10	
10.1 b) Total costs for parks per person.	\$ 13.99		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient operation of parks.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

10.2 RECREATION PROGRAMS – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009	
10.2 a) Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 223.87	\$ 329.86	
10.2 b) Total costs for recreation programs per person.	\$ 223.87		

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient operation of recreation programs.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.3 RECREATION FACILITIES – EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
10.3 a) Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.	n/a	n/a
10.3 b) Total costs for recreation facilities per person.	\$ 12.20	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation facilities.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		

10.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS AND RECREATION FACILITIES (SUBTOTAL) EFFICIENCY		
	2010	2009
10.4 a) Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 223.87	\$ 329.86
10.4 b) Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person (Subtotal)	\$ 236.07	
OBJECTIVE: Efficient operation of recreation programs and facilities.		
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:		

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.5 TRAILS – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.5 Total kilometres of trails	3	3	3	3	3
10.5 Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	2.51	2.45	2.45	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Trails provide recreation opportunities.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

10.6 OPEN SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.6 Hectares of open space (municipally owned)	9	9	9	9	9
10.6 Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	7.5	7.3	7.3	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Open space is adequate for population.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.7 PARTICIPANT HOURS FOR RECREATION PROGRAMS EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.7 Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	9.0	7.3	7.3	64.9	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Recreation programs serve needs of residents.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

10.8 INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities (municipally owned)	3	3	3	3	xxx
10.8 Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	2,792.6	2,724.3	2,724.3	2,708.0	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Indoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

10.9 OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITY SPACE – EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space (municipally owned)	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
10.9 Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons (municipally owned)	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Outdoor recreation facility space is adequate for population.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Libraries

CONTACT PERSON FOR LIBRARIES: Nicole Lafontaine

11.1 LIBRARY COSTS PER PERSON – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
11.1 a) Operating costs for library services per person.	\$ 58.65	\$ 53.23
11.1 b) Total costs for library services per person.	\$ 58.65	

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

11.2 LIBRARY COSTS PER USE – EFFICIENCY

	2010	2009
11.2 a) Operating costs for library services per use. ¹	\$ 70.15	\$ 5.60
11.2 b) Total costs for library services per use.	\$ 70.15	

OBJECTIVE:
Efficient library services.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

11.3 LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
11.3 Library uses per person. ¹	950.00	950.00	
OBJECTIVE: Increased use of library services.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

11.4 ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
11.4 Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. ¹	30%	23%	
OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

11.5 NON - ELECTRONIC LIBRARY USES – EFFECTIVENESS			
	2010	2009	
11.5 Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses. ¹	70%	77%	
OBJECTIVE: Better information on library usage.			
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:			

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

Land Use Planning

CONTACT PERSON FOR LAND USE PLANNING:

12.1 LOCATION OF NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007
12.1 Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

OBJECTIVE:

New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

12.2 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS

	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.2 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

OBJECTIVE:

Preservation of agricultural land.

NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

12.3 PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RELATIVE TO 2000 EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.3 Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	n/a	n/a	xxx	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

12.4 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES DURING REPORTING YEAR EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.4 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	n/a	0	0	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					

MUNICIPALITY

Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) • 2010 RESULTS

12.5 CHANGE IN NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL HECTARES SINCE 2000 EFFECTIVENESS					
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
12.5 Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	n/a	0	0	xxx	xxx
OBJECTIVE: Preservation of agricultural land.					
NOTES & KEY FACTORS FOR UNDERSTANDING RESULTS:					