

City of Pickering Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report

Overview

As required by the Ontario Government's Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP), the Treasurer of the City of Pickering, as part of its 2010 Financial Information Return (FIR) package, has submitted financial and related service performance measurements to the Province.

This program was announced in 2000 by the Ontario Government, which requires municipalities to collect data on measures of effectiveness and efficiency in key service areas and report these measures to the Province and the Public.

The objectives of the Province are: to enhance local government transparency and accountability by reporting specific measures to the taxpayers; to increase taxpayers awareness on service plans, standards and costs at the municipal level; to improve local service delivery by sharing best practices with comparable municipalities and provide municipalities with useful data to make informed local service level decisions while optimizing available resources. As municipalities change and grow, its citizens expect to receive quality, cost effective services. Performance measurements are a means of benchmarking these services that will allow the City to review and improve their delivery. Existing measures are continuously refined and new measures are introduced depending on the value and importance for public information.

In reporting the results to the public, each measure is accompanied by comments regarding aspects of the measurement. The comments are an integral part in the interpretation of the performance measure results. These results should not be compared across municipalities without consideration on the comments that impact the interpretation and understanding of individual results. In addition, influencing factors in the collection of data or refinements while the measures are still evolving could affect the current year's results and the year over year comparability.

Starting with the 2009 reporting year, efficiency measures based on Total Costs per Unit are to be reported to the public. Total Costs are calculated as the sum of Operating Costs, Interest on Long Term Debt and Amortization of related capital assets. The Total Costs per Unit measure add an important dimension to efficiency measures by including capital costs and interest on long term debt.

New for 2010, all Total Costs per unit measures will net out Revenue from Other Municipalities related to Tangible Capital Assets (inputs on Schedule 12). This was previously reported in Schedule 52 prior to 2009 but was discontinued thereafter. In 2010 for the City of Pickering, no revenues were received from other municipalities related to capital assets. Hence, all measures affected by this change in 2010 should be comparable to 2009.

City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report

Also new for 2010, the formula for Operating Costs for paved roads in calculating efficiency (Schedule 91) has been changed to net out revenue received from utilities for utility cut repairs. This change should provide a more accurate picture of expenses on the maintenance of municipal roads. However, no revenue was received by the City in 2010 from utilities as all utility cut repairs were done by the utilities themselves.

For the calculation of measures pertaining to a per person or per 1,000 persons bases, the City population in 2010 was 93,315 compared to 92,950 in 2009.

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

General Government

1.1a Operating Costs for Governance and Corporate Management	
2010	2009
7.90%	7.00%
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Objective To determine the efficiency of municipal management.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent that cost centers within municipalities directly relate to the functions included under the governance and corporate management categories. • The level of service provided to the corporation and the public. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Calculation of this measure includes the total of the operating costs for governance, corporate management and related allocation from program support expenditures net of tax write-offs over total municipal operating costs.</p> <p>Note that 2010 was a municipal election year and related costs have contributed to the increase in governance and corporate operating expenses. Also, the implementation of the harmonized sales tax may have increased overall expenses on items that were previously charged only with the GST.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

General Government

1.1b Total Costs for Governance and Corporate Management	
2010	2009
6.80%	6.00%
<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal costs.</p> <p>Objective To determine the efficiency of municipal management.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The extent that cost centers within municipalities directly relate to the functions included under the governance and corporate management categories.• The level of service provided to the corporation and the public.	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Calculation of this measure includes the total operating costs for governance and corporate management, related interest on long term debt and amortization net of revenue received from other municipalities on tangible capital assets over total municipal cost.</p> <p>The increase from 6.0% in 2009 to 6.8% in 2010 was driven by the increase in related operating costs identified on the previous measure.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Fire Services

2.1a Operating Costs for Fire Services	
2010	2009
\$1.36	\$1.43
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient municipal fire services.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency response times • Number and location of fire halls • Urban/rural mix of properties as well as density of buildings • Geographic size of municipality 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Assessment value does not necessarily correlate to operating cost for fire services. The higher the assessment value, the lower the cost per \$1,000 assessment. Conversely the urban/rural mix of the community affects the results as do the size and type of commercial/industrial establishments within the municipality.</p> <p>Number of households, response time and urban/rural mix of the municipality are factors that determine the need for fire services and not necessarily property value. Although there was a slight increase in operating expenses from 2009, the decrease in the 2010 measure was primarily due to the increase in the value of property assessment (denominator) from 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Fire Services

2.1b Total Costs for Fire Services	
2010	2009
\$1.43	\$1.50
<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient municipal fire services.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency response times • Number and location of fire halls • Urban/rural mix of properties as well as density of buildings • Geographic size of municipality • Capital costs and interest on long term debt 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>The numerator in the calculation of this measure adds interest on long term debt and amortization to the total operating costs for Fire Services. However, like in the previous measure, the assessment value as denominator does not necessarily correlate to the total cost for fire services. The higher the assessment value, the lower the cost per \$1,000 assessment. Conversely the urban/rural mix of the community affects the results as with the size and type of commercial/industrial establishments.</p> <p>Number of households, response time and urban/rural mix of the municipality are key factors that determine the need for fire services and not necessarily the property value. The slight decrease in the resulting measure for 2010 was primarily due to the increase in total property assessment value from 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Fire Services

2.2 Residential Fire Related Civilian Injuries	
2010	2009
0.00	0.00
Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related civilian injuries per 1,000 persons.	
Objective Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.	
General Comments The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of residential fires• Emergency response times• Number and location of fire halls• Geographic size of municipality	
Detailed Comments This measure presents the total number of residential fire related civilian injuries as reported by the fire department to the Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) in the OFM Standard Incident Report. In 2010, no residential fire related civilian injury was reported to the OFM.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Fire Services

2.3 Residential Fire Related Civilian Injuries – 5 Year Average	
2010	2009
0.021	0.065
Effectiveness Measure Total number of residential fire related civilian injuries averaged over 5 years from 2006 to 2010 per 1,000 persons.	
Objective Minimize the number of civilian injuries in residential fires.	
General Comments The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of residential fires• Emergency response times• Number and location of fire halls• Geographic size of municipality	
Detailed Comments This measure presents the number of residential fire related civilian injuries as reported by the fire department to the Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) in the OFM Standard Incident Report from 2006 to 2010 averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons. The fire department reported an average of two residential fire related civilian injuries to the OFM per year from 2006 to 2010. However, with no injuries being reported in 2009 and 2010, the five year average has decreased substantially.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Fire Services

2.4 Residential Fire Related Civilian Fatalities	
2010	2009
0.000	0.011
Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities per 1,000 persons.	
Objective Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.	
General Comments The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of residential fires• Emergency response times• Number and location of fire halls• Geographic size of municipality	
Detailed Comments This measure presents the number of residential fire related civilian fatalities as determined by the Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) per 1,000 persons. In 2010, no residential fire related civilian fatality was reported to the OFM.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Fire Services

2.5 Residential Fire Related Civilian Fatalities – 5 Year Average	
2010	2009
0.011	0.011
<p>Effectiveness Measure Number of residential fire related civilian fatalities averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Objective Minimize the number of civilian fatalities in residential fires.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of residential fires• Emergency response times• Number and location of fire halls• Geographic size of municipality	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>This measure presents the total number of residential fire related civilian fatalities as determined by the Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) from 2006 to 2010 averaged over 5 years per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>The average residential fire related civilian fatality per year for 5 years from 2006 to 2010 is one, as reported to the OFM. This translates to 0.011 per 1,000 persons, the same result in 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Fire Services

2.6 Number of Residential Structural Fires	
2010	2009
1.068	0.875
Effectiveness Measure Number of residential structural fires per 1,000 households.	
Objective Minimize the number of residential structural fires.	
General Comments The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of residential fires• Emergency response times• Number and location of fire halls• Geographic size of municipality	
Detailed Comments This measure presents the total number of residential structural fires and explosions reported by the fire department to the Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) in the OFM Standard Incident Report per 1,000 households. In 2010, there were 32 residential structural fires and explosions reported by the fire department to the OFM. Three more than what was reported in 2009. This increased the resulting measure per 1,000 persons to 1.068, or 22% from 0.875 in 2009.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.1a Operating Costs for Paved Roads	
2010	2009
\$1,814.61	\$1,958.98
<p>Efficiency Measure Revised Measure - Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of roads by heavy equipment. • The municipality's standard for road conditions in comparison with comparable municipalities. • Kilometres of paved roads in the municipality. • The method of allocating overhead costs (such as office supplies, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Paved (hard top) roads include roads with asphalt surface, concrete surface, composite pavement, Portland cement or surface treatment.</p> <p>The identified costs attributable to this measure include related employee wages & benefits, road materials, contracted services, program support, rental of heavy equipment and shoulder maintenance.</p> <p>The City of Pickering maintains separate accounts to track material costs related to roads. However, the costs for administration and other indirect costs have been allocated to the cost for paved roads based on management's best estimate of the proportion of responsibility dedicated to the road functions such as maintenance of paved and unpaved roads and winter control.</p> <p>In 2010, the calculation of the operating costs was revised to net out revenue from utilities for utility cut repairs. However, utilities repair their own road cuts after completing all intended works so no related revenues are being collected by the City.</p> <p>The decrease in the resulting measure for 2010 can be attributed to the decrease in the volume of purchased materials compared to 2009. With the continuous and expeditious repairs done on existing paved roadways, cost of maintenance are reduced accordingly. The City maintained a total of 704 kilometres of paved roads in 2010 compared to 703 kilometres in 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.1b Total Costs for Paved Roads	
2010	2009
\$5,574.86	\$6,155.67
<p>Efficiency Measure Revised Measure - Total costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of roads by heavy equipment. • The municipality's standard for road conditions in comparison with comparable municipalities. • Kilometres of paved roads in the municipality. • The method of allocating overhead costs (such as office supplies, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. • Interest on long term debt and amortization on capital costs. • Revenue received from other municipalities related to tangible capital assets. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>The total cost is calculated by adding the calculated operating costs, interest on long term debt and amortization net of revenue received from other municipalities related to tangible capital assets. Although no related revenue was received in 2010, the decrease in the calculation for 2010 was largely due to the decrease in the volume of purchased materials and a decrease in amortization amount on tangible capital assets compared to 2009.</p> <p>The decrease in related costs reported on the previous measure translates to a decrease in the resulting total cost measure. The City maintained 704 kilometres of paved road in 2010 compared to 703 kilometres in 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.2a Operating Costs for Unpaved Roads	
2010	2009
\$5,188.99	\$5,237.12
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</p>	
<p>Objective Provide efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of the roads by heavy equipment. • The kilometres of unpaved roads in the municipality in comparison with comparable municipalities. • Locations of the unpaved roads. • The method of allocating overhead costs (that includes office supplies, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Unpaved (loose top) roads include roads with gravel, stone or other loose surface.</p> <p>The City of Pickering maintains separate accounts to track material costs related to roads. However, the cost for administration and other indirect costs have been allocated to the cost of unpaved roads based on management's best estimate of the proportion or responsibility dedicated to the road functions such as maintenance of paved and unpaved roads and winter control.</p> <p>The operating costs of maintaining the City's unpaved roads include employee wages & benefits, amount granular materials, administering calcium programs, program support, contracted services, rental of heavy equipment, grading, wash out repair and shoulder maintenance.</p> <p>In 2010, the City used less granular materials on many unpaved roads due to lesser than usual washouts in the spring reducing expenditures. The City maintained 214 kilometres of unpaved lanes in the reporting year compared to 216 in 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.2b Total Costs for Unpaved Roads	
2010	2009
\$5,243.48	\$5,295.11
<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</p>	
<p>Objective Provide efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of the roads by heavy equipment. • The kilometres of unpaved roads in the municipality in comparison with comparable municipalities. • Locations of the unpaved lanes. • The method of allocating overhead costs (that includes office supplies, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. • Interest on long term debt and amortization on capital costs. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Calculation of total costs include the sum of the total operating cost, interest on long term debt and amortization on capital costs net of revenue received from other municipalities related to tangible capital assets over 214 kilometres of unpaved lanes maintained in 2010. The decrease in 2010 from 2009 was reflective of the decrease in the operating costs calculated from the previous measure.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.3a Operating Costs for Bridges and Culverts	
2010	2009
\$0.00	\$0.00
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of bridges and causeways. • Location of bridges and culverts. • The method of allocating overhead costs (that includes office supplies, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>The operating costs of maintaining the City's bridges and culverts include employees' wages and benefits, materials used for repairs & maintenance, contracted services, rental of equipment, program support less revenue from other municipalities.</p> <p>In 2010, the City did not incur any operating costs related to the repairs & maintenance of bridges and culverts, as was in 2009.</p> <p>However, the total surface area of bridges and culverts measured in 2010 was 9,474 square metres compared to 8,599 in 2009. This increase was a result of a recent municipal bridge and culvert inspection and assessment study that provided a more accurate measure of the total surface area of qualified bridges and culverts by definition.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.3b Total Costs for Bridges and Culverts	
2010	2009
\$21.30	\$24.70
<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for bridges and culverts per square metre of surface area.</p>	
<p>Objective Provide efficient maintenance of bridges and culverts.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of bridges and causeways. • Locations of bridges and culverts. • The method of allocating overhead costs (that includes office supplies, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>The total costs of maintaining the City's bridges and culverts is the sum of the total operating cost, interest on long term debt and amortization less revenue from other municipalities related to tangible capital assets.</p> <p>The resulting measure was slightly lower by about 14% from \$24.70 in 2009 to \$21.30 in 2010. The decrease was largely due to the increase in the total square metres of surface area on bridges and culverts used as denominator in calculating the measure. The increase in surface area from 8,599 square metres in 2009 to 9,474 square metres in 2010 was a result of a recent bridge and culvert assessment study that provided a more accurate measure on the total surface area of qualified bridges and culverts.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.4a Operating Costs for Winter Maintenance of Roads	
2010	2009
\$963.32	\$1,328.15
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p>	
<p>Objective Provide efficient winter maintenance of roadways.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The municipality's standard service levels for road conditions. • The kilometres of paved and unpaved roads in the municipality in comparison with comparable municipalities. • The method of allocating overhead costs (that includes office supplies, travel, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Since 2004 the City of Pickering has maintained a separate account to track material costs that are directly related to winter control of roadways. The costs for administration and other indirect costs however have been allocated based on management's best estimate of the proportion of responsibility dedicated to the road function for winter control.</p> <p>The total operating cost of the City's winter control maintenance includes related employee wages & benefits, salt, sand & other materials, program support, equipment rental and culvert thawing.</p> <p>The decrease in costs of winter maintenance on roads from 2009 was due to the lesser intensity of winter events experienced in 2010. This resulted in less use of de-icing materials and related staff overtime. The City maintained 918 kilometres of lanes during the winter season.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.4b Total Costs for Winter Maintenance of Roads	
2010	2009
\$963.32	\$1,328.15
<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p>	
<p>Objective Provide efficient winter control operation.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The municipality's standard service levels for road conditions. • The kilometres of paved and unpaved roads in the municipality in comparison with comparable municipalities. • The method of allocating overhead costs (that includes office supplies, travel, telephone, advertising, subscriptions, insurance, general repairs and maintenance, other indirect costs) used in the determination of the numerator when there is not a separate cost centre. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>The total cost for winter maintenance of roads is calculated as the sum of the total operating cost, interest on long term debt and amortization on related assets net of revenue from other municipalities related to tangible capital assets.</p> <p>In 2010, there was no interest and amortization costs for equipment related to winter maintenance of roadways. Therefore, the resulting measure is the same as the calculated result showing on the operating costs for winter maintenance of roads (see 4.4a).</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.5 Adequacy of Roads	
2010	2009
86.6%	84.9%
Effectiveness Measure Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.	
Objective Provide a paved road system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.	
General Comments The following factors can influence the above results: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The municipality's standard service levels for road conditions.• The kilometres of paved roads in the municipality in comparison with comparable municipalities.• Volume of traffic.	
Detailed Comments City staff uses their best estimates to establish the percentage of roads that are rated as good to very good. The City's road patrols, the public, employees and the Roads Needs Study are other sources providing feedback on road conditions. As existing roads are reconstructed, repaired and rehabilitated, the rating improves to a higher level year over year. In 2010, 610 out of 704 kilometres (86.6%) of paved lane was rated to be in good to very good condition as compared to 597 out of 703 kilometres (84.9%) in 2009.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.6 Adequacy of Bridges and Culverts	
2010	2009
73.1%	64.8%
Effectiveness Measure Percentage of bridges and culverts where the condition is rated as good to very good.	
Objective Maintain safe bridges and culverts.	
General Comments The following factors can influence the above results across municipalities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use of bridges and causeways.• Maintenance of bridges and causeways as required to meet standards.• Locations of bridges and culverts.	
Detailed Comments The condition of a bridge or culvert in this performance measure means the condition of only the primary components which are the main load carrying components of the structure. This includes: decks, beams, girders, abutments, foundations, etc. Any other components used to distribute loads such as sidewalks, curbs, sway braces and wingwalls are excluded. In 2010, a municipal bridge and culvert inspection and assessment study was conducted which provided more accurate information on all bridges and culverts within the City. A total of 38 bridges and culverts were rated as good to very good out of 52 (73.1%) compared to 35 out of 54 (64.8%) in 2009. The total count was reduced from what was reported in 2009 as it was determined that two railway bridges previously included were not the City's responsibility.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Road Services

4.7 Winter Event Response	
2010	2009
100%	100%
<p>Effectiveness Measure Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined road municipal service levels for road maintenance.</p> <p>Objective Provide an appropriate response to winter storm events.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the above results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The municipality's standard service levels for road conditions. • The frequency and severity of the winter weather. • The kilometres of paved and unpaved roads in the municipality in comparison with comparable municipalities. • Hours of Service regulations under the Highway Traffic Act. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Roads are cleaned and cleared usually within 24 hours of a snowfall when adequate resources are available in accordance with hours of service regulations. In 2010, the City did not experience a winter event where staff was not able to meet or exceed road maintenance standards.</p> <p>The City responded to 27 winter storm events in 2010 compared to 19 in 2009. All responses met or exceeded the municipal standard winter control maintenance levels. However, note that although there were more winter events in 2010, most were not as intense as compared to those experienced in 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Storm Water Management

7.1a Operating Costs for Urban Storm Water Management	
2010	2009
\$1,617.07	\$1,502.89
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient storm water management.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the efficiency rate of urban storm water management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geography of the City • The extent and age of the drainage system • The inventory of pipes in the Municipality 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Storm-water management has become increasingly important in the urban area as the City continues to develop and intensify. Impacts such as flooding, erosion and poor water quality are being addressed through watershed wide controls thus reducing the pressures that are put on watercourses and Frenchman's Bay.</p> <p>This performance measure identifies direct costs related to the efficient collection, treatment and conveyance of stormwater from urban areas against total kilometres of urban drainage systems. Direct costs include salaries/wages/benefits, contracted services and materials, storm pipe cleaning, flushing, video inspection, catch basin/manhole repairs, storm pipe repairs, cleaning of specialized oil and grit separators.</p> <p>The City maintained 295 km of urban drainage system in 2010, the same as what was maintained in 2009. The operating cost increase in the resulting measure for 2010 from 2009 was largely due to the increase in staff salaries/wages/benefits.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Storm Water Management

7.1b Total Costs for Urban Storm Water Management	
2010	2009
\$8,289.91	\$8,011.91
<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for urban storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient storm water management.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the efficiency rate of urban storm water management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geography of the City • The extent and age of the drainage system • The inventory of pipes in the Municipality 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>This measure sums the total operating costs for urban storm water management, interest on long term debt and amortization on urban storm capital assets over total kilometres of urban drainage system plus 0.005 kilometre on the total number of catch basins. This provides us the picture of how much was spent in the complete management of our urban storm water systems on a per kilometre bases.</p> <p>The City maintained 295 km of urban drainage system in 2010, the same as in 2009. An increase in the 2010 amortization costs related to capital assets resulted to an increase in the resulting measure from 2009.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Storm Water Management

7.2a Operating Costs for Rural Storm Water Management	
2010	2009
\$2,744.23	\$2,308.05
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient rural storm water management.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the efficiency rate of rural storm water management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geography, size and nature of the rural area. • Land erosion control. • The frequency and time devoted to the maintenance of the rural drainage system. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>A rural stormwater system is one where stormwater is conveyed primarily along side of roadways normally with open ditches located in areas defined as rural Pickering's Official Plan. A rural system may also storm sewers and catch basins.</p> <p>The total operating cost sums up all related salaries/wages/benefits, contracted services, materials, other direct costs such as culvert repairs and maintenance, ditching, bank repair and other day-to-day maintenance measures, rentals, interfunctional adjustments and program support over the total kilometres of drainage system.</p> <p>The 351 km of rural drainage system in 2009 remained unchanged in 2010. The operating cost increase in the resulting measure for 2010 from 2009 was largely due to the increase in staff salaries/wages/benefits.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Storm Water Management

7.2b Total Costs for Rural Storm Water Management	
2010	2009
\$2,805.46	\$2,369.96
<p>Efficiency Measure Total costs for rural storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient rural storm water management.</p>	
<p>General Comments</p> <p>The following factors can influence the efficiency rate of rural storm water management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geography, size and nature of the rural area. • Land erosion control. • The frequency and time devoted to the maintenance of the rural drainage system. • Interest on long term debt and amortization. 	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>This measure calculates the sum of operating costs, interest on long term debt and related amortization for rural storm water management over total kilometres of rural drainage system plus 0.005 kilometres times the number of catch basins. It provides a picture of how much was spent in maintaining a rural drainage system on a per kilometre basis.</p> <p>The City maintained a total of 351 km of rural drainage system in both 2009 and 2010. The difference in the resulting measure was from the increase in operating costs as calculated in the previous measure (7.2a).</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.1a Operating Cost for Parks per Person	
2010	2009
\$41.49	\$43.94
Efficiency Measure Operating costs for maintaining the parks per person.	
Objective Provide efficient operation of parks.	
General Comments Operating costs in maintaining outdoor open spaces including parks, parkettes, flower gardens, natural areas, playgrounds, public squares, skateboard parks, outdoor skating rinks, sports fields, splash pads, trails and similar spaces are included in the determination of this measure. To calculate this measure, the total operating cost is divided by the total City population.	
Detailed Comments The City maintains the parks on a daily basis during summer. The scheduled grass cutting cycle of 5 to 10 days is maintained to control growth and keep all parks available and safe for public use at all times during the summer months. However, the amount of precipitation received during this time directly affects the grass cutting cycle. With a relatively drier summer experienced in 2010, costs of materials and contracted services were less compared to 2009. This resulted to a slightly lower operating cost per person in 2010. The increase in population also contributed to the decrease in the resulting measure.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.1b Total Cost for Parks per Person	
2010	2009
\$50.59	\$52.92
Efficiency Measure Total costs for maintaining the parks per person.	
Objective Provide efficient operations of parks.	
Detailed Comments Calculation of this measure totals the operating costs, interest on long term debt and amortization on capital assets related to parks divided by the total population. This measure provides a picture of how much the City spent in maintaining the parks on a per person basis in 2010. The slight decrease in the calculated measure was largely due to the increase in total population (denominator).	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.2a Operating Costs for Recreation Programs per Person	
2010	2009
\$47.76	\$45.12
Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	
Objective Provide efficient operation of recreation programs.	
Detailed Comments Recreation programs include a wide range of programs, services and activities offered by the City to the public. The measure is calculated by dividing the total operating cost with total population. Total operating cost in running the programs includes salaries, wages, benefits, materials, contracted services, rents, transfers and adjustments. Existing recreation programs are continuously reviewed and changed depending on public demand. New programs were also introduced in 2010 with the availability of additional recreation space from the 2009 recreation complex expansion. Seasonality of activities also affects the type and frequency of program offerings.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.2b Total Costs for Recreation Programs per Person	
2010	2009
\$47.76	\$45.12
Efficiency Measure Total cost for the operation of recreation programs per person.	
Objective Provide efficient operation of recreation programs.	
Detailed Comments The total cost is calculated as the sum of operating costs, interest on long term debt and amortization related to recreation programs. In 2010, no interest and amortization related to recreation programs were allocated hence the total costs per person is the same as the operating cost per person reported in 10.2a above.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.3a Operating Costs for Recreation Facilities per Person	
2010	2009
\$86.44	\$80.81
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient operation of recreation facilities.</p>	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Recreation facilities include built or enclosed structures used for the purposes of community recreation and leisure. These facilities normally involve some form of operating function either mechanical, electrical or both and some form of controlled access. Recreation facilities include community centres, gymnasiums, arenas, fitness centres, indoor skating rinks, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, lawn bowling greens, tennis courts, youth/senior centres, wading pools, etc.</p> <p>Included in the calculation of this measure are salaries/wages/benefits, materials, contracted services, rents, transfers and adjustments related to the operation of all recreation facilities, divided by total population.</p> <p>Cost of repairs and maintenance and overall use of materials increase as existing facilities age over the years. The additional maintenance costs and staff salaries to run new programs related to the 2009 recreation complex expansion contributed to the slight increase in the calculated measure.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.3b Total Costs for Recreation Facilities per Person	
2010	2009
\$99.62	\$93.20
Efficiency Measure Total cost for recreation facilities per person.	
Objective Provide efficient operation of the City's recreation facilities.	
Detailed Comments Total cost include operating costs, interest on long term debt and amortization tangible capital assets related to the operation of all recreation facilities. In 2010, an increase in the amortization expense resulted to an increase in the calculation of this measure.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.4a Operating Costs for Recreation Programs and Recreation Facilities per Person (Subtotal)	
2010	2009
\$134.20	\$125.93
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient operation of the City's programs and recreation facilities.</p>	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>Included in this measure is the cost of salaries/wages/benefits and all other related direct costs in the operation of recreational programs and facilities.</p> <p>The facility expansion at the recreation complex in 2009 has afforded the continued introduction of more programs that directly contributed to the increase in operating costs for both programs and facilities in 2010. Repairs and maintenance related expenses including labour, contracted services and materials also contributed to the increase in 2010.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.4b Total Costs for Recreation Programs and Recreation Facilities per Person (Subtotal)	
2010	2009
\$147.38	\$138.32
Efficiency Measure Total costs for recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.	
Objective Provide efficient operation of the City's programs and recreation facilities	
Detailed Comments Total costs include the operating costs calculated in 10.4a above plus interest on long term debt and amortization related to the operation of recreation programs and maintenance of facilities. An increase in amortization in 2010 resulted to an increase in the calculated measure compared to 2009.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.5 Total Kilometres of Trails per 1,000 Persons	
2010	2009
0.171 km	0.161 km
Effectiveness Measure Kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	
Objective Measure the effectiveness of trails in the City that provide recreation opportunities.	
Detailed Comments Total kilometres of trails owned by the City plus trails owned by third parties where the City has a formal lease contract, joint use agreement or reciprocal use agreement for every 1,000 residents were used in the calculation of this measure. The 16 kilometres of trail maintained by the City in 2010 increased by a kilometre from 15 kilometres in 2009 due to additional construction in 2010.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.6 Hectares of Open Space and Hectares of Open Space per 1,000 Persons	
2010	2009
2.347 ha	7.639 ha
Effectiveness Measure Hectares of open space (City owned) per 1,000 person.	
Objective Measure the adequacy of open space for the population.	
Detailed Comments Total hectares of City owned open space was used in this calculation. Open space includes all outdoor open spaces that provide opportunities and benefits for active, passive and programmed community recreation and leisure that are accessible to the public. This includes but not limited to allotments, horticultural areas, natural areas, parks and parkettes, playgrounds, public squares, skateboard parks, sports fields and trails. The definition of how total hectares was to be reported had changed. The total hectares previously used in the computation included areas that should have been excluded such as hydro corridors. After the appropriate changes in the determination of total hectares of open space was completed, the effective total area used in the 2010 calculation was reduced to 219 hectares compared to 710 hectares as reported in 2009.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.7 Total Participant Hours for Recreation Programs	
2010	2009
21,030 hrs	20,099 hrs
Effectiveness Measure Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons.	
Objective Measure the effectiveness of programs provided by the City.	
Detailed Comments Participant hours are based only on the number of active registrants or participants in a program. Hours for special events are not part of this measure. Total participant hours for every 1,000 person in the City including registered, drop-in and permitted recreation programs and activities was used in this calculation. The facility expansion in 2009 provided space that allowed an increase in the number of recreation programs offered in 2010. This resulted to an increase in the number of participant hours from drop-ins and program registrations.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.8 Square Metres of Indoor Recreation Facilities and Square Metres of Indoor Recreation Facilities per 1,000 Persons (Municipally Owned)	
2010	2009
437.561 sqm	439.279 sqm
Effectiveness Measure Square metres of indoor recreation facilities per 1,000 persons.	
Objective Determine the adequacy of indoor recreation facility space available to the public.	
Detailed Comments City owned indoor recreation facilities include built or enclosed structures used for the purposes of community recreation and leisure. The 40,831 total square metres of City owned indoor recreation facilities in 2010 was the same area reported in 2009. The slight decrease in the calculation of this measure in 2010 from 2009 was due to the increase in population (denominator).	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Parks and Recreation

10.9 Square Metres of Outdoor Recreation Facility Space and Square Metres of Outdoor Recreation Facility Space per 1,000 Persons (Municipally Owned)

2010	2009
284.938 sqm	286.057 sqm

Effectiveness Measure

Square metres of outdoor recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.

Objective

Determine the adequacy of outdoor recreation facility space available to the public.

Detailed Comments

Total area in square metres of municipally owned outdoor recreation facility space with controlled access and electrical or mechanical functions per 1,000 persons were used in this calculation.

The 26,589 square metres of City owned outdoor space reported in 2010 was the same as in 2009. The slight decrease in the 2010 calculation was a result of the increase in population from 2009 (denominator).

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Library Services

11.1a Operating Costs for Library Services per Person	
2010	2009
\$55.27	\$54.89
<p>Efficiency Measure Operating costs for library services per person.</p> <p>Objective Provide efficient library services to the public.</p>	
<p>Detailed Comments</p> <p>The City has five library locations servicing its residents. The cost for all five locations is included in the calculation of this measure, which includes wages, benefits, materials, rent and all other operating costs.</p> <p>The increase in library operating costs per person was mainly due to a slight increase in staff salaries, benefits and maintenance costs due to ageing facilities.</p>	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Library Services

11.1b Total Costs for Library Services per Person	
2010	2009
\$66.83	\$67.45
Efficiency Measure Total costs for library services per person.	
Objective Provide efficient library services to the public.	
Detailed Comments Total cost for this new measure is the sum of the operating costs, interest on long term debt and amortization of related capital assets divided by total population. The resulting calculation slightly decreased in 2010 from 2009 due to the decrease in the allocation of total interest on long term debt and amortization on related capital assets.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Library Services

11.2a Operating Costs for Library Services per Use	
2010	2009
\$1.76	\$1.75
Efficiency Measure Operating costs for library services per use.	
Objective Provide efficient library services to the public.	
Detailed Comments The City has five locations servicing its residents. The total operating costs for all five locations and the total library uses was included in the calculation of this measure. The resulting measure in 2010 was almost the same as in 2009. Although there was a slight increase in total operating cost in 2010 (numerator), there was also a corresponding increase in total library uses (denominator) in the same year.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Library Services

11.2b Total Costs for Library Services per Use	
2010	2009
\$2.13	\$2.15
Efficiency Measure New Measure - Total costs for library services per use.	
Objective Provide efficient library services to the public.	
Detailed Comments The total costs for all five library locations was used in the calculation of this measure against total library uses. The total costs include the sum of the operating costs, interest on long term debt and amortization of related capital assets. The decrease in the resulting measure was due to a lower interest and amortization in 2010.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Library Services

11.3 Library Uses per Person	
2010	2009
31.340	31.425
Effectiveness Measure Library uses per person.	
Objective Increased use of library services.	
General Comment Although population changes impact the resulting measure, it does not necessarily affect the level of service provided. Just a change in usage alone is a satisfactory indicator of service levels.	
Detailed Comments Total electronic and non electronic library uses from all five locations together with the total population of the City were used in the calculation of this measure. There was a slight increase in total library usage in 2010 compared to 2009. But the resulting usage per person decreased primarily due to the increase in total population (denominator).	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Library Services

11.4 Electronic Library Uses as a Percentage of Total Library Uses	
2010	2009
28.8%	30.0%
Effectiveness Measure Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	
Objective Effectiveness of information on library usage.	
Detailed Comments The percentage of electronic uses includes data from the five library locations. Uses include the number of people using on-site library computers, number of times electronic collections (e-books, etc.) are accessed, number of electronic reference transactions, number of users of wireless connection and number of electronic visits to the library. The decrease in this measure from 2009 was attributed to a change in the method of counting the use of library computers and wireless network in 2010.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Library Services

11.5 Non Electronic Library Uses as a Percentage of Total Library Uses	
2010	2009
71.2%	70.0%
Effectiveness Measure Non-electronic Library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	
Objective Effectiveness of information on library usage.	
Detailed Comments The percentage of non-electronic uses includes data from the five library locations. Uses include borrowing books, program attendance, in-library materials, number of standard reference transactions and number of in-person visits to the library. From among the categories under non electronic library uses mentioned above, the increase in the resulting measure for 2010 was largely due to increase in the total number of visits made to the library in person compared to 2009. Attendance to library events and programs made this increase possible.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Land Use Planning

12.1 Percentage of New Residential Units Located Within Settlement Areas	
2010	2009
100.0%	98.2%
Effectiveness Measure Percentage of new residential units located within settlement areas.	
Objective New residential development is occurring within settlement areas.	
Detailed Comments The number of new residential units in detached houses, semi-detached houses, row /town houses and apartments/condo apartments within the settlement areas are used for the calculation of this measure as a percentage of the total number of new residential units created within the entire City. Settlement areas include areas within the City which have been designated for residential development in an approved municipal official plan. In 2010, there was a total of 107 new dwelling units created within the City's designated settlement areas compared to the 56 created in 2009. This represents a 91.1% increase in new residential units created compared to 2009.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Land Use Planning

12.2 Preservation of Agricultural Lands	
2010	2009
100.0%	99.7%
Effectiveness Measure Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	
Objective Preservation of agricultural land.	
Detailed Comments The City of Pickering maintained 8,823 hectares of land designated for agricultural purposes in 2010. No area was re-designated to other uses in the reporting year.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Land Use Planning

12.3 Preservation of Agricultural Lands Relative to 2000	
2010	2009
99.5%	99.5%
Effectiveness Measure Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	
Objective Preservation of agricultural land.	
Detailed Comments Of the 8,865 hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes in the official plan as of January 1, 2000, 42 hectares was re-designated since then. However, no land was re-designated in the reporting year 2010.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Land Use Planning

12.4 Hectares of Agricultural Land which was Re-designated for Other Uses During the Reporting Year	
2010	2009
0	27
Effectiveness Measure Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	
Objective Preservation of agricultural land.	
Detailed Comments There was no re-designation of agricultural land to other classifications in 2010.	

**City of Pickering
Year 2010 Performance Measurement Report**

Land Use Planning

12.5 Hectares of Agricultural Lands which was Re-designated for Other Uses Since 2000	
2010	2009
42	42
Effectiveness Measure Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	
Objective Preservation of agricultural land.	
Detailed Comments A total of 42 hectares of agricultural land was re-designated to other uses from 2000 to 2010.	