

# Municipality of Red Lake

## Year 2002

### Performance Measures Report

The year 2002 is the 3<sup>RD</sup> year that the Municipality of Red Lake has measured performance in many areas of our municipal programs and service delivery. Traditionally, there has been a lack of reliable Performance Measures in public sector organizations. Developing and implementing useful measures is a long-term process that will require us to change some of our accounting practices and to develop systems to capture and track the required information.

Every municipality faces unique circumstances that will not be reflected in data alone. For the first few years, our resulting measures will be used as a starting point for further investigation and analysis into the individual circumstances of our municipality.

Performance measures will be used to assess how well the municipality delivers its services. The Ontario Government is working with municipalities to develop common measures, which, over time will allow local governments to 'benchmark' or compare their results with each other. As we compare information, we will begin to identify and share 'best practices' that will help all Ontario municipalities to improve performance.

The information we gather in the first few years will be used to establish a baseline indicator of our current levels of service. Our 'baseline' will allow us to communicate to our citizens exactly what levels of service you currently receive for your investment. From there, we can determine, as a Community, what levels of service our citizens expect, and are willing to pay for, through taxes and/or user fees.

#### **WHY MEASURE?**

What gets measured gets done. Performance measures will help us improve the services that we provide to our citizens. Once we can measure our results, we will be able to track the effectiveness of new and existing programs and services that we deliver, against established objectives. Performance measures can also help allocate resources; both budget and staff time. Because all municipalities across Ontario will be participating in this project, we will have the opportunity to learn from others to continuously improve our performance. No two municipalities are alike, so while comparison has its limitations, it will be useful in alerting us to situation that needs attention.

#### **WHAT WILL WE MEASURE?**

To get an accurate picture of our service delivery performance, where possible, we have implemented both efficiency and effectiveness measures. Efficiency indicators measure the amount of staff time and money used to delivery a service. In other wards, efficiency indicators measure the cost of service delivery. Efficiency measures are most often expressed as a cost or output in ratio form.

It is important to measure both efficiency and effectiveness to achieve optimum service delivery results. Of course, a higher quality of service can always be purchased for more money. Similarly, cutting spending can lead to a decline in service effectiveness. Our goal is to deliver the level of service our citizen's desire, at the best possible price.

#### **HOW WERE THE SERVICE AREAS SELECTED?**

Municipalities deliver a variety of services and programs. The Provincial Government, in working with Ontario municipalities, identified the core service areas that have the greatest impact on most citizens. Municipalities will be gathering data based on the following criteria.

1. Service area to be measured reflects a major cost for municipalities.
2. Service area reflects areas of provincial and municipal interests.
3. Service area reflects high interest and value to the public.
4. Service area data is relatively easy to collect.
5. Service area falls under municipal responsibility.

# Local Government

1.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT	
2002	2001
20.18%	17.10%
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating costs.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient municipal government.</i></p>	

# Fire Services

2.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR FIRE SERVICES	
2002	2001
\$0.98	\$0.96
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> <i>Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.</i></p> <p><b>Objective</b> <i>Efficient municipal fire services.</i></p>	
<p><b>Notes:</b> <i>The Municipality of Red Lake has approximately 85 volunteer fire fighters and there are 5 Fire Halls.</i></p>	

# Police Services

3.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR POLICE SERVICES		3.2 VIOLENT CRIME RATE	
2002	2001	2002	2001
\$566.48	\$589.50	29.77	19.84
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for police services per household.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient municipal police services.</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities.</p>	

3.3 PROPERTY CRIME RATE		3.4 TOTAL CRIME RATE
2002	2001	2002
34.02	30.71	328.14
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Property crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities.</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Total crime rate per 1,000 persons.</p> <p>Note that the definition used refers to Criminal Code offences, excluding traffic.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities.</p>
		<p><b>Notes</b> * Formula change for total crime means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001.</p>

3.5 YOUTHS CHARGED
2002
59.73
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of youths charged per 1,000 youths.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Safe communities.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> * Formula change for youths charged means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001.</p>

# Road Services

4.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR PAVED ROADS	4.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR UNPAVED ROADS
<b>2002</b>	<b>2002</b>
<b>\$5,588.00</b>	<b>\$5,727.06</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient maintenance of paved roads.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient maintenance of unpaved roads.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b> * Formula change for paved means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001.</p>	<p><b>Notes</b> * Formula change for unpaved roads means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001.</p>

4.3 OPERATING COSTS FOR WINTER MAINTENANCE OF ROADS	4.4 CONDITION OF PAVED ROADS	
<b>2002</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>
<b>\$1,694.81</b>	<b>82.25%</b>	<b>82.25%</b>
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient winter control operation.</p>	<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Provide a paved lane system that has a pavement condition that meets municipal standards.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b> * Formula change for winter maintenance means measure for 2002 cannot be compared to measure for 2001.</p>		

4.5 WINTER EVENT RESPONSES	
<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>
<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<p><b>Effectiveness</b> Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined road maintenance standards.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Provide an appropriate response to winter events.</p>	

# Wastewater

5.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR WASTEWATER SYSTEM		5.2 WASTEWATER MAIN BACKUPS	
2002	2001	2002	2001
\$402.53	\$377.32	11.43	65.50
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>            Operating costs for collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater per megalitre (Integrated system).</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>            Efficient wastewater system.</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b>            Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>            Prevention of human and environmental health hazards.</p>	

5.3 WASTEWATER TREATMENT BYPASS	
2002	2001
0.01%	0.0%
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b>            Percentage of wastewater estimated to have bypassed treatment.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>            Effective wastewater and treatment and disposal services.</p>	

# Drinking Water Services

6.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION		6.2 BOIL WATER ADVISORIES	
2002	2001	2002	2001
\$283.26	\$295.01	365.0	365.0
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b>            Operating costs for the treatment and distribution of drinking water per megalitre (Integrated System).</p> <p>A megalitre equals 1,000,000 litres, or 1,000 cubic metres.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>            Efficient treatment and distribution of water.</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b>            Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the Medical Officer of Health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>            Water is safe and meets local needs.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b>            The Municipality of Red Lake has 4 Water Treatment Plants; therefore operating costs are substantially high.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b>            There is a boil water advisory in the Golden and Madsen wards of the Municipality of Red Lake. The Municipality is in the process of building two water treatment plants in order to provide quality drinking water to all residents of the Municipality of Red Lake. This project will be completed by May 2004.</p>	

6.3 DRINKING WATER MAIN BREAKS	
2002	2001
29.0	94.0
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b>            Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.</p> <p><b>Objective</b>            Improve system reliability.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b>            Please explain local circumstances.</p>	

# Solid Waste

7.1 OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE DIVERSION (RECYCLING)		7.2 OPERATING COSTS FOR SOLID WASTE (INTEGRATED SYSTEM)	
2002	2001	2002	2001
\$47.98	\$25.16	\$94.15	\$92.39
<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Operating costs for solid waste diversion (recycling) per tonne or per household.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient solid waste diversion (recycling) services.</p>		<p><b>Efficiency Measure</b> Average operating costs for solid waste management (collection, disposal and diversion) per tonne or per household (Integrated system).</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Efficient solid waste management.</p>	
<p><b>Notes</b> In 2002 Red Lake had to cover a portion of the deficit.</p>		<p><b>Notes</b> The Municipality of Red Lake contracts Chukuni Sanitation</p>	

7.3 COMPLAINTS FOR SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION		7.4 NUMBER OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES	
2002	2001	2002	2001
13.7615	38.2263	2	2
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Number of complaints received in a year concerning the collection of garbage and recycled materials per 1,000 households.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Improved garbage collection services.</p>		<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> Total number of solid waste management sites owned by the municipality with a Ministry of Environment Certificate of Approval.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Context for solid waste management facility compliance measure.</p>	

7.5 FACILITY COMPLIANCE		
Facility Name	Days 2002	Days 2001
Municipality of Red Lake Waste Disposal Site	0.0	0.0
McKenzie Island Waste Disposal Site	0.0	0.0
<p><b>Effectiveness Measure</b> 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 site.</p> <p><b>Objective</b> Municipal solid waste services do not have an adverse affect on environment.</p>		

**7.8 DIVERSION OF SOLID WASTE**

<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>
<b>31.03 %</b>	<b>30.0 %</b>
<b><i>Effectiveness Measure</i></b> <i>Percentage of residential solid waste diverted for recycling.</i>	
<b><i>Objective</i></b> <i>Municipal waste programs divert garbage from landfills and incinerators.</i>	