



NATIONAL MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



RICK AUDAS
HOLLY CHISHOLM
BOBBY O'KEEFE
Charles Cirtwill – Series Editor

AIMS TECHNICAL APPENDIX

July 2009

© 2009 Atlantic Institute for Market Studies

Published by the Atlantic Institute for Market Studies
2000 Barrington Street, Suite 1302
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3K1

Telephone: (902) 429-1143
Fax: (902) 425-1393
E-mail: aims@aims.ca
Web site: www.aims.ca

The authors of this appendix have worked independently and are solely responsible for the views presented here. The opinions are not necessarily those of the Atlantic Institute for Market Studies, its Directors, or Supporters.

This project was made possible in part due to the support of the Donner Canadian Foundation.

National Municipal Performance Report – Technical Appendix

This Technical Appendix for the *National Municipal Performance Report* describes the data that have been collected and their sources. As well, details are provided here on the calculations performed with these data to generate the results that are displayed in the performance reports.

BACKGROUND

The broad objective of the municipal performance report project is to provide more and better information to citizens that will allow them to assess how well their city governments are performing.

Creating such an assessment tool, however, is not a simple and straightforward task.

City administrations perform a wide variety of functions. These include, among other things: collecting taxes and managing city finances; providing safety services; collecting garbage; operating and maintaining sewer systems and waterworks; maintaining roads, bridges, and sidewalks; managing parks, rinks, and libraries; and setting policy for zoning and development.

As well, these cities come in a diverse range of sizes and types, including very large cities like Toronto and Montreal; large cities like Winnipeg and Edmonton; mid-size cities such as St. John's and Saskatoon; and there are cities like Charlottetown and Victoria, while small, are the Capitals of their respective provinces.

Furthermore, the world is a dynamic place and events on the global, national, and provincial stages can suddenly and dramatically affect a municipality's fortunes. Recognition of this complexity has led to the development of an approach that is focused on balance. The performance report structure strives for balance in the following ways:

- Indicators are included across a wide range of city services and responsibilities. They have been grouped into seven broad categories:
 - Governance and Finance
 - Taxation
 - Safety and Protection
 - Transportation
 - Environmental Health
 - Economic Development
 - Recreation and Culture
- In assessing city performance, many of the individual measures could be viewed as ambiguous on their own. If City X spends less per capita on recreation than City Y, does that mean that City X is a more efficient provider in this area? Or does it mean that the voters of City Y simply choose to spend more of their tax dollars on recreation and receive more and/or higher quality amenities and services? To provide balance, in each of the seven categories two types of indicators are included. *Efficiency* measures focus on

the amount of resources required to produce a unit of output. For example, if one city can maintain its streets and roads each year for \$100/ lane kilometre and another city can maintain its streets and roads to a comparable level of repair for \$50/ lane kilometre, then the second city is more efficient at this task.¹ *Effectiveness* measures focus on the extent to which a service or policy is achieving intended results. If, for example, two cities share the objective of clearing their roads of snow to bare pavement within 24 hours after the end of snowfall and one city meets this objective 95 percent of the time while the other city meets this objective only 60 percent of the time, then the first city is more effective on this front.

By including a balanced combination of efficiency and effectiveness measures, municipalities that choose to “spend more to get more” or that make an equally valid choice to “receive less but spend less” will not be systematically penalized in the scoring. As well, municipalities that “spend a lot but do little with it” or “spend little and get a lot for it” will stand out from the rest of the pack – below it in the former case and above it in the latter.

- Expenditures are the operating and capital costs, both are used to provide the true cost incurred by the city to provide a service to its residents. Some reports, like the Ontario Municipal Performance Measurement Program only report a city’s operating cost that covers expenses like administration, staffing and electricity bills. However, by including capital costs, like buildings and equipment, a better analysis of actual service spending is afforded.
- To minimize the impact that an abnormal data point in a given year may have on the overall results, multi-year averages are used, rather than just the most recent year’s data.
- Indicators generally are calculated on a per capita or per dwelling basis to provide a common basis of comparison among municipalities of all sizes.
- The indicators contain a mix of “snapshot” and trend (“change”) variables. This allows for good and bad performances at a point in time to be identified and assessed, but also rewards struggling cities who are making efforts to turn the corner and shines a critical light on historically strong performers who have lapsed.
- There are differences in the circumstances faced by different cities. Larger cities like Calgary and Ottawa face different types of challenges than do smaller municipalities like Fredericton and Thunder Bay, for example. Thus, in addition to the absolute statistics that have been assembled, “in-context” measures are used that adjust for demographic, socio-economic, and financial factors that are beyond the immediate control of current city administrations.² One city may have a highly educated workforce, high average incomes,

¹ While an absolute measure of efficiency based on standard of services, expenditure per lane km to maintain roads to a specific standard, data is not available to allow for such a comparison.

² This is similar to the methodology employed in the *Performance report on Atlantic Canadian High Schools* that AIMS produces each year. See: <http://www.aims.ca/education.asp?typeID=1&id=2073&fd=0&p=1>.

a local economy based on a sector enjoying a boom, and no legacy of debt from prior administrations, for example, while another may be characterized by high unemployment, low incomes, industries in decline, and a large, longstanding debt load. The goal in making these contextual adjustments is to focus on and compare municipalities' performances "given the cards they've been dealt."

This combination of multi-year efficiency and effectiveness measures across seven categories, assessed in both absolute and in-context frameworks, totals 426³ potential indicators for the scoring and grading scheme. Having such a large number of indicators minimizes the likelihood that an extreme value for any one indicator in a particular year will have an undue influence on the overall score and grade for any municipality.

In selecting these indicators, AIMS has attempted to identify those basic services that generally are provided in all cities. Measures were selected because they speak to things that matter to people: citizens care about the safety and health of their communities, the quality of their basic infrastructure and services, and the way in which public officials manage their tax dollars. In addition to this relevance criterion, indicators have been selected because experience elsewhere has shown that they can be measured objectively and reported in a meaningful manner.

Unfortunately, however, data are not available for all our chosen measures (see Annexes A for a summary of data availability). Little information is available consistently on the *effectiveness* of municipal service delivery in across the country in terms of standards and levels of services, while relatively more information is available under the *efficiency* heading. These missing indicators, and the lack of effectiveness measures, in particular, undermine somewhat the effort to achieve balance in the scoring and grading mechanism.

By highlighting the absence of data that would allow for comparative assessment of the quality of municipal services, citizens will be encouraged to demand more and better information and governments will be compelled to provide. As new data become available, our set of indicators will become more complete and our methodology even more robust.

³ 71 different indicators, each indicator has values for three years, $71*3=213$, assessed for both absolute performance and adjusted for context $213*2=426$

GENERAL NOTES

There are 31 cities in this performance report. These cities represent the drivers of the country, they are our largest cities and our capitals and therefore most recognizable.

The only large cities not captured are those Ontario cities classified as multi tier municipalities, these are cities that have another level of government providing municipal services.

Most of the indicator data come from the cities financial statements and the provincial governments. We use three-year averages wherever possible to minimize the impact that an abnormal figure in a given year may have on the results. In certain cases data are not available for all three years: where data for two years are available, we use a two-year average; we do not report any indicator value for a municipality where we have information for only a single year.⁴

The most recent data available across the country are for 2007, thus we base the averages on 2005, 2006, and 2007 data. All data is actual expenditures, as opposed to budget forecasts.

Most of the basic demographic and socio-economic data that factor into our indicators come from the 2006 Census. Since the Census occurs only once every five years, these are the most recent available. For all indicator values that are reported as “per capita” or “per dwelling”, 2006 Census figures are used as the denominator.

In addition to the direct indicator data, certain demographic, socio-economic, and financial data are used as inputs (controls) in our “in-context” calculations. To take account of the situation that existed before our study periods (2005 to 2007), average data from the prior three-year periods, 2002 to 2004, are used. For example, three-year average financial statistics for the period 2002 to 2004 are used to set the context for our analysis of municipal performance in the 2005 to 2007 period – if City X ran up a huge debt from 2002 to 2004 but City Y did not, then we would expect City X to have difficulty in performing as well as City Y over the 2005 to 2007 period, all else being equal.

In some cases Census data are used with these variables – to calculate per capita financial figures for 2003, for example. Census data from 2001 are used in calculations for 2001, 2002, and 2003, and Census data from 2006 are used for 2004 and all later years.

⁴ Exception: census data is not available on a yearly basis. The only outcome indicators that uses single data from the Census is Percent of Labour Force using Public Transit to Commute to Work, Voter Turnout, Number of Councillors, Candidates for Council and Candidates for Mayor.

METHODOLOGY

Calculation of Z-Scores

This performance report is based on a relative assessment approach. Each city's score for a particular indicator⁵ is based on how that municipality performs compared to other municipalities, rather than an assessment against some exogenous standard or benchmark.

For example, City X's score for the change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita indicator is based on how City X's change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita compares to the average change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita for all cities. (A larger change in the assessment base is considered a good thing – a growing assessment is consistent with the city attracting more business investment – and thus a high value for this indicator results in a high score and a low value results in a low score.)

To be more precise, a city's score on a given indicator is determined through the calculation of a standard score, also known as a “z-score” or a normalized score. The z-score is calculated as:

$$z = (x - \mu) / \sigma$$

where,

x = the raw score to be standardized,

σ = the standard deviation of the population, and

μ = the mean of the population.

The z-score indicates how many standard deviations an observation is above or below the population mean. A z-score of zero means that the observation in question is equal to the mean. A z-score of 1 (-1) means that the observation lies one standard deviation above (below) the mean.

If, say, the average change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita is \$100 and City X also reports \$100, then City X will receive a z-score of zero. If instead City X's change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita is slightly above the national average at, say, \$105, and if the standard deviation across all cities is, say, \$10, then City X's z-score will be 0.5, that is, City X's change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita is one-half of a standard deviation above the mean for all cities.

Note again that the performance report methodology makes no attempt to establish a “right” size for change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita (or for any other indicator) – the scoring and grading is based purely on one city's performance in relation to the other cities in the country.

⁵ Recall that “an” indicator value for a municipality is a three-year average.

Z-scores also are calculated in the same manner for the control variables that are discussed in the next section.

Absolute and In-Context Results

As discussed earlier, there are significant differences among cities. To provide a more balanced comparison, we include both “absolute” and “in-context” versions for each indicator in the performance report.

Each in-context indicator score is derived in the same manner. The absolute indicator values (e.g., the change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita) are converted into z-scores. These absolute indicator z-scores are then regressed against z-scores for a number of control variables (demographics, socio-economic, and financial variables – these are described in detail further below in this technical appendix) using ordinary least squares. The data points for each city are weighted by that city’s share of the total population of all the cities. The same set of control variables are used for each regression equation. Once the equation’s parameters have been estimated, the control variable values for a given city are inputted into the equation to generate a predicted value for the dependent variable (in this example, the z-score for change in non-residential property tax assessment base per capita). This predicted z-score value is then subtracted from the actual z-score value to produce a residual score (i.e. how that city fared as compared to how we would have expected them to fare, given their resources); this residual score is the in-context score for the municipality for that indicator.

So, if a city receives an in-context score of 1.5 on a given indicator, this means that the city is one-and-a-half standard deviations above the national average for that indicator after controlling for differences in the specified demographic, socio-economic, and financial variables.

Aggregating the Individual Indicator Scores and Grades

Individual absolute and in-context scores are aggregated to produce, ultimately, a city’s overall grade.

The table below provides a schematic for the various indicators that go into the performance report calculations.

Indicators	Categories		Group Scores
	Absolute	In-Context	
Governance & Finance	Efficiency indicators	Efficiency indicators	Average Efficiency
	Effectiveness indicators	Effectiveness indicators	Average Effectiveness
Taxation	Efficiency indicators	Efficiency indicators	Average Efficiency
	Effectiveness indicators	Effectiveness indicators	Average Effectiveness
Safety & Protection	Efficiency indicators	Efficiency indicators	Average Efficiency
	Effectiveness indicators	Effectiveness indicators	Average Effectiveness
Transportation	Efficiency indicators	Efficiency indicators	Average Efficiency
	Effectiveness indicators	Effectiveness indicators	Average Effectiveness
Environmental Health	Efficiency indicators	Efficiency indicators	Average Efficiency
	Effectiveness indicators	Effectiveness indicators	Average Effectiveness
Economic Development	Efficiency indicators	Efficiency indicators	Average Efficiency
	Effectiveness indicators	Effectiveness indicators	Average Effectiveness
Recreation & Culture	Efficiency indicators	Efficiency indicators	Average Efficiency
	Effectiveness indicators	Effectiveness indicators	Average Effectiveness
Overall Efficiency	Absolute Efficiency	In-Context Efficiency	Average Absolute & In-Context Efficiency
Overall Effectiveness	Absolute Effectiveness	In-Context Effectiveness	Average Absolute & In-Context Effectiveness

A city’s final score is calculated by averaging an overall efficiency score and an overall effectiveness score.

The overall efficiency score is calculated by averaging the city’s efficiency scores across the seven groups (governance & finance...recreation & culture). An allowance has been made that each city must have data for five out of the seven groups to receive an overall efficiency score. The overall effectiveness scores are calculated in a parallel manner.

The group level scores are calculated for each category (e.g., governance & finance efficiency) by averaging the absolute governance & finance efficiency score with the in-context governance & finance efficiency score. The group level effectiveness scores are calculated in the same manner. There is also a final score for each group level that averages the efficiency score and the effectiveness scores.

The category level scores are divided into absolute and in-context (e.g. governance & finance absolute efficiency). The absolute efficiency scores are determined by averaging all the absolute efficiency indicators within their respective categories. (Absolute governance & finance efficiency indicator 1+ absolute governance & finance efficiency indicator 2... absolute governance & finance efficiency indicator N)/N. A city must have at least half of the indicators to receive a score. The same method is used to derive the in-context scores.

The preceding description implicitly assumes that there are valid data points for all three years for each indicator. However, this is not always the case. Given the objective of having balance in the methodology and of avoiding situations where an overall grade could be impacted unduly by one or two data points, several rules have been imposed on the process for aggregating individual indicator scores into higher level grades.

As noted previously, in order for a city to have a valid data point for inclusion on any given indicator, there must be observations for at least two years for that city.

The final score is awarded only if a city has valid total efficiency and total effectiveness scores.

Annex B contains a summary diagram of the score aggregation methodology.

Assigning Letter Grades

A municipality's z-scores are translated into letter grades according to the following table.

Lower bound z- score range	Letter Grade	Upper bound z-score range
1.000	A+	∞
0.818	A	1.000
0.636	A-	0.818
0.455	B+	0.636
0.273	B	0.455
0.091	B-	0.273
-0.091	C+ Average	0.091
-0.273	C	-0.091
-0.455	C-	-0.273
-0.636	D+	-0.455
-0.818	D	-0.636
-1.000	D-	-0.818
∞	F	-1.000

The grade for an average performance has been set at C+, hence the z-score band that includes zero corresponds to C+ in the table. The lower bound for the top grade of A+ has been set at 1.0, or one standard deviation above the mean. The upper bound for the lowest grade of F similarly has been set at -1.0, one standard deviation below the mean. The grades from D- up to A, inclusive, represent equal-sized intervals over the range from -1.0 to 1.0.

INDICATORS

The National Cities Performance report groups outcome indicators into seven groups. The indicators within each of these groups are discussed in turn below. Recall that each indicator described below is included in the performance report in both an “absolute” sense and an “in-context” sense.⁶

Input/Control Data

In order to provide a more “apples-to-apples” comparison among these cities, we use both absolute and in-context indicators in our analysis. The in-context indicators are created by using regression equations to generate predicted indicator values when a variety of input variables are controlled for. Put simplistically, we aim to understand how, say, Halifax Regional Municipality, Laval, the Saskatoon, and Richmond compare on the various outcome indicators when differences in things like population, income levels, and legacy finances⁷ are accounted for.

We use a mix of demographic, socio-economic, geographic, and financial input/control variables.

People & Place

In our in-context regression equations we control for **population**, the **geographic area** of each city (in square kilometres), the **dependency ratio** which is the proportions of the population composed of the young (under age 15) and the elderly (aged 65 and older) to the proportion of the population between the ages 15-64, the **immigrant population** as a percentage of the population and the **number of crimes** as a proportion of the population. These data come from Statistics Canada’s 2006 Census Community Profiles⁸ and Statistics Canada Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.⁹ Population figures from the 2001 Census¹⁰ also are used to derive some of the per capita financial variables discussed below.

The average annual **snowfall** (cm) as taken from Environment Canada¹¹ is the average amount of snowfall for each city for the years 2005, 2006 and 2007. This data was not reported for Quebec City, Sherbrooke and London, however, an average was obtained from Environment Canada¹² for these cities for the years 1971-2000 which provides an expectable substitute.

⁶ Data for all the cities come from various sources. For a list of all the sources used please see Annex C.

⁷ Legacy finances are the financial performance of a city during three years prior to the years being examined (2002, 2003 and 2004).

⁸ Community Profiles (2006), Statistics Canada,
<http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/data/profiles/community/Index.cfm?Lang=E>

⁹ Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada
<http://www.statcan.ca/bsolc/english/bsolc?catno=85F0033M>

¹⁰ Community Profiles (2001), Statistics Canada,
<http://www12.statcan.ca/english/Profil01/CP01/Index.cfm?Lang=E>

¹¹ Canadian Climate Data On-line Customized Search | Canada's National Climate Archive
http://www.climate.weatheroffice.ec.gc.ca/advanceSearch/searchHistoricData_e.html?timeframe=1&Prov=XX&StationID=9999&Year=2009&Month=2&Day=18

¹² Weather conditions in capital and major cities, <http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/l01/cst01/phys08a-eng.htm>

The **road lengths** and snowfall statistics are included because, according to the Ontario Good Roads Association, they directly impact the cost maintaining roads and controlling for winter events. **Traffic volumes** also have a direct impact on the condition, and therefore the expenditures, of roads; however this information could not be sourced for this year. We intend to include it in future reports.

Indicators	Type
Population	Control
Area (square kilometres)	Control
Dependency Ratio	Control
Lane Kilometres of City Roads	Control
Snow fall (cm)	Control
Immigrant Population as a Percent of Total Population	Control
Number of Crimes Per 100,000 Population	Control
Traffic Volumes	Control

Socio-Economic Status

Our socio-economic status (SES) input covers a range of variables: employment, education, income, housing, and family structure. All of these measures are from the 2006 Census.

Indicators	Type
Employment Rate	Control
Labour Force Participation Rate	Control
Unemployment Rate	Control
Percent of Adults Without High School Education	Control
Percent of Adults that Completed Post Secondary Education	Control
Percent of Labour Force With High Status Occupations	Control
Percent of Single Parent Families	Control
Median Income	Control
Average Property Values	Control
Median Monthly Rent	Control

Many of these data points, such as the percentage of adults without a **high school diploma** and the percentage of families that are **single-parent families**, are self-explanatory.

The **employment rate** is the percentage of the population aged 15 and older that is employed. The **labour force participation** rate is calculated as the number of people in the labour force divided by the total population aged 15 and older. The **unemployment rate** is calculated as the number of people who are unemployed divided by the number of people in the labour force.

The percentage of **adults in high status occupations** is determined by adding the number of people working in the following categories and then dividing the total by the labour force:

- management
- business and finance
- natural and applied sciences
- health science
- social science, education and government
- art, culture and recreation

Post secondary education includes universities, colleges, and trade schools.

Our income measure is the **median household income** (pre tax). For each municipality, this is the household income level at which exactly half the municipality's households have a higher income and half the municipality's households have a lower income.

There are two housing indicators: the **average residential property value** for each municipality and the **median monthly cost for rented accommodations** (rent and costs of electricity, heat, and municipal services paid by tenant households) for each municipality.

Other potential socioeconomic indicators that may have an impact on city service demands are the youth employment rate, youth unemployment rate and the proportion of 15-24 year olds not participating in education. For this performance report these data are not available, however they will be used in future reports if the data become available.

Financial History

Historical finance inputs are calculated using the three years prior to our "study periods" and therefore are from 2002, 2003, and 2004. All variables have been calculated on a per capita basis.¹³

The **total revenue** figure identifies how much money each municipality receives from taxes, transfers from other governments, and the sale of its services, which includes individual user fees for use of facilities and services such as a skating rink, business user fees for services such as applying for a building permit, and compensation for services that a municipality may provide to another municipality or to the Province.

Outstanding debt per capita is based on the municipality's long term debt, defined as a loan(s) with a maturity of longer than one year.

These revenue and debt figures mostly come from the cities' financial statements, Financial Information Return, provincial reports and independent studies¹⁴.

The **total uniform assessment** (or assessment base) is the market value of all property in a municipality. (The non-residential assessment is based on non-residential property, as the name implies.).

Non-residential assessment as a percentage of total property assessment provides the size of the value of the commercial activity in the city. This information was not adjusted for special legislation and charitable deductions that a municipality may grant.

¹³ Population figures for the years 2002 and 2003 are taken from the 2001 Census. Population figures for the years 2004 are from the 2006 Census.

¹⁴ Canada West Dollars and Sense, fiscal database.

The assessment values come from a variety of sources. Such provincial reports,¹⁵ was sent directly by fax or via a survey or was published in their annual report.

Total Own Source Revenues as a proportion of total revenues per capita excludes revenues that come from other governments to acts as a measure of autonomy.

The **Value of Capital Assets** provides the value of the properties, buildings, equipment, etc. used for city operations and represents a significant investment; it is also important to recognize that the benefits derived from these capital assets will extend beyond the current fiscal year.

Transfers are funds provided from sources outside the municipal unit, typically from the provincial, federal, and other local governments. Since the level of transfers received is beyond the immediate control of municipal administrations, we use “study period” data (2005, 2006 and 2007), rather than “prior period” data for this variable.

These data for each city come from the each city’s financial statements and from the Financial Information Returns and from provincial reports.

Indicators	Type
Total Revenues Per Capita, 2002-2004	Control
Long Term Debt Per Capita, 2002-2004	Control
Total Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, 2002-2004	Control
Non-residential Property Tax Assessment Per Capita as a Proportion of Total Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, 2002-2004	Control
Total Own Source Revenues as a Proportion of Total Revenues, 2002-2004	Control
Transfers Per Capita, 2005-2007	Control
Value of Capital Assets, 2002-2004	Control

Governance & Finance

This group captures the basic operations of “city hall”.

¹⁵ http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/fin/uniform_assessment.asp,
<http://www.gnb.ca/0370/0361/0004/index-e.asp>,
http://www.mamrot.gouv.qc.ca/finances/fina_info_publ_rich.asp#id2007,
<http://csconramp.mah.gov.on.ca/fir/ViewFIR2007.htm#4342>,
http://www.cd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/infra/statistics_index.htm,
http://www.municipalaffairs.alberta.ca/municipal_financial_statistical_data.cfm,

Indicators	Type
Total Revenues Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Total Revenues Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
General Government Cost Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in General Government Cost Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Long Term Debt Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Long Term Debt Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
User Fees as a Proportion of Own Source Revenues, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in the Proportion of User Fees to Own Source Revenues, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Credit Rating, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Population per Municipal Staff, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Population per Councillor	Effectiveness
Number of Candidates for Council per position	Effectiveness
Number of Candidates for Mayor	Effectiveness
Voter Turnout	Effectiveness

“Average Annual Change 2005-2007” means that the year-over-year changes for 2004 to 2005, 2005 to 2006, and 2006 to 2007 are averaged.

Total revenue figures identify how much money each city receives from taxes, transfers from other governments, the sale of services, user fees, and compensation for services that a city may provide for another municipality or for the Province. These revenue figures provide a sense of how much money each city requires to carry out its operations; thus, lower per capita revenue figures lead to higher scores in our methodology, all else being equal.¹⁶

Higher **levels of debt** mean that less money is available for other purposes and/or that taxes must be higher than would otherwise be the case. Higher debt figures lead to lower scores.

User fees include fees charged to individuals for the use of skating rinks, swimming pools, etc., and fees charged to businesses for services such as building permits. The own source revenues figure excludes revenues that come from other governments such as grants. The **User Fees as a Proportion of Own Source Revenues** statistic provides an indication of the extent to which a municipality raises revenue from non-tax sources and also provides some sense of how much the “user-pay” criterion is applied in the municipality. Higher proportions of revenue from user fees lead to higher scores.

The **General Government Costs** cover expenditures like councils’ salaries and record keeping; administrative costs and the basic day-to-day costs – electricity, supplies, etc. – of managing the municipality and its finances. Lower cost figures lead to higher scores.

The revenues, debt, user fees and expenditure figures are from the cities’ financial statements and provincial reports.

The **credit rating** is by Standard & Poor who rates each city where available¹⁷. The highest rating awarded by Standard & Poor is AAA, this signifies that the city has an extremely strong capacity to meet its financial commitments. The lowest rating that any city in this performance report has received is an A. An A rating identifies that the city has a strong capacity to meet its financial commitments but is somewhat more susceptible to the adverse effects of changes in

¹⁶ This does not include the education portion of taxation revenues

¹⁷ For those cities that are rated by other agencies such as DBRS and Moody’s, their scores have been converted in Standard & Poor equivalents.

circumstances and economic conditions than those cities with higher ratings. Credit ratings are provided on a subscription basis, that is, the cities must pay an agency to rate their finances. Cities that have not subscribed to a credit rating agency (or made their rating publicly available) do not receive a score.

Municipal staff are full time employees (and where provided full time equivalents) of the city. A larger number of staff relative to the population is associated with a lower score. This data was collected from the cities by email or through a survey response and where available from annual reports and financial information returns (Ontario cities).

With regard to the **size of council**, no adjustments have been made for the differences that may exist among councils in terms of full-time/part-time responsibilities, frequency of council meetings, etc. The measure compares a city's population to the size of its council. A larger population per councillor is associated with a higher score. The number of councillors was taken from the names published on city websites.

The **number of candidates for council** represents the number of people who have run for a councillor position. The **number of candidates for mayor** is the number of people who ran for the position of mayor. These statistics illustrate the level of civic engagement in a city according to the University of Maryland's Centre for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.¹⁸ **Voter turnout** is considered the primary indicator for civic participation. A high voter turnout is desirable as it demonstrates involvement and an accurate reflection of the will of the people; while a low voter turnout is a reflection of dissatisfaction and indifference. These indicators were collected from city websites¹⁹, provincial records and emails sent directly from the cities.

Taxation

This group focuses on city taxes, both residential and non-residential, from two viewpoints. First, how large is the **municipal tax burden** and is it growing or shrinking? Lower and shrinking tax burdens lead to higher scores, while higher and growing tax burdens result in lower scores.

Second, how large is the **assessment base** and is it growing or shrinking? A larger and growing assessment base indicates that the municipality has been successful in attracting and retaining people and businesses without deterring them with through property tax rates and hence leads to a higher score; a smaller and shrinking base results in a lower score.

The total uniform assessment (or assessment base) is the value of all real estate in a city. There is a trend to use the market value for valuation purposes with varying revaluation cycles. A number of cities have established an annual reassessment cycle while others have longer periods between

¹⁸ Keeter, S., C. Zukin, M. Andolina, and K. Jenkins, 2002, The Civic and Political Health of the Nation: A Generational Portrait. The Centre for Information & Research on Civil Learning and Engagement. http://www.civicyouth.org/research/products/Civic_Political_Health.pdf

¹⁹ Barrie municipal election candidates was taken from <http://www.simcoe.com/elections/municipal/barrie>, Barrie voter turnout is from <http://www.simcoe.com/article/25042>

valuation periods.²⁰ The non-residential assessment information data have not been adjusted for special legislation and charitable deductions that a municipality may grant.

Assessment Values are available from city financial reports and provincial records.

Indicators	Type
Residential Tax Burden (per dwelling), Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Residential Tax Burden, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Non-residential Tax Burden Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Non-residential Tax Burden Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Non-residential Tax Revenues as a Proportion of Own Source Revenues, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Non-residential Tax Revenues as a Proportion of Own Source Revenues, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Total Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Change in Total Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Non-residential Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Change in Non-residential Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Effectiveness

Safety & Protection

In this group we have gathered data related to police services and fire protection services.

The **police services cost** per capita indicator is calculated by taking the costs for police services and dividing by the population in the municipality. Note that St. John's police is provided by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary which contracted by the province to provide police services to the city.

The **fire cost** indicator is derived by taking the reported costs for each municipality and then dividing by the number of dwellings in the municipality (because firefighting is generally associated with homes, rather than persons). This report has not been able to account for any municipalities that provide fire services to other community because this information is not available.

These expenditures come from the cities' financial statements, financial information return (Ontario cities), provincial reports and survey responses. Note that Fredericton and Winnipeg²¹ do not include the cost of vehicles (e.g., police cars and fire trucks) in these cost statistics – therefore Fredericton's and Winnipeg's results are not fully comparable to those of other cities. Lower and decreasing operating costs are associated with higher scores.

Total monetary loss due to fire is the value of the claim paid for damages resulting from a fire. We average this figure on a per-fire basis. This measure is included as a proxy for the efficiency and response time of the fire department²² since there is little data available on the fire

²⁰ Winnipeg every two years and Saskatchewan, Ontario for 2009-2012 every four years

²¹ Winnipeg's financial statements do not break down its spending into its various services. To calculate the total expenditure for police services we used the proportion of police operating expenditure to total operating protection services budget and applied that percentage to the financial statement expenses for protection. The same method was applied across all services including the proportion of capital expenditures where available. See appendix for a more detailed explanation.

²² We would prefer to use measures that focus on fire departments' response times and abilities to effectively extinguish fires and save lives and property, but no such data are available.

department's response time across the cities. A higher loss figure is associated with a lower score. Similarly, a higher change in monetary of loss due to fire figure is associated with a lower score.

The fire loss data was mainly provided by the provincial bodies, such as the Fire Commissioner's Office²³, two cities had such data in their annual reports²⁴, while other cities provided their data in the survey.

The **change in the number of crimes** (expressed per 100,000 population) includes violent and property crimes as well as other *Criminal Code* offences (e.g., prostitution), but excludes traffic incidents, and is collected from Statistics Canada's Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.²⁵

Increasing crime rate figures lead to lower scores; decreasing crime rate figures lead to higher scores.

Indicators	Type
Police Services Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Police Services Costs Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Fire Services Costs Per Dwelling, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Fire Services Costs Per Dwelling, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Number of Crimes Per 100,000 Population, Average Annual Change 2005-2006	Effectiveness
Monetary Loss Due to Fire Per Fire, Average 2005-2006	Effectiveness
Percentage Change in Monetary Loss Due to Fire Per Fire, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Average Fire Services Response Time to Fire Emergencies	Effectiveness

Transportation

Our selected **transportation** indicators include **cost** figures along with quality and usage measures.

The transportation group includes streets, roads, and bridge maintenance, plus the provision and maintenance of sidewalks and street lighting. In some cases the cost of snow removal is included in this indicator because the city's financial statements do not breakdown their service provisions (Laval, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Burnaby, Richmond, Vancouver and Victoria).

The cost and change-in cost measures are calculated on a **per lane kilometre** of road basis. The data come from different city and provincial reports and directly from city staff. Lane kilometres of road are owned and maintained by the city.^{26,27& 28} A lane kilometre is roadway that conveys

²³ New Brunswick Fire Marshal's 2005 and 2006 Annual Reports; Nova Scotia Department of Labour and Workforce Development; Ontario Office of the Fire Marshal; Manitoba's Office of the Fire Commissioner; Saskatchewan Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety & Policing.

²⁴ Vancouver Annual Report and Victoria's Annual Report and Vancouver Fire & Rescue Services, BC Stats <http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/data/pop/pop/mun/MUN2007a.asp>

²⁵ <http://www.statcan.ca/bsolc/english/bsolc?catno=85F0033M&CHROPG=1>

²⁶ The following cities have their lane km data available in annual reports, benchmark reports and performance reports: St.John's, Montreal, Saskatoon and all cities from Ontario.

traffic in one direction. Transport Canada calculates lane kilometres by multiplying the number of kilometres of road by the number of lanes²⁹. A lower cost and change-in-cost figures lead to higher scores.

Winter Control Costs per lane km are measured separately. Winter control activities include: snow removal (roads and sidewalks where applicable), salting and/or sanding (roads and sidewalks where applicable), snow removal, snow fencing, winging back snow, winter drainage and other winter weather control expenditures.

Public Transit per capita is regular service trips where the fare system is applicable as a proportion to the total population.³⁰

We expect that citizens would want to have information on the quality of the streets and roads in their cities, thus we include an indicator in our framework –**the percentage of roads rated in good condition**, the greater the percentage the higher the score. The change in the percent of roads in good to excellent condition identify those cities that are upgrading their roads, those cities with a greater increase in road quality receive a higher score than those with declining changes in quality. Unfortunately only a few cities collect information on this measure, worse though is that consistent quality measurement is not used across the country. For example Halifax uses the Surface Distress Index, Saint John uses the Pavement Condition Index and Calgary uses the Pavement Quality Index. Although these indices are unique in their own method of measurement, knowing the condition of a city's roads is important no matter which index is used because road condition is related to road safety.

Annual Ridership of public transit per population of the service area describes how well utilized a city's public transit system is. The population of the service area is the population residing within the area which receives regular transit service and therefore will be the most frequent users of the service. These public transit values are primarily supplied by the cities themselves or through provincial statistical reports, although there are a few cases where data

²⁷ Quebec City did not provide their lane km of city roads until after the established deadline, in its place we have used data from province of 1752km and then according the national average proportion of lane km to get an estimated lane km of city roads. This estimated value is similar to cities of the same geographic size and population. Longueurs itinéraires, réelles et pondérées du réseau routier sous la gestion du ministre des Transports, selon les différentes classes de routes, Québec et régions administratives (18 juillet 2008), http://www.bdso.gouv.qc.ca/pls/ken/Ken263_Liste_Total.p_tratr_reslt?p_iden_tran=REPER45@18M41-1667464648586_a0&p_modi_url=0219090052&p_id_rapp=249

²⁸ For those cities that did not provide their road lengths for all three years, estimates were derived using the national average proportion of lane km to provide an estimated lane km of city roads corresponding to the appropriate year. This procedure was applied to the following cities: Halifax, Longueuil, Quebec City, Sherbrooke, Barrie, Guelph, Kingston, Windsor and Saskatoon.

²⁹ http://www.tc.gc.ca/pol/en/report/anre2005/7B_e.htm

³⁰ In British Columbia transit is not provided by the city itself, but there is a charge for it on the property taxes. To calculate the cost for public transit in the cities of Burnaby, Richmond, Surrey and Vancouver we took the Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority Expenditures for a given year divided them by the Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority's property tax revenues and then multiplied that result by the value of the property taxes charged for transit in a given city. Victoria's expenditure could not be calculated due to Victoria Regional Transit System only reporting operating expenditures.

was taken from the city's public transit website³¹. Another measure of usage is the **percent of the labour force using transit as mode of commute to work** comes from the Census. It is the population that is working age and use public transit to get to and from work.

Indicators	Type
Transportation Costs Per lane km, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Transportation Costs Per lane km, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Winter Control Costs Per lane km, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Winter Control Costs Per lane km, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Public Transit Cost Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Percentage Change Public Transit Cost Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Percent of Roads in Good to Excellent Condition, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Change in the Percent of Roads in Good to Excellent Condition, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Annual Ridership Per Population of the Service Area, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Percent of the Labour Force using Public Transit to Commute to Work, 2006	Effectiveness

Environmental Health

The environmental health group covers the provision of **drinking water** and the **management of wastewater (sewage) and solid waste**. Efficiency measures include cost (and change-in-cost) figures for the provision and management of drinking water, wastewater and solid waste which ranges from garbage collection and disposal to recycling and compost collection/disposal.³² These data come from each city's financial statements, financial information returns (Ontario cities), websites, survey responses and provincial statistical reports. As with all cost indicators in the performance report, lower cost and change-in-cost figures lead to higher scores.

We have identified five effectiveness indicators in the environmental health area: the **number of boil water advisories issued** in a city, more advisories lead to lower scores; the **number of water main breaks per km of water main**, a higher number of breaks leads to lower scores; the **number of wastewater main back-ups per kilometre of main**, more back-ups leads to lower scores, the **number of complaints regarding solid waste collection per dwelling**, a high number of complaints receives a lower the score; and the range of solid waste services, garbage collection only, garbage and recycling or compost collection or garbage, recycling and compost collection. The more extensive the solid waste service provided is the higher a score.

Data for these effectiveness indicators come from responses to the survey, city websites, annual reports, provincial statistical reports (including the Municipal Performance Measurement Program) and emails and phone calls from the cities.

³¹ Ottawa, Toronto and Victoria

³² In British Columbia the Regional Service District provides some of the solid waste services. In Victoria the city provides garbage collection while the Capital Regional District handles the disposal of garbage and the collection of recyclables. Where as in Vancouver the city collects both garbage and recyclables and handles the disposal.

Indicators	Type
Drinking Water Costs Per km of Water Main, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Drinking Water Costs Per km of Water Main, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Solid Waste Control Costs Per Dwelling, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Solid Waste Costs Per Dwelling, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Waste Water Cost Per km of Waste Water Pipe Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Percentage Change Waste Water Cost Per km of Waste Water Pipe Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Number of Boil Water Advisories, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Number of Water Main Breaks Per km of Water Main, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Number of Waste Water Back-ups Per km of Waste Water Pipe, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Number of Complaints Regarding Collection of Solid Waste, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Extent of Solid Waste Service, Garbage only, Garbage and Recycling or Compost, Garbage Recycling & Compost	Effectiveness

Economic Development

The **economic development** group captures a range of municipal activities including planning, zoning, tourism and community development.

This category also assesses the **cost of infrastructure** in each city, represented by the total capital spending. This provides insight into how much the city is investing in building and maintaining its streets, buildings, etc.

Expenditure data were obtained from provincial reports, financial statements, financial information returns and from survey responses. As always, lower cost figures generate higher scores in the performance report methodology.

As a means of assessing the effectiveness of a municipality in developing its local economy, we identified six measures.

First, the **value of new construction per million dollars of property tax assessment**, this measure identifies the level of new construction in a city. A higher level of new construction would lead to a higher score. The values of construction come from the Conference Board of Canada, Annual Reports, Provincial Report, Financial Information Returns (Ontario cities) and responses to the survey.

Second and third are the **number of new immigrants** and the **percentage change in population**. These measures identify how well the city performs at attracting and retaining people. These data are collected from Statistics Canada. A higher value is associated with a higher score.

Fourth, to assess the productivity of the city the **real gross domestic product**, as derived from the Conference Board of Canada is employed. The higher a city's GDP is, the higher its score will be.

Fifth, the **economic diversity** of a city is an indicator developed by the Conference Board of Canada. It assumes that Canada is the benchmark of a highly diversified economy, a value of one is given to a city that has the same structure as Canada, a value of zero is given to the city that has a totally different economic structure because it is lacking diversity. A city that is awarded a

value close to one will receive a higher score compared to a city that is awarded a value close to zero.

Last, the **change in the value of capital assets** is assessed to identify how much the city is investing into new infrastructure. A higher change leads to a higher score. Data for this outcome was collected from financial statements, financial information returns³³ and provincial statistical reports.

Indicators	Type
Economic Development Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Economic Development Costs Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Cost of Infrastructure Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in the Cost of Infrastructure Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Value of Construction Per Million Dollars of Property Assessment, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Total Increase in Immigrants Per 1,000 Population, 2001-2006	Effectiveness
Percentage Change in Population, 2001-2006	Effectiveness
Real GDP Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Relative Economic Diversity, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Percentage Change in the Value of Capital Assets, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Effectiveness

Recreation & Culture

Recreation covers the provision and maintenance of services and facilities such as playgrounds, walking trails, sports fields, rinks, and swimming pools. **Culture** captures items such as libraries and cultural events.

Recreation and Culture expenditure data were obtained from provincial reports, financial statements, financial information returns and from survey responses.

By looking at the work that other jurisdictions, like Ontario, have done in measuring municipal performance, we have identified three seemingly basic and straightforward effectiveness indicators for the recreation and culture category: **square metres of outdoor recreation space, kilometres of trails and library use** which we have broken out into **library in-person visits and library cardholders**.

Most of these outcome recreation measures have been submitted by city staff and through responses to a survey that was sent to the cities in December 2008. The data was collected from annual reports, city websites and reports.

For the library measures³⁴ data have been obtained for the library visits from each libraries annual report. Where an annual report wasn't available, we received the information directly from the library itself³⁵ or from Mississauga's Statistical Report.³⁶ For the number of cardholders most of the data was obtained from Mississauga Statistical Report, however, some cities

³³ London 2004, 2005 and Thunder Bay 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007

³⁴ Library services in Newfoundland and Labrador are provided by the province.

³⁵ Halifax, Saint John, Fredericton, Gatineau, Montreal, Sherbrooke and Surrey.

³⁶ Greater Sudbury, Hamilton, Kingston, Windsor, Burnaby (2004, 2005), Richmond (2004), Surrey (2004) and Vancouver (2004).

provided the information in the library's annual report and others provided the information directly.³⁷

Indicators	Type
Recreation Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Recreation Costs Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Cultural Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Efficiency
Change in Cultural Costs Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Efficiency
Square Metres of Outdoor Space Per Square Kilometre, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness
Kilometres of trails Per Square kilometre, 2005-2006	Effectiveness
Number of In-person Library Visits, 2005-2006	Effectiveness
Library Cardholders as a Proportion of the Population, Average 2005-2007	Effectiveness

³⁷ Halifax, Saint John (through New Brunswick Public Libraries), Fredericton, Gatineau, Montreal, Thunder Bay, Toronto and Calgary.

ANNEX A: INDICATOR AVAILABILITY

Indicator	Group	Type	Have for >= 50%	Have for < 50%
Total Revenue Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
Change in Total Revenue Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
General Government Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
Change in General Government Costs Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
Long Term Debt Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
Change in Long Term Debt Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
User Fees As A Proportion of Own Source Revenues, Average 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
Change in User Fees As A Proportion of Own Source Revenues, Average 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Efficiency	X	
Credit Rating, Average 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Effectiveness	X	
Population Per Municipal Staff, Average 2005-2007	Governance & Finance	Effectiveness	X	
Population Per Councillor	Governance & Finance	Effectiveness	X	
Population Per Staff	Governance & Finance	Effectiveness	X	
Number of Candidates for Council Per Position	Governance & Finance	Effectiveness	X	
Number of Candidates for Mayor	Governance & Finance	Effectiveness	X	
Voter Turnout	Governance & Finance	Effectiveness	X	
Residential Tax Burden Per Dwelling, Average 2005-2007	Taxation	Efficiency	X	
Change in Residential Tax Burden Per Dwelling, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Taxation	Efficiency	X	
Non-Residential Tax Burden Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Taxation	Efficiency	X	
Change in Non-Residential Tax Burden Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Taxation	Efficiency	X	
Non-Residential Tax Revenues as a Proportion of Own Source Revenues, Average 2005-2007	Taxation	Efficiency	X	
Change in Non-Residential Tax Revenues as a Proportion of Own Source Revenues, Average 2005-2007	Taxation	Efficiency	X	
Total Property Tax Assessment Base Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Taxation	Effectiveness	X	
Change in Total Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Taxation	Effectiveness	X	
Non-Residential Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Taxation	Effectiveness	X	
Change in Non-Residential Property Tax Assessment Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Taxation	Effectiveness	X	
Police Services Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Safety & Protection	Efficiency	X	
Change in Police Services Costs Per Capita, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Safety & Protection	Efficiency	X	
Fire Services Costs Per Dwelling, Average 2005-2007	Safety & Protection	Efficiency	X	

Indicator	Group	Type	for >= 50%	for < 50%
Change in Fire Services Operating Costs Per Dwelling, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Safety & Protection	Efficiency	X	
Change in Number of Crimes Per 100,000 Population, Average 2005-2007	Safety & Protection	Effectiveness	X	
Monetary Loss Due to Fire Per Fire, Average 2005-2006	Safety & Protection	Effectiveness	X	
Change in Monetary Loss Due to Fire Per fire, Average 2005-2007	Safety & Protection	Effectiveness	X	
Fire Department Response Time To Fire Emergency, Average 2005-2007	Safety & Protection	Effectiveness		X
Transportation Cost Per Lane Kilometre of City Road, Average 2005-2007	Transportation	Efficiency	X	
Change in Transportation Cost Per Lane Kilometre of City Road, Average Annual Change 2005-2007	Transportation	Efficiency	X	
Winter Control Costs Per Lane Kilometre, Average 2005-2007	Transportation	Efficiency	X	
Change in Winter Control Costs Per Lane Kilometre, Average 2005-2007	Transportation	Efficiency	X	
Public Transit Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Transportation	Efficiency	X	
Change in Public Transit Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Transportation	Efficiency	X	
Percent of Roads in Good to Excellent Condition according to city stanadards	Transportation	Effectiveness		X
Change in the Percent of Roads in Good to Excellent Condition according to city stanadards	Transportation	Effectiveness		X
Annual Ridership per population of the service area	Transportation	Effectiveness	X	
Percent of Labour Force that uses Public Transit to Commute to Work	Transportation	Effectiveness	X	
Drinking Water Costs Per Kilometre of Water main, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Efficiency	X	
Change in Drinking Water Costs Per Kilometre of Water main, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Efficiency	X	
Solid Waste Costs Per Dwelling, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Efficiency	X	
Change in Solid Waste Costs Per Dwelling, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Efficiency	X	
Waste water Cost Per Kilometre of Waste water pipe, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Efficiency	X	
Change in Waste water Costs Per Kilometre of Waste water pipe, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Efficiency	X	
Number of Boil Water Advisories Issued, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Effectiveness	X	
Number of Water main Breaks Per km of Water main, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Effectiveness	X	
Number of Waste water Back-ups Per km of Waste water pipe, Averahe 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Effectiveness	X	
Complaints Regarding Solid Waste Collection Per Dwelling, Average 2005-2007	Environmental Health	Effectiveness	X	
Range of Solid Waste Collection	Environmental Health	Effectiveness	X	
Economic Development Cost Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Efficiency	X	
Change in Economic Development Cost Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Efficiency	X	

Indicator	Group	Type	for >= 50%	for < 50%
Infrastructure Cost Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Efficiency	X	
Change in Infrastructure Cost Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Efficiency	X	
Value of Constructure Per Million Dollars of Assessment, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Effectiveness	X	
New Immigrants Per 1,000 Population, 2001-2006	Economic Development	Effectiveness	X	
Change in Population, 2001-2006	Economic Development	Effectiveness	X	
GDP Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Effectiveness	X	
Relative Economic Diversity, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Effectiveness	X	
Change in Value of Captial Assets, Average 2005-2007	Economic Development	Effectiveness	X	
Recreation Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Efficiency	X	
Change in Recreation Cost Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Efficiency	X	
Cultural Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Efficiency	X	
Change in Cultural Costs Per Capita, Average 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Efficiency	X	
Square Metres of Outdoor Space Per Square km, 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Effectiveness	X	
Trails Per Square km, Average 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Effectiveness	X	
In person Library Visits, Average 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Effectiveness	X	
Library Cardholders as a Percent of the Population, Average 2005-2007	Recreation & Culture	Effectiveness	X	

ANNEX B: SUMMARY DIAGRAM FOR AGGREGATION OF SCORES

<p>FINAL SCORE =</p> <p>$(\text{Overall Efficiency} + \text{Overall Effectiveness Score}) / 2$</p>	
<p>TOTAL</p>	
<p>Total Efficiency Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Governance \& Finance Efficiency Score}) + (\text{Taxation Efficiency Score}) + (\text{Safety \& Protection Efficiency Score}) + (\text{Transportation Efficiency Score}) + (\text{Environmental Health Efficiency Score}) + (\text{Economic Development Efficiency Score}) + (\text{Recreation \& Culture Efficiency Score})) / 7$</p>	<p>Total Effectiveness Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Governance \& Finance Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{Taxation Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{Safety \& Protection Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{Transportation Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{Environmental Health Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{Economic Development Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{Recreation \& Culture Effectiveness Score})) / 7$</p>
<p>GROUP LEVEL</p>	
<p>Efficiency Governance & Finance Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Absolute Governance \& Finance Efficiency Score}) + (\text{In-context Governance \& Finance Efficiency Score})) / 2$</p> <p>Efficiency Taxation Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Absolute Taxation Efficiency Score}) + (\text{In-context Taxation Efficiency Score})) / 2$</p> <p>...</p> <p>Efficiency Recreation & Culture Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Absolute Recreation \& Culture Efficiency Score}) + (\text{In-context Recreation \& Culture-Efficiency Score})) / 2$</p>	<p>Effectiveness Governance & Finance Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Absolute Governance \& Finance-Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{In-context Governance \& Finance Effectiveness Score})) / 2$</p> <p>Effectiveness Taxation Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Absolute Taxation Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{In-context Taxation Effectiveness Score})) / 2$</p> <p>...</p> <p>Effectiveness Recreation & Culture Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Absolute Recreation \& Culture Effectiveness Score}) + (\text{In-Context Recreation \& Culture Effectiveness Score})) / 2$</p>
<p>CATEGORY LEVEL</p>	
<p>Governance & Finance-Efficiency Absolute Score =</p> <p>$((\text{Absolute Governance \& Finance-Efficiency Indicator \#1}) + \dots + (\text{Absolute Governance \& Finance-Efficiency Indicator \#N})) / N$</p>	<p>Governance & Finance-Effectiveness In-context Score =</p> <p>$((\text{In-context Governance \& Finance-Effectiveness Indicator \#1}) + \dots + (\text{In-context Governance \& Finance- Effectiveness Indicator \#N})) / N$</p>

Annex C

Beattie, Sara, Amy Mole. 2008. Police Resources in Canada. Statistics Canada Catalogue no 85225XWE. Ottawa. December 12.

<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-561-m/85-561-m2008011-eng.htm>

Canadian Library Statistics 2004-2007, Mississauga Library System for the Canadian Urban Libraries Council

National Climate Data and Information Archive, Environment Canada

Canada West Foundation, Dollars & Sense II, Big City Finances in Western Canada 1990-2007, Casey Vander Ploeg

Statistics Canada Statistics Canada. 2008. Ottawa, Ontario. 2006 Community Profiles. 2006 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no 92591XWE. Ottawa. July 24.

<http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=E>

Statistics Canada. 2002. Ottawa, Ontario. 2001 Community Profiles. 2001 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no 93F0053XIE. Ottawa. June 27.

<http://www12.statcan.ca/english/Profil01/CP01/Index.cfm?Lang=E>

The Conference Board of Canada, Economic Insights Into 27 Canadian Metropolitan Economies, Economic Performance and Trends, Spring 2008, 2007, 2006, 2005, Summer 2008, 2A Spring 2007, 2006, 2005, 2B Summer 2007, 2006, 2005

Cities that responded to the AIMS survey sent in December 2008: Charlottetown, Fredericton, Gatineau, Quebec City (received after the deadline and will not be included in this year's performance report), Calgary, Saskatoon, Surrey, Burnaby, Kingston, London, Thunder Bay, Toronto and Windsor.

St. John's

City of St. John's, 2007 Consolidated Financial Statements, [St. John's NL.]: 2009,

<http://www.stjohns.ca/cityhall/publications.jsp>

City of St. John's, Annual Report 2006, [St. John's NL.]: 2007,

<http://www.stjohns.ca/cityhall/publications.jsp>

City of St. John's, Annual Report 2004, [St. John's, NL.]: 2005,

<http://www.stjohns.ca/cityhall/publications.jsp>

City of St. John's, 2003 Annual Report, [St. John's NL.]: 2004,

<http://www.stjohns.ca/cityhall/publications.jsp>

City of St. John's, Year End 2007 Economic Update, prepared by St. John's Department of Economic Development, Tourism & Culture. [St. John's, NL.]: 2008, <http://www.stjohns.ca/business/pdfs/Year%20End%2007.pdf>

Charlottetown

Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. **Red Hill Watershed Study: Fisheries: Phase 1, Background Inventory**, prepared by C. Portt and Associates. [Hamilton, Ont.]: The Municipality, 1997.

City of Charlottetown, 2006 Consolidated Financial Statements, [Charlottetown, PEI.]: 2007.

City of Charlottetown, 2005 Consolidated Financial Statements, [Charlottetown, PEI.]: 2006.

City of Charlottetown, 2004 Consolidated Financial Statements, [Charlottetown, PEI.]: 2005

City of Charlottetown, 2003 Consolidated Financial Statements, [Charlottetown 2003

City of Charlottetown Consolidated Financial Statements, December 31, 2002

Halifax Regional Municipality

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics, for the fiscal year ended, March 31, 2007, Service Nova Scotia Municipal Relations, http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/info/pdf/NS_Report_2007.pdf

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics, for the fiscal year ended, March 31, 2006, Service Nova Scotia Municipal Relations, http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/info/pdf/NS_Report_2006.pdf

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics, for the fiscal year ended, March 31, 2005, Service Nova Scotia Municipal Relations, http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/info/pdf/NS_Report_2005.pdf

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics, for the fiscal year ended, March 31, 2005, Service Nova Scotia Municipal Relations, http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/info/pdf/NS_Report_2004.pdf

Consolidated Audited Financial Statements of Halifax Regional Municipality, Year ended March 31, 2007 (October 11, 2007)

Consolidated Audited Financial Statements of Halifax Regional Municipality, Year ended March 31, 2006 (November 17, 2006)

Consolidated Audited Financial Statements of Halifax Regional Municipality, Year ended March 31, 2004 (July 7, 2004)

How Your Municipal Tax Dollars are Spent: A Report to Citizens of Halifax Regional Municipality, 2006

Municipal Financial Information - Final Uniform Assessment, Service Nova Scotia Municipal Relations, (2003-2007), http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/fin/uniform_assessment.asp

Municipal Indicators, Service Nova Scotia Municipal Relations, (2005-2007),
<http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/muns/indicators/public/default.asp>

Labour and Workforce Development, the geographic distribution of insured and uninsured monetary loss due to fire for the years 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007

Labour and Workforce Development, the geographic distribution of the number of fires for the years 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007

New Brunswick

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics 2007

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics 2006

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics 2005

Annual Report of Municipal Statistics 2004

Fredericton

The City of Fredericton Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2007

The City of Fredericton Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2006

The City of Fredericton Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2005

The City of Fredericton Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2004

The City of Fredericton Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2003

The City of Fredericton Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2002

Saint John

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John General Fund, December 31, 2007

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John Water & Sewer Utility, December 31, 2007

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John General Fund, December 31, 2006

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John Water & Sewer Utility, December 31, 2006

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John General Fund, December 31, 2005

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John Water & Sewer Utility, December 31, 2005

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John General Fund, December 31, 2004

Financial Statements, The City of Saint John Water & Sewer Utility, December 31, 2004

New Brunswick Public Libraries Statistics 2005-2006 Revised, New Brunswick Public Library Services

New Brunswick Public Libraries Statistics 2004-2005 Revised, New Brunswick Public Library Services

New Brunswick Public Libraries Statistics 2003-2004 Revised, New Brunswick Public Library Services

Saint John Transit Commission, Ridership/Service Info 2003-2007 Inclusive

Québec

Finances Fiscalité Évaluation Foncière Publications électroniques, Affaires municipales, Régions et Occupation du Territoire, http://www.mamrot.gouv.qc.ca/finances/fina_info_publ.asp

Gatineau

2005 Annual Report, Gatineau: Closer than Ever to its Residents, Ville de Gatineau

Economic Profile, Corporation de development économique Ville de Gatineau, February 2004

États financiers 2007, Ville de Gatineau, Rapport Financier 2007 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

États financiers 2006, Ville de Gatineau, Rapport Financier 2006 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

États financiers 2005, Ville de Gatineau, Rapport Financier 2005 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

États financiers 2004, Ville de Gatineau, Rapport Financier 2004 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Rapport Financier 2003 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Laval

Rapport Financier 2006, Laval

Rapport Financier 2005, Laval

Rapport Financier 2004, Laval

Rapport Financier 2003, Laval

Ville de Laval, Rapport Financier Consolidé 2007

Longueuil

Rapport Financier 2007 Ville de Longueuil À L'Heure des Choix

Rapport Financier 2006 Ville de Longueuil

Rapport Financier 2005 Ville de Longueuil

Ville de Longueuil Rapport Financier 2003 Faits saillants

Ville de Longueuil Rapport Financier 2002, Sommaire

Ville de Longueuil Élection du 6 novembre 2005

Montréal

Annual Financial Report 2007, Fiscal Year Ended December 2007

Annual Financial Report 2006, Fiscal Year Ended December 2007

Annual Report 2004, Annual Financial Report

Ville de Montréal Annual financial report Year ended December 31, 2005, Deposited at the City Clerk's Office of the Ville de Montréal March 31, 2005

Ville de Montréal 2003 Annual Financial Report Year ended December 31, 2003

Ville de Montréal 2002 Annual Financial Report Year ended December 31, 2002

Québec City

Québec Municipal Organization, December 2006

Rapport Financier 2007 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Rapport Financier 2006 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Rapport Financier 2005, Ville de Québec

Rapport Financier 2004, Ville de Québec

Ville du Québec Évolution des Taxes et Compensations, Prévisions budgétaires du MAMR, 2002 à 2008

Sherbrooke

Compilation par type de permis de l'année 2004 à 2007, Ville de Sherbrooke Planification et développement urbain

Liste Officielle des Candidats au Poste de Maire et de Conseillers, Ville de Sherbrooke Élection Sherbrooke 2005

Rapport Financier 2007 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Rapport Financier 2006 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Rapport Financier 2005 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Rapport Financier 2004 Consolidé, Exercice terminé le 31 décembre

Sommaire des Effectifs Permanents, Temporaires et Temps Partiel Par Groupe D'employés 2002- 2007, Ville de Sherbrooke Services des ressources humaines

Tableau 1, Inventaire de Réseay Routier et Piétonnier Données Statistiques Ville de Sherbrooke, Infrastructures urbaines et environnement Infrastrucutres de transport et construction

Ontario

2006 Performance Benchmarking Report, Ontario Municipal CAO's Benchmarking Initiative

Municipal Study 2007, Ontario, BMA Management Consulting Inc.

Barrie

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

City of Barrie Elections Special, Simcoe.com

The Corporation of the City of Barrie, Consolidated Financial Statements, Year ended December
31, 2007

The Corporation of the City of Barrie, Consolidated Financial Statements, Year ended December
31, 2006

The City of Barrie, Municipal Performance Measures For the year ending December 31, 2006

Guelph

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

City of Guelph, Municipal Performance Measurement Program 2006 Results

Consolidated financial statements of City of Guelph December 31, 2007

Consolidated financial statements of City of Guelph December 31, 2006

Consolidated financial statements of City of Guelph December 31, 2005

Consolidated financial statements of City of Guelph December 31, 2004

Consolidated financial statements of City of Guelph December 31, 2003

Hamilton

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Financial Report 2007, Hamilton

Financial Report 2005, Hamilton

Financial Report 2004, Hamilton

Notice to Ratepayers, 2007 MPMP Results (Municipal Performance Measurement Program),
Hamilton

Notice to Ratepayers, 2006 MPMP Results (Municipal Performance Measurement Program),
Hamilton

Notice to Ratepayers, 2005 MPMP Results (Municipal Performance Measurement Program),
Hamilton

Notice to Ratepayers, 2004 MPMP Results (Municipal Performance Measurement Program),
Hamilton

Kingston

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Audited Financial Statements and Other Financial Information of Corporation of the City of
Kingston, Year ended December 31, 2007

Audited Financial Statements and Other Financial Information of Corporation of the City of
Kingston, Year ended December 31, 2006

Audited Financial Statements and Other Financial Information of Corporation of the City of
Kingston, Year ended December 31, 2005

City of Kingston Municipal Measurement Performance Program (MPMP) Report for the 2006
Reporting Year, Volume 7

City of Kingston Performance report to Citizens Municipal Performance Measures, Measuring
our way to Service Excellence!, Volume 5, Strategic Initiatives and Corporate Communications

City of Kingston Performance report to Citizens Municipal Performance Measures, Measuring
our way to Service Excellence!, Volume 4, Strategic Initiatives and Corporate Communications

London

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2007 Financial Performance report, London Canada

2006 Financial Performance report, London Canada

2007 MPMP Results for City of London

2006 MPMP Results for City of London

2005 MPMP Results for City of London

2004 MPMP Results for City of London

The Corporation of the City of London Consolidated Financial Statements, As At December 31, 2007

Ottawa

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2007 City of Ottawa Annual Report, Providing for Today Planning for Tomorrow, Ottawa

Financial Statements City of Ottawa December 31, 2006

2005 City of Ottawa Consolidated Financial Statements

2004 City of Ottawa Consolidated Financial Statements

Consolidated Financial Statements City of Ottawa December 31, 2003

Greater Sudbury

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2007 MPMP Report to Citizens

Consolidated Financial Statements City of Greater Sudbury Year ended December 31, 2007

Consolidated Financial Statements City of Greater Sudbury Year ended December 31, 2006

Consolidated Financial Statements City of Greater Sudbury Year ended December 31, 2005

Greater Sudbury 2006 Municipal Performance Measurement Program Report to Citizens,
September 2007

Greater Sudbury 2004 Municipal Performance Measurement Program Report to Citizens,
September 2005

2006 City of Greater Sudbury Returning Officer's Official Election Results

Thunder Bay

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2007 Municipal Performance Measurement Program City of Thunder Bay

2006 Municipal Performance Measurement Program City of Thunder Bay

The Corporation of the City of Thunder Bay Consolidated Financial Statements, For the year
ended December 31, 2007

The Corporation of the City of Thunder Bay Consolidated Financial Statements, For the year
ended December 31, 2006

The Corporation of the City of Thunder Bay Consolidated Financial Statements, For the year
ended December 31, 2005

The Corporation of the City of Thunder Bay Consolidated Financial Statements, For the year
ended December 31, 2004

The Corporation of the City of Thunder Bay Consolidated Financial Statements, For the year
ended December 31, 2003

Toronto

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2007 Consolidated Financial Statements, City of Toronto 2007 Financial Report

2006 Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Report, Toronto

2005 Financial Report

Province of Ontario Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) 2007

Province of Ontario Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) 2006

Statistical Information, City of Toronto 2007 Financial Report

Windsor

2007 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2007, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2006 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2006, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2005 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2005, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2004 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2004, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2003 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2003, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

2002 Financial Information Return, for the year ended December 31, 2002, Province of Ontario
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

City of Windsor Municipal Performance Measurement Program, 2006 Results

City of Windsor Municipal Performance Measurement Program, 2005 Results

City of Windsor Municipal Performance Measurement Program, 2004 Results

Financial Statements of the Corporation of the City of Windsor, December 31, 2007

Financial Statements of the Corporation of the City of Windsor, December 31, 2006

Financial Statements of the Corporation of the City of Windsor, December 31, 2005

Financial Statements of the Corporation of the City of Windsor, December 31, 2004

Winnipeg

The City of Winnipeg 2007 Annual Financial Report

The City of Winnipeg 2006 Annual Financial Report

The City of Winnipeg 2005 Annual Financial Report

Winnipeg 2007 Adopted Operating Budget

Winnipeg 2007 Adopted Capital Budget

Regina

2005 Assessment Bi-weekly BOR Tracking

2004 Assessment Bi-weekly BOR Tracking

2003 Assessment Bi-weekly BOR Tracking

2002 Assessment Bi-weekly BOR Tracking

City of Regina Annual Financial Statements 2007

City of Regina Annual Financial Statements 2006

City of Regina Annual Financial Statements 2005

City of Regina Annual Financial Statements 2004

City of Regina Annual Financial Statements 2003

City of Regina Annual Financial Statements 2002

Summary of Assessment Transactions for 2007 Tax and Assessment Suite

Summary of Assessment Transactions for 2006 Tax and Assessment Suite

Saskatoon

City of Saskatoon, Municipal Services Benchmark Project, October 2008, Robert Prosser & Associates Inc.

City of Saskatoon (Saskatchewan Canada), Financial Report Year ended December 31, 2004

City of Saskatoon (Saskatchewan Canada), Financial Report Year ended December 31, 2003

Financial Report, City of Saskatoon Saskatchewan Canada, City of Saskatoon 2007 Annual Report

Financial Report, City of Saskatoon Saskatchewan Canada, 2006

Alberta

Municipal Financial & Statistical Data, Alberta Municipal Affairs, 2003-2007,
http://www.municipalaffairs.alberta.ca/municipal_financial_statistical_data.cfm

Calgary

Milestone 1,000,000 The City of Calgary Annual Report 2006, for the year ended December 31, 2006

New Times, New Ways, The City of Calgary Annual Report 2007, For the year ended December 31, 2007

The City of Calgary, City Auditor's Office Annual Report 2005 (AC2006-06 as submitted to Audit Committee 2006 February 16)

The City of Calgary, City Auditor's Office Annual Report 2004 (AC2005-08 as submitted to Audit Committee 2005 February 17)

Edmonton

Edmonton 2007 Annual Report, City of Edmonton, Alberta Canada, For the year ended December 31, 2007

Edmonton Office of the City Clerk, Election and Census Services, 2007 Voter Turn Out Summary

British Columbia

Local Government Statistics, 2003-2007, Ministry of Community Development

Union of British Columbia Municipalities 2005 Percent Voter Turnout

Burnaby

Burnaby Public Library 2006 Performance Indicators

The City of Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada, 2007 Financial Report Fiscal Year Ended December 31, 2007

Richmond

2007 Annual Report, City of Richmond, British Columbia, Canada, For the year ended December 31, 2007

2006 Annual Report, City of Richmond, British Columbia, Canada, For the year ended December 31, 2006

2005 Annual Report, City of Richmond, British Columbia, Canada, For the year ended December 31, 2005

2004 Annual Report, City of Richmond, British Columbia, Canada, For the year ended December 31, 2004

City of Richmond, British Columbia, Canada, 2003 Annual Report

Surrey

2007 Annual Report, for the year ended December 31, 2007, City of Surrey

City of Surrey, Statement of Financial Information, Year Ended December 31, 2007

Vancouver

City of Vancouver, 2007 Annual Report

City of Vancouver, Annual Report 2006

City of Vancouver, 2005 Annual Report

City of Vancouver, 2004 Annual Report

City of Vancouver, 2003 Annual Report

City of Vancouver Including Boards and Commissions British Columbia, Statement of Financial Information, December 31, 2007

City of Vancouver Including Boards and Commissions British Columbia, Statement of Financial Information, December 31, 2006

City of Vancouver Including Boards and Commissions British Columbia, Statement of Financial Information, December 31, 2005

City of Vancouver Including Boards and Commissions British Columbia, Statement of Financial Information, December 31, 2004

City of Vancouver Including Boards and Commissions British Columbia, Statement of Financial Information, December 31, 2003

Vancouver Public Library Annual Report 2007

Vancouver Public Library Annual Report 2006

Victoria

A Liveable City, The City of Victoria, City of Victoria, British Columbia, Annual Report 2004

City of Victoria Annual Report 2007

City of Victoria, British Columbia, Annual Report 2006

City of Victoria, Building Community, Annual Report 2005

Greater Victoria Public Library Annual Report 2006

Greater Victoria Public Library Annual Report 2005

The City of Victoria, 2003 Annual Report, Working for Our Citizens

The City of Victoria, Annual Report 2002

Atlantic Institute for Market Studies

The Atlantic Institute for Market Studies (AIMS) is an independent, non-partisan, social and economic policy think tank based in Halifax. The Institute was founded by a group of Atlantic Canadians to broaden the debate about the realistic options available to build our economy.

AIMS was incorporated as a non-profit corporation under Part II of the *Canada Corporations Act* and was granted charitable registration by Revenue Canada as of October 3, 1994; it recently received US charitable recognition under 501(c)(3) effective the same date.

The Institute's chief objectives include:

- a) initiating and conducting research identifying current and emerging economic and public policy issues facing Atlantic Canadians and Canadians more generally, including research into the economic and social characteristics and potentials of Atlantic Canada and its four constituent provinces;
- b) investigating and analyzing the full range of options for public and private sector responses to the issues identified and acting as a catalyst for informed debate on those options, with a particular focus on strategies for overcoming Atlantic Canada's economic challenges in terms of regional disparities;
- c) communicating the conclusions of its research to a regional and national audience in a clear, non-partisan way; and
- d) sponsoring or organizing conferences, meetings, seminars, lectures, training programs, and publications, using all media of communication (including, without restriction, the electronic media) for the purpose of achieving these objectives.

Board of Directors

Chair: John F. Irving; *Vice-Chair:* Dianne Kelderman

Chairman Emeritus: Purdy Crawford

Directors: George T.H. Cooper, Brian Lee Crowley; J. Colin Dodds, Doug Hall, Frederick E. Hyndman, Phillip R. Knoll, Earl Ludlow, Martin MacKinnon, G. Peter Marshall, John T. McLennan, Norman Miller, Don Mills, Perry Newman, Andrew Oland, Derrick H. Rowe, Jacquelyn Thayer Scott, Vaughn Sturgeon, Heather Tulk, Peter Vigue

President: Brian Lee Crowley

Advisory Council

Angus A. Bruneau, R.B. Cameron, Purdy Crawford, Ivan E.H. Duvar, James Gogan, Bernard Imbeault, Colin Latham, Denis Losier, Hon. Peter Lougheed, David McD. Mann, James W. Moir Jr., James S. Palmer, Gerald L. Pond, John Risley, Cedric E. Ritchie, Joseph Shannon, Allan C. Shaw, Paul Sobey

Board of Research Advisors

Chair: Professor Robin F. Neill, University of Prince Edward Island

Isabel B. Anderson; Professor Charles S. Colgan, Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine; Professor Doug May, Memorial University of Newfoundland; Professor James D. McNiven, Dalhousie University; Professor Robert A. Mundell, Nobel Laureate in Economics, 1999

2000 Barrington Street, Suite 1302, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3K1
Telephone: (902) 429-1143; fax: (902) 425-1393
E-mail: aims@aims.ca; Web site: www.aims.ca