

### **Summary of Toronto's Results**

The 36 municipal services included in this report have a colour coded summary of results, corresponding charts as well as detailed narratives for approximately 208 indicators and measures. Below are the key highlights of Toronto's overall results.

### **Internal Comparisons**

Of the 52 service/activity level indicators included this report, levels in Toronto in 2016 maintained stable or increased for 77 percent of the indicators in relation to 2015.

Of the 175 performance measurement results of efficiency, customer service and community impact included in this report, 67 percent of the measures examined had results that were either improved or stable relative to prior year, as shown in Figure 3.

Several examples where Toronto's service level indicators or performance measures are shown to be favourable or unfavourable is presented in Figure 4.



## Figure 3 – Toronto's internal trends in Service/Activity Level Indicators (52) and Performance Measures (192)

# M TORONTO

Toronto's Results Over Time		
Toronto's 2016 service/activity level indicators increased or performance was improved/favourable:	Toronto's 2016 performance measurement results that were <u>unfavourable</u> :	
<ul> <li>Increase in the number of building permits issued (ICI and Residential)</li> <li>Increased investments in childcare</li> <li>More efficient operating cost per MFIPPA request</li> <li>Increased investments in arts grants</li> <li>Less time to resolve/close a bylaw complaint</li> <li>Increased vehicle hours for ambulances and more vehicle responses</li> <li>More development applications received</li> <li>Increased the number of vehicle hours of transit service</li> <li>More regulated child care spaces</li> <li>Higher attendance at city funded cultural events</li> <li>Faster response time for fire services</li> <li>More green vehicles in City fleet</li> <li>Less time for municipality to receive payment on invoices issues</li> <li>More efficient cost to manage the City's investments</li> <li>Lower library cost per use</li> <li>Continuing high satisfaction levels of residents in long term care homes &amp; parks &amp; community centres</li> <li>More cheques or direct deposits processed</li> <li>Improved length of time it takes to issue a purchase order</li> <li>Lower cost to operate a conventional transit vehicle</li> <li>Fewer wastewater backups</li> <li>More efficient cost to collect wastewater</li> <li>Improved cost to dispose a tonne of garbage</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Longer time to pay an invoice</li> <li>Decrease in Construction Value of industrial, commercial, institutional buildings</li> <li>Increase in size of waiting list for subsidized child care space</li> <li>Higher cost per POA charge filed</li> <li>Increase in the cost per hour to have a fire vehicle available to respond</li> <li>Longer average length of stay in an emergency shelter for singles and families</li> <li>Higher legal cost per in-house lawyer hour</li> <li>Increase in the time ambulances spend at hospitals transferring patients</li> <li>Increase in the use of non-electronic library services such as borrowing a book</li> <li>Increase in total crime rate, and crime severity index</li> <li>Decrease in cost to process the purchase of goods and services</li> <li>Decrease in the condition of pavement</li> <li>Increase in cost to collect a tonne of garbage</li> <li>Increase in cost to treat drinking water</li> </ul>	

Figure 4 – Toronto's internal trends



### **External Comparisons**

There are 52 service/activity level indicators included in this report for which Toronto's results can be compared and ranked with other municipalities. Toronto's service/activity levels are at or higher than the MBNCanada median for 58 percent of the indicators.

Of the 145 performance measurement results of efficiency, customer service and community impact included in this report, 52 percent of Toronto's measures were shown to be in the first or second quartile in comparison to other municipalities, as shown in Figure 5 below. Any changes in Toronto's quartile ranking for individual indicators will likely occur over longer periods of time.

Several examples where Toronto's service level indicators or performance measures are shown to be favourable or unfavourable is presented in Figure 6.



Figure 5 – Toronto's 2016 Service/activity Levels Indicators (52) and Performance Measures (145) compared to other municipalities.

## M TORONTO

Toronto's Results Compared to Other Municipalities	
Toronto's service levels increased or	Toronto's performance results that were
performance <u>was best or better t</u> han others	less favourable compared to others
<ul> <li>Highest number of subsidized childcare spaces per 1,000 children</li> <li>Lower costs to provide an average child care space</li> <li>Lower cost of Court Services per charge filed</li> <li>Fewer residential fires with property losses</li> <li>Response time for TFS is shorter than others</li> <li>Less bad debt write-offs compared to others</li> <li>Higher rate of returns on investments</li> <li>Highest library circulation rates and highest usage of library system</li> <li>More licenses issued per 100,000 population compared to others</li> <li>Lowest cost to operate a Long-Term Care bed</li> <li>High percentage of ambulances to arrive on scene within standard of 8 minutes</li> <li>Highest proportion of natural and maintained parkland</li> <li>Higher number of payroll direct deposits and cheques process per payroll employee</li> <li>Lower total crime rate compared to others</li> <li>Faster response time to inform a client they are eligible for social assistance</li> <li>Highest diversion rate for single family and multi-residential units compared to others</li> <li>Lowest cost for recreation programs and facilities per participant visit based on usage</li> <li>Highest number of transit passenger trips and lowest operating cost per trip</li> <li>Lowest amount of wastewater estimated to have bypassed treatment</li> <li>Lower operating cost to treat drinking water</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Higher cost to process an AP account</li> <li>Highest percentage of children that are LICO (low income cut off)</li> <li>Lowest collection rate on cases in default of payment</li> <li>Highest cost to have a fire services vehicle available to respond to an emergency</li> <li>High cost to bill and collection an invoice</li> <li>Longest length of stay for singles and families in emergency shelters</li> <li>Highest cost per hour for internal lawyers, including overhead costs</li> <li>Highest percentage of ambulance time lost to hospital turnaround</li> <li>Highest reported number of violent crimes compared to others (but lowest annual percentage change)</li> <li>Lowest clearance rate for violent crimes</li> <li>Most congested roads</li> <li>Longest wait for social housing wait list</li> <li>Highest operating cost for one tonne of garbage disposal and recycling</li> <li>Fewest number of taxpayers taking advantage of a pre-authorized payment plans</li> <li>More sewer backups and water main breaks</li> </ul>

Figure 6 – Toronto's external trends

## M Toronto

Some of the key factors that influence Toronto's results in relation to other municipalities include the following:

- Services where Toronto's size and high population density requires higher service levels, indicative of large densely populated cities, such as higher levels of police staff, more transit vehicle hours and a larger library collection;
- Higher needs and demands for social programs such as childcare, social assistance, social housing and emergency hostels/shelters;
- Fewer facilities may not be as required in densely populated municipalities like Toronto because of proximity and ease of access. Other less densely populated municipalities require proportionately more facilities or infrastructure to be within a reasonable travel distance of their residents. Examples include the number of recreation facilities, libraries and kilometres of roads;
- Fewer emergency service vehicle-hours may be required in densely populated municipalities like Toronto because of the close proximity of vehicles and stations to residents. This may allow for more timely emergency response. This proximity, however, is also offset by higher traffic congestion, which reduces the speed of response vehicles;
- Age and condition of infrastructure can significantly impact results, as it is typically more expensive to maintain an aging infrastructure. For example, Toronto has the oldest underground waste water infrastructure of all municipalities and is a key factor in Toronto's higher costs.