Subject: Municipal Benchmarking Network of Canada (MBNCanada) 2018 Data Report
Report to: Corporate Services Committee
Report date: Wednesday, December 4, 2019

Recommendations

That this report BE RECEIVED for information

Key Facts

- The purpose of this report is to inform Council on the release of the latest MBNCanada report containing 2018 data which shares information on Niagara’s performance as it compares to partnering municipalities within the program. The full report is available at www.mbncanada.ca.
- As a founding member, Niagara has participated in MBNC since 1998. The program is now national, with 17 participating municipalities. The new report, containing 2018 data, was released on November 1, 2019.
- Niagara collects data across 27 service areas with measures that include both financial and operational measures.
- Multiple factors influence the comparability of metrics, including a municipality’s size, organizational structure, single or upper tier status, age / size of infrastructure, etc. Each of these factors must be considered in making any direct comparisons, and the purpose is to invoke meaningful questions around how we can all do better to serve our residents.

Financial Considerations

Participation in MBNCanada costs Niagara $28,450 for annual membership, in addition to the in-kind services provided by the CAO, Municipal Lead, and staff time from all service areas to collect and validate data. These costs are included in the council approved operating budget.

Analysis

MBNCanada is the most comprehensive benchmarking system available for Canadian municipalities. Financial and operating measures reflect business performance across Canada for single and upper tier municipalities. Data experts from each participating municipality collaboratively create data definitions and suggest additional or alternative measures to reflect emerging trends. MBNC’s Board of Directors consist of
participating municipalities’ CAOs who support the strategic decisions of the program, ensuring the program is aligned directly with the needs of member municipalities.

Public benchmarking is a mode of providing government transparency and is increasingly expected from our residents. Benchmarking is commonly used in the public sector to compare areas such as taxation, staffing and funding, and can empower staff to make informed decisions. As a result of changes in public expectations for access to information, this has resulted in public dashboards in all levels of government, including Niagara’s public facing dashboard [www.niagararegion.ca/priorities/dashboard](http://www.niagararegion.ca/priorities/dashboard), which includes measures captured through this program. A few highlights from the 2018 report can be found in Appendix 1 of this report, and the full report can be downloaded from [www.mbnncanada.ca](http://www.mbnncanada.ca).

**Alternatives Reviewed**

Although service-specific benchmarking is available for some business units such as through their respective Ministries, formal or informal networks, MBNCanada is the only municipal benchmarking available for many service areas in our organization.

**Relationship to Council Strategic Priorities**

This report aligns with Strategic Priority 4: Sustainable and Engaging Government. Niagara’s participation in MBNCanada’s public report shows municipal performance across a wide range of service areas and supports our goals to be transparent, drive informed decisions and ensure access to data without limitations of silos across the organization.

**Other Pertinent Reports**

Submitted by:
Ron Tripp, P.Eng.
Acting, Chief Administrative Officer

This report was reviewed by Maciej Jurczyk, Director of Internal Control & Organizational Performance.
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Appendix 1: MBNCanada 2018 Data Report Highlights

The MBNCanada Board of Directors is made of member municipalities CAOs who provide direction for the program. The Board recently recreated Value statements which identify what we hope to accomplish collectively as municipalities through the services provided in each service area we report on. These Value statements were written from the perspective of service users and drive the types of measures collected in this program and in the public report.

The following is a small snapshot of some of the measures available in the recently published public MBNCanada report. The data is current as of year end 2018, and is compiled with the significant input and review of staff across all participating municipalities. A copy of the full report which provides the Board measures across all service areas, please go to www.mbncanada.ca.

2018 Measure Highlights:

Child Care Value Statement – “I expect that high quality licensed child care is accessible, affordable and responsive to my child’s needs in a safe and secure environment”.

Child Care

Figure 4.1 Regulated Child Care Spaces in Municipality per 1,000 Children (12 and Under)

The measure reflects the number of licensed spaces in child care centres, preschools and home child care agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>229</th>
<th>296</th>
<th>209</th>
<th>221</th>
<th>202</th>
<th>255</th>
<th>205</th>
<th>180</th>
<th>189</th>
<th>212</th>
<th>215</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CHDC 105 (Community Impact)
Clerks Value Statement – “I expect my municipality to provide information and access for my municipal government and meet legislative requirements regarding Council operations and access to information in a timely and readily accessible manner.”

Emergency Medical Services Value Statement – “I expect if I have a medical emergency, that the ambulance will arrive in a timely manner; and I will be assessed, cared for and/or delivered to an appropriate destination, promptly and safely, as required.”
**Information Technology Value Statement (Resident lens)** – “I expect to be able to access municipal information and services when, where, and how it is convenient to me.”

**Investment Management Value Statement** – “I expect the municipality is managing its cash effectively by investing it in a manner that minimizes risk while meeting the organization’s cash flow requirements and reasonable return on investment.”

---

**Figure 15.1 Number of Visitor Sessions to Municipal Website per Capita**

This measure reflects the number of visitor sessions to the main municipal website. A visitor session is a group of interactions that take place on the website within a given time frame, by an individual visitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single-Tier</th>
<th>Upper-Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INTN 103 (Community Impact)

---

**Figure 16.1 Gross Percent Realized Return on the Total Investment Portfolio**

This measure is based on the Average Adjusted Book Value and refers to the General Investment Fund only. Sinking funds, pension funds, and trust funds are excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CAL</th>
<th>DUR</th>
<th>HAL</th>
<th>HAM</th>
<th>HFX</th>
<th>LON</th>
<th>MTL</th>
<th>NAG</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>SUO</th>
<th>TBVY</th>
<th>TUR</th>
<th>WPD</th>
<th>WNN</th>
<th>YORK</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INVT310 (Efficiency)
Planning Value Statement – “I expect to have clear information about planning requirements in adherence with legislation, and that the application process is convenient, timely, predictable and affordable, while supporting sustainable community development.”

Police Value Statement – “I expect my police service to have the trust of the community and to take a collaborative approach that achieves excellence in crime prevention, law enforcement, and victims’ assistance while practicing fair treatment and promoting public safety and well-being.”

Planning

**Figure 24.1  Total Cost for Planning per Capita**

This measure reflects the total cost to provide planning services. The amount spent on planning-related activities and application processing can vary significantly from municipality to municipality based on the types of applications, different organizational structures and legislation, and priorities established by local Councils.

Police Services

**Figure 26.6  Total Crime Severity Index**

The Crime Severity Index (CSI) includes violent crime, property crime, other Criminal Code offences, as well as traffic, drug violations and all Federal Statutes as defined by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS). The CSI considers not only the change in volume but the relative seriousness of the crime. Sourced from Statistics Canada Tables.

*The Statistics Canada National Average is included as a reference only and is not included in the calculation of the MBN Canada median.*
**Roads Value Statement** – “I expect roads to be well-maintained and allow me to get where I need to go in a safe and consistent timely manner.”

**Social Housing Value Statement** – “I expect safe, well-maintained affordable housing that is administered fairly with connections and/or support to other applicable programs and services.”

**Social Housing**

Figure 30.2 Percent of Social Housing Waiting List Placed Annually

Units include rent-g geared-to-income (RGI) units, market units and rent supplement units that were available in the year reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dur</th>
<th>Hal</th>
<th>Hal</th>
<th>Ldn</th>
<th>Nw</th>
<th>Sl</th>
<th>Tmu</th>
<th>Wat</th>
<th>Wind</th>
<th>Yrk</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCCHG110 (Community Impact)

London: In 2018, London’s social housing waitlist continues to experience substantial growth, with an increase of 70% since 2016. With low vacancy rate in the social housing stock, the availability of units to house new and existing applicants has also been reduced. London also continues to experience low vacancy rates within the private rental market, resulting in pressure to increase rents to respond to the high demand. This makes it very difficult for individuals living in social housing to transition into the private rental market.

Windsor: The number of applicants housed was significantly reduced (36%) in 2017 in addition to a large increase (30%) in active applications on the centralized waiting list.
Waste Management Value Statement – “I need my waste collected in a reliable manner and as scheduled. I expect my waste to be managed in an environmentally sustainable way and that any issues are addressed in a timely manner.”

Wastewater Value Statement – “I expect my wastewater to be collected, treated and disposed of in an affordable and effective manner while being environmentally responsible.”
**Water Value Statement**—“I expect safe and affordable drinking water available continuously and that my municipality is responsive to conversation, environmental and quality issues.”

**Water**

**Figure 36.2  Average Age of Water Pipe and Number of Water Main Breaks per 100 Km of Water Distribution Pipe**

*Age of Water Distribution Pipe:* Old pipes are usually in poor condition as a result of pipe corrosion, pipe materials (susceptible to fractures), and leakage at pipe joints and service connections which contributes to an increased frequency of water main breaks relative to newer systems that do not have such deficiencies. The practice of relining pipes has caused inconsistent reporting on the age of the pipe.

*Number of Water Main Breaks:* Excludes service connections and hydrant leads.

---

**Legend:**
- Average Age of Water Pipe (Years) Source: WATR809 (Statistic)
- Annual Number of Water Main Breaks per 100 km of Water Main Source: WATR410 (Customer Service)