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Chapter I – Executive Summary
Executive Summary

KPMG LLP (“KPMG”) has been retained by the Township of Armour (the “Township”) to undertake a review of the Township’s services and organizational structure. As outlined in the terms of reference for our engagement and consistent with the objectives of the Province of Ontario’s Municipal Modernization Program (the “MMP”), the overall goal of the review was to assist in an objective evaluation of current service offerings provided by the Township as well as an objective review of the Township’s organizational structure, with the view of identifying potential opportunities intended to maximize value-for-money, minimize pressure on taxes and contribute towards the long-term sustainability of the Township.

A. Background to the Review

The terms of reference for our engagement were established in KPMG’s engagement letter dated April 21, 2020. The Township of Armour (the “Township”) engaged KPMG LLP (‘KPMG’) to assist in an objective evaluation of current service offerings provided by the Township as well as an objective review of the Township’s organizational structure, with the view of identifying potential opportunities intended to maximize value-for-money, minimize pressure on taxes and contribute towards the long-term sustainability of the Township.

With respect to this engagement, KPMG’s specific role includes:

• Assisting the Township with the establishment of a methodology for the review;
• In conjunction with the Township’s staff, undertaking analysis of services, organizational structure, internal processes, service levels and associated costs and funding; and
• Summarizing the results of our analysis and presenting potential opportunities to the Township.

B. Key Themes

During the course of our review, a number of common themes emerged with respect to the Township, its services, workflow processes, and organizational structure:

• The majority of the Township’s municipal services are either mandatory in nature (i.e. required by legislation) or essential. The Township involvement in traditional and discretionary services are minimal which therefore, limits Council’s ability to reduce the overall municipal levy;
• Consistent with municipal best practices, the Township appears to be making good use of shared service agreements to deliver various municipal services;
• There appears to be satisfaction among the community stakeholder groups engaged as part of the review;
• The current complement of services provided by the Township and the organizational structure in place to deliver those services is consistent with similarly sized municipalities;
Executive Summary

B. Key Themes

During the course of our review, a number of common themes emerged with respect to the Township, its services, workflow processes, and organizational structure:

- The Township’s operating costs associated with service delivery appear to lower or consistent with similarly sized municipalities; and
- A number of the Township’s processes may benefit from a shift away from manual processes and the implementation of the use of technology.

C. Service-Focused Opportunities for Consideration

Our report outlines the potential opportunities for the consideration of the Township and they generally fall into one of four categories:

- Operating efficiencies, with the anticipated benefit of (i) enhanced decision making and service delivery, (ii) potential capacity gains, and/or (iii) potential cost savings while maintaining current service levels;
- Service level adjustments, representing either (i) the discontinuance of the Township’s involvement in a non-core service; or (ii) a reduction in the level of service provided;
- Alternate service delivery, which involves changing the Township’s delivery model for a service (e.g. exploration of shared services); and
- Revenue generation. These opportunities seek to reduce the municipal levy by identifying alternate means of funding municipal services through user fees and other cost recovery methods.

D. Acknowledgement

We would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge the assistance and cooperation provided by staff of the Township and community stakeholders that participated in the development of the service profiles and the service delivery and organizational review. We appreciate that reviews such as this require a substantial contribution of time and effort on the part of Township employees and we would be remiss if we did not express our appreciation for the cooperation afforded to us.

As the scope of our review is intended to focus on areas for potential efficiency improvements and/or cost reductions, we have not provided commentary on the numerous positive aspects of the Township’s operations identified during the course of our review.
Chapter II – Background to the Review
Background to the Review

Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for our engagement were established in KPMG’s engagement letter dated April 21, 2020. The Township of Armour (the ‘Township”) engaged KPMG LLP (‘KPMG’) to assist in an objective evaluation of current service offerings provided by the Township as well as an objective review of the Township’s organizational structure, with the view of identifying potential opportunities intended to maximize value-for-money, minimize pressure on taxes and contribute towards the long-term sustainability of the Township.

With respect to this engagement, KPMG’s specific role includes:

- Assisting the Township with the establishment of a methodology for the review;
- In conjunction with the Township’s staff, undertaking analysis of services, organizational structure, internal processes, service levels and associated costs and funding; and
- Summarizing the results of our analysis and presenting potential opportunities to the Township.

Project Methodology

The methodology for the review involved the following major work steps:

**Project Initiation**

- An initial meeting was held with the Clerk-Treasurer-Administrator to confirm the terms of the review including the objectives, deliverables, methodology and timeframes.
- KPMG provided Township Council with a presentation on April 28th, 2020 to provide an overview of the project including the objectives, deliverables, methodology and timeframes.

**Current State Assessment and Workflow Review**

The purpose of the second phase assessed the current state of the Township and its departments. To achieve this, the following took place:

- Information concerning the Township’s operations, staffing and financial performance were reviewed and summarized in order to identify the types of services delivered, the associated level of resources (personnel and financial) and the method of funding.
- In advance of the first set of meetings with Township staff, KPMG prepared draft municipal service profiles for the Township’s municipal services;
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Project Methodology

Current State Assessment and Workflow Review (Continued)

• Meetings were held with municipal staff to discuss the nature of the services provided and the associated service levels, the rationale for the Township’s involvement in the delivery of these services and the method of delivery.

• As part of the current state assessment, the Township identified three community organizations for the purpose of discussing the Township and the services provided. KPMG held meetings with the Three Mile Lake Association, the Almaguin Highlands Chamber of Commerce and the Katrine Community Centre. Each group was asked to provide their thoughts with respect to municipal service delivery and provided with an opportunity to provide insight in potential changes for the Township.

Review of Current Service Delivery Models and Organizational Structure

• Upon the completion of the first set of meetings, the Township provided commentary with respect to the municipal service profiles. Upon receipt, KPMG issued the final municipal service profiles. The service profiles illustrate the services offered by the Township, the rationale for service delivery, the current service level standard and service delivery model, financial performance, and benchmarking information.

• During this stage of our work, an analysis of the current procedures and practices was performed. In conjunction with the Clerk-Treasurer, key processes were mapped out, analyzed and reviewed to ensure compliance. Those processes included:
  • Resident complaints
  • Payroll processing
  • Accounts Receivable
  • Budget
  • Purchasing
  • Building Permits
  • Property taxation
  • Accounts Payable
  • Bylaw Enforcement

• KPMG reviewed the current organizational structure of the Township with the intention of identifying any potential organizational structure changes consistent with similarly sized municipalities as well as to be consistent with municipal common/best practices.
Background to the Review

Project Methodology

Comparisons and Opportunities/Service Delivery and Organizational Options

• Discussions were held with the Clerk-Treasurer to determine appropriate municipal comparators that would be utilized during the course of the review. Municipal comparators were identified and selected based on the following considerations listed:

  • Single tier municipalities
  • Similar population and households
  • Located in Northern Ontario and more specifically, the Parry Sound District
  • Typical and/or historical comparators

• Based on those consideration listed above, the following municipalities were chosen for comparative purposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population¹</th>
<th>Households¹</th>
<th>% of Seasonal Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetawan</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKellar</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Information concerning the comparator municipalities was obtained through analysis of available documentation (including information provided by the municipalities’ websites and other information such as Financial Information Returns and statistics from each comparator’s 2016 Census Profile).

• Discussions were held with municipal staff to identify potential opportunities for enhancing efficiencies, reducing operating costs and increasing non-taxation revenues, as well as the potential implementation issues and risks associated with each opportunity.
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**Project Methodology**

**Reporting**

- A draft report was provided to the Clerk-Treasurer-Administrator on July 31st, 2020. Upon receipt of comments from the Township, KPMG incorporated the edits into the final report.
- The opportunities and final report were then presented to Council during an open meeting of Council on September 8, 2020

**Restrictions**

This report is based on information and documentation that was made available to KPMG at the date of this report. KPMG has not audited nor otherwise attempted to independently verify the information provided unless otherwise indicated. Should additional information be provided to KPMG after the issuance of this report, KPMG reserves the right (but will be under no obligation) to review this information and adjust its comments accordingly.

Pursuant to the terms of our engagement, it is understood and agreed that all decisions in connection with the implementation of advice and recommendations as provided by KPMG during the course of this engagement shall be the responsibility of, and made by, the Township of Armour. KPMG has not and will not perform management functions or make management decisions for the Township of Armour.

Comments in this report are not intended, nor should they be interpreted, to be legal advice or opinion.

KPMG has no present or contemplated interest in the Township of Armour nor are we an insider or associate of the Township of Armour or its management team. Our fees for this engagement are not contingent upon our findings or any other event. Accordingly, we believe we are independent of the Township of Armour and are acting objectively.
Township of Armour

Municipal Service Delivery and Organizational Review

Chapter III – Current State Assessment
A. Municipal Services

For the purposes of our review, we have classified the Township’s services into one of four categories based on the rationale for the Township’s delivery of the service.

- **Mandatory services** are those services that are required to be delivered by regulation or legislation.
- **Essential services** are those services that, while not mandatory, are required to be delivered in order to ensure public health and safety and/or the effective functioning of the Township from a corporate perspective.
- **Traditional services** are those services that are not mandatory or essential but which are typically delivered by municipalities of comparable size and complexity and for which a public expectation exists that the service will be provided.
- **Discretionary services** are those services that are delivered at the direction of the Township without a formal requirement or expectation, including services that may not be delivered by other municipalities of comparable size and complexity.

![Municipal Services by Category](image1)

![Municipal Services by Category – Budgeted Net Levy](image2)
Current State Assessment

A. Municipal Services

A representation of the service based on the Township’s service level (at, above or below standard) and the basis for the Township’s delivery of the service (mandatory, essential, traditional, other discretionary) is provided on the left. Service level standards reflect legislated service level standards or, where no legislated standard exists, service level standards enacted by municipalities of comparable size and complexity.

The second chart is a representation of the Township’s services based on how the Township goes about in delivering municipal services. For the purposes of the reader, the categories are as follows:

- **Own resources** – the Township uses predominantly its own resources to deliver a service (there may be the use of contracted services but these are either infrequently used or for specific needs);
- **Shared services** – services where the Township has entered into some form of a shared service arrangement to provide municipal services; and
- **Combined** – services where the Township delivers a service with the use of own resources and third party service providers.

---

Municipal Services by Service Level and by Budgeted Net Levy

![Graph showing service levels and budgeted net levy.]

Municipal Services by Service Delivery Model

![Graph showing service delivery model categories.]
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B. Financial Overview

Operating Expenditures

Over the past five years, the Township’s operating expenditures (excluding amortization) have increased by approximately $430,000 ($2.5 million in 2015 vs. $3.0 million in 2019), representing an average increase of 4.2% over that period of time. All expenditure categories grew with an average change ranging from 2.7% (materials and external transfers) to 50.0% (rents and financial expenses). The Township’s largest expenditure category was wage and benefits and these expenditures grew by an average of 4.1% for the years reviewed. Contracted services grew by an average increase of 5.3% and external transfers which consist of payments to the Parry Sound District Social Services Administrative Board and North Bay Parry Sound Health Unit increased by an average of 2.7% over the past five years and these costs are largely out of the control of the Township.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Average Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and benefits</td>
<td>$1,138,934</td>
<td>$1,197,145</td>
<td>$1,291,514</td>
<td>$1,211,739</td>
<td>$1,327,891</td>
<td>+4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on long term debt</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$3,414</td>
<td>$19,148</td>
<td>$20,121</td>
<td>$21,191</td>
<td>+5.2%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>$438,637</td>
<td>$541,241</td>
<td>$517,343</td>
<td>$517,262</td>
<td>$474,874</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted services</td>
<td>$631,876</td>
<td>$762,850</td>
<td>$847,428</td>
<td>$789,298</td>
<td>$762,492</td>
<td>+5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and financial expenses</td>
<td>$10,151</td>
<td>$11,477</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$9,605</td>
<td>$29,135</td>
<td>+50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External transfers</td>
<td>$309,652</td>
<td>$320,776</td>
<td>$329,688</td>
<td>$328,200</td>
<td>$344,008</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,529,573</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,837,083</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,014,110</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,876,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,959,564</strong></td>
<td><strong>+4.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - exclusion of 2015 and 2016 given the increase in interest costs

Source: KPMG Analysis of Financial Information Returns
B. Financial Overview

Funding Sources

For the 2019 fiscal year, the Township of Armour generated and received revenues of $5.8 million. Of that total, the Township’s local funding sources (defined as taxes and user fees) accounted for $2.9 million and represented 50.3% of total revenue. Property tax revenues (own purpose taxation) has increased on an average of 4.6% for the years between 2015 to 2019. Over the same time period, user fee revenues decreased on an average of 1.9%.

Unconditional grants provided to municipalities by the Province of Ontario, increased by an average of 22% over the past five years with a significant increase between 2018 and 2019 where the Township received $1.1 million in unconditional grants.

Other revenue sources for the Township’s purposes have varied over the five years examined for the purposes of the review and in many cases, the revenues generated are not entirely within the control of the municipality. Revenues associated with licensing and permitting increased by an average of 14.1% meanwhile fines and penalties related revenues decreased by an average of 1.0%.

Consistent with service delivery model utilized by the Township, revenues received from other municipalities has increased by an average of 23.5% over the past five years.

Source: KPMG Analysis of Financial Information Returns
Current State Assessment

B. Financial Overview

Financial Indicator Analysis

In order to provide additional perspective on the Township’s financial performance, we have included in this chapter an analysis of financial indicators for the Township and other comparative municipalities.

In Canada, the development and maintenance of principles for financial reporting fall under the responsibility of the Accounting Standards Oversight Council (‘AcSOC’), a volunteer body established by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants in 2000. In this role, AcSOC provides input to and monitors and evaluates the performance of the two boards that are tasked with established accounting standards for the private and public sector:

• The Public Sector Accounting Board (‘PSAB’) establishes accounting standards for the public sector, which includes municipal governments; and

• The Accounting Standards Board (‘AcSB’), which is responsible for the establishment of accounting standards for Canadian entities outside of the public sector.

In May 2009, PSAB released a Statement of Recommended Practice that provided guidance on how public sector bodies should report on indicators of financial condition. As defined in the statement, financial condition is ‘a government’s financial health as assessed by its ability to meet its existing financial obligations both in respect of its service commitments to the public and financial commitments to creditors, employees and others’. In reporting on financial condition, PSAB also recommended that three factors, at a minimum, need to be considered:

• Sustainability. Sustainability is the degree to which the Township can deliver services and meet its financial commitments without increasing its debt or tax burden relative to the economy in which it operates. To the extent that the level of debt or tax burden grows at a rate that exceeds the growth in the Township’s assessment base, there is an increased risk that the Township’s current spending levels (and by association, its services, service levels and ability to meet creditor obligations) cannot be maintained.

• Flexibility. Flexibility reflects the Township’s ability to increase its available sources of funding (debt, taxes or user fees) to meet increasing costs. Municipalities with relatively high flexibility have the potential to absorb cost increases without adversely impacting on affordability for local residents and other ratepayers. On the other hand, municipalities with low levels of flexibility have limited options with respect to generating new revenues, requiring an increased focus on expenditure reduction strategies.

• Vulnerability. Vulnerability represents the extent to which the Township is dependent on sources of revenues, predominantly grants from senior levels of government, over which it has no discretion or control. The determination of vulnerability considers (i) unconditional operating grants such as OMPF; (ii) conditional operating grants such as Provincial Gas Tax for transit operations; and (iii) capital grant programs. Municipalities with relatively high indicators of vulnerability are at risk of expenditure reductions or taxation and user fee increases in the event that senior levels of funding are reduced. This is particularly relevant for municipalities that are vulnerable with respect to operating grants from senior levels of government, as the Municipal Act does not allow municipalities to issue long-term debt for operating purposes (Section 408(2.1)).
### Current State Assessment

#### FINANCIAL ASSETS TO FINANCIAL LIABILITIES

This financial indicator provides an assessment of the Township’s solvency by comparing financial assets (including cash, investments and accounts receivable) to financial liabilities (accounts payable, deferred revenue and long-term debt). Low levels of financial assets to financial liabilities are indicative of limited financial resources available to meet cost increases or revenue losses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 70, Line 9930, Column 1 divided by FIR Schedule 70, Line 9940, Column 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS

- Financial assets may include investments in government business enterprises, which may not necessarily be converted to cash or yield cash dividends.
- Financial liabilities may include liabilities for employee future benefits and future landfill closure and post-closure costs, which may (i) not be realized for a number of years; and/or (ii) may not be realized at once but rather over a number of years.

TOTAL RESERVES AND RESERVE FUNDS PER HOUSEHOLD

This financial indicator provides an assessment of the Township’s ability to absorb incremental expenses or revenue losses through the use of reserves and reserve funds as opposed to taxes, user fees or debt. Low reserve levels are indicative of limited capacity to deal with cost increases or revenue losses, requiring the Township to revert to taxation or user fee increases or the issuance of debt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 70, Line 6420, Column 1 divided by FIR Schedule 2, Line 40, Column 1</td>
<td>• Reserves and reserve funds are often committed to specific projects or purposes and as such, may not necessarily be available to fund incremental costs or revenue losses&lt;br&gt;• As reserves are not funded, the Township may not actually have access to financial assets to finance additional expenses or revenue losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES AS A PERCENTAGE OF TAXABLE ASSESSMENT**

This financial indicator provides an assessment of the Township’s solvency by determining the extent to which increases in operating expenses correspond with increases in taxable assessment. If increases correspond, the Township can fund any increases in operating costs without raising taxation rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 40, Line 9910, Column 7 less FIR Schedule 40, Line 9910, Column 16 divided by FIR Schedule 26, Column 17, Lines 9199 and 9299</td>
<td>As operating expenses are funded by a variety of sources, the Township’s sustainability may be impacted by reductions in other funding sources that would not be identified by this indicator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Sustainability**
- **Flexibility**
- **Vulnerability**

**POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS**

- As operating expenses are funded by a variety of sources, the Township’s sustainability may be impacted by reductions in other funding sources that would not be identified by this indicator.

**Source:** KPMG Analysis of Financial Information Returns (2018)
### CAPITAL ADDITIONS AS A PERCENTAGE OF AMORTIZATION EXPENSE

This financial indicator provides an assessment of the Township’s solvency by assessing the extent to which it is sustaining its tangible capital assets. In the absence of meaningful reinvestment in tangible capital assets, the Township’s ability to continue to deliver services at the current levels may be compromised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sustainability    | FIR Schedule 51, Line 9910, Column 3 divided by FIR Schedule 40, Line 9910, Column 16 | • This indicator considers amortization expense, which is based on historical as opposed to replacement cost. As a result, the Township’s capital reinvestment requirement will be higher than its reported amortization expense due to the effects of inflation.  
• This indicator is calculated on a corporate-level basis and as such, will not identify potential concerns at the departmental level. |
| Flexibility       |         |                       |
| Vulnerability     |         |                       |

**Current State Assessment**

**Residential Taxes Per Household**

This financial indicator provides an assessment of the Township’s ability to increase taxes as a means of funding incremental operating and capital expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Indicator</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Potential Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 26, Line 0010 and Line 1010, Column 4 divided by FIR Schedule 2, Line 0040, Column 1</td>
<td>This indicator does not incorporate income levels for residents and as such, does not fully address affordability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Limitations**

- This indicator does not incorporate income levels for residents and as such, does not fully address affordability concerns.

**Source:** KPMG Analysis of Financial Information Returns (2018)
This financial indicator provides an indication of potential affordability concerns by calculating the percentage of total household income used to pay municipal property taxes.

**FORMULA**
FIR Schedule 26, Line 0010 and Line 1010, Column 4 divided by FIR Schedule 2, Line 0040, Column 1 (to arrive at average residential tax per household). Average household income is derived from the National Housing Survey.

**POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS**
- This indicator considers residential affordability only and does not address commercial or industrial affordability concerns.
- This indicator is calculated on an average household basis and does not provide an indication of affordability concerns for low income or fixed income households.

**TYPE OF INDICATOR**
- Sustainability
- Flexibility ✓
- Vulnerability

### TOTAL LONG-TERM DEBT PER HOUSEHOLD

This financial indicator provides an assessment of the Township’s ability to issue more debt by considering the existing debt loan on a per household basis. High debt levels per household may preclude the issuance of additional debt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 70, Line 2699, Column 1 divided by FIR Schedule 2, Line 0040, Column 1</td>
<td>This indicator does not consider the Provincial limitations on debt servicing cost, which cannot exceed 25% of own-source revenues unless approved by the Ontario Municipal Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart](image-url)

Current State Assessment

TOTAL TAXATION AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ASSESSMENT

This financial indicator provides an indication of potential affordability concerns by calculating the Township’s overall rate of taxation. Relatively high tax rate percentages may limit the Township’s ability to generate incremental revenues in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 26, Line 9199 and Line 9299, Column 4 divided by FIR Schedule 26, Line 9199 and 9299, Column 17.</td>
<td>- This indicator considers the Township’s overall tax rate and will not address affordability issues that may apply to individual property classes (e.g. commercial).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEBT SERVICING COSTS (INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL) AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL REVENUES

This financial indicator provides an indication as to the Township’s overall indebtedness by calculating the percentage of revenues used to fund long-term debt servicing costs. The Township’s ability to issue additional debt may be limited if debt servicing costs on existing debt are excessively high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 74C, Line 3099, Column 1 and Column 2 divided by FIR Schedule 10, Line 9910, Column 1.</td>
<td>No significant limitations have been identified in connection with this indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NET BOOK VALUE OF TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HISTORICAL COST OF TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

This financial indicator provides an indication as to the extent to which the Township is reinvesting in its capital assets as they reach the end of their useful lives. An indicator of 50% indicates that the Township is, on average, investing in capital assets as they reach the end of useful life, with indicators of less than 50% indicating that the Township’s reinvestment is not keeping pace with the aging of its assets.

TYPE OF INDICATOR
- Sustainability
- Flexibility ✓
- Vulnerability

FORMULA

POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS
- This indicator is based on the historical cost of the Township’s tangible capital assets, as opposed to replacement cost. As a result, the Township’s pace of reinvestment is likely lower than calculated by this indicator as replacement cost will exceed historical cost.
- This indicator is calculated on a corporate-level basis and as such, will not identify potential concerns at the departmental level.

OPERATING GRANTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL REVENUES

This financial indicator provides an indication as to the Township’s degree of reliance on senior government grants for the purposes of funding operating expenses. The level of operating grants as a percentage of total revenues is directly proportionate with the severity of the impact of a decrease in operating grants.

FORMULA

POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS
• To the extent possible, the Township should maximize its operating grant revenue. As such, there is arguably no maximum level associated with this financial indicator.

Current State Assessment

CAPITAL GRANTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

This financial indicator provides an indication as to the Township’s degree of reliance on senior government grants for the purposes of funding capital expenditures. The level of capital grants as a percentage of total capital expenditures is directly proportionate with the severity of the impact of a decrease in capital grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>FIR Schedule 10, Line 0815, Line 0825, Line 0831, Column 1 divided by FIR Schedule 51, Line 9910, Column 3.</td>
<td>• To the extent possible, the Township should maximize its capital grant revenue. As such, there is arguably no maximum level associated with this financial indicator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS

• To the extent possible, the Township should maximize its capital grant revenue. As such, there is arguably no maximum level associated with this financial indicator.

## Current State Assessment

### C. Jurisdictional Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Armour</th>
<th>Comparator Municipalities</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>Operating costs per household</td>
<td>$569.53</td>
<td>$407.54</td>
<td>$752.17</td>
<td>$533.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services</td>
<td>Police – Operating costs per household</td>
<td>$389.97</td>
<td>$250.49</td>
<td>$459.01</td>
<td>$333.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire – Net operating costs per household</td>
<td>$146.72</td>
<td>$98.48</td>
<td>$333.16</td>
<td>$185.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Services – Net operating costs per household</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
<td>$25.81</td>
<td>$92.16</td>
<td>$61.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bylaw Enforcement Services – Net operating costs per household</td>
<td>$53.28</td>
<td>$17.01</td>
<td>$73.53</td>
<td>$38.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>Road maintenance operating costs per lane kilometre</td>
<td>$3,380</td>
<td>$6,878</td>
<td>$19,453</td>
<td>$11,325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter control maintenance operating costs per lane kilometre</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>$593</td>
<td>$926</td>
<td>$696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation – Operating costs per household</td>
<td>$548.35</td>
<td>$532.80</td>
<td>$1,281.56</td>
<td>$805.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture Services</td>
<td>Recreation Services – Net operating costs per household</td>
<td>$173.50</td>
<td>$110.72</td>
<td>$447.66</td>
<td>205.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Services – Cost recovery through non-taxation revenues</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Facilities – Net operating costs per household</td>
<td>$91.99</td>
<td>$24.23</td>
<td>$193.23</td>
<td>104.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Facilities – Cost recovery through non-taxation revenues</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks – Operating costs per household</td>
<td>$26.25</td>
<td>$0.53</td>
<td>$175.90</td>
<td>$50.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library – Operating costs per household</td>
<td>$47.96</td>
<td>$4.74</td>
<td>$74.45</td>
<td>$38.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Services</td>
<td>Planning and Development – Net operating costs per household</td>
<td>$76.07</td>
<td>($1.51)</td>
<td>$35.05</td>
<td>$14.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Themes

During the course of our review, a number of themes emerged concerning both positive aspects of the Township and areas of potential improvements which we have summarized below:

1. The majority of the Township’s municipal services are either mandatory in nature (i.e. required by legislation) or essential. The Township involvement in traditional and discretionary services are minimal which therefore, limits Council’s ability to reduce the overall municipal levy

   As part of the review process, KPMG developed municipal service profiles with the objective of identifying and categorizing all municipal services that the Township is involved in. All of the municipal services were categorized into one of four categories defined in a previous chapter of the summary report. Based on the application of the methodology, 85% of the Township’s services fall into the categories of mandatory and essential. Further to this, the balance of the Township’s services (15%) were defined as traditional whereas the services provided by the Township are consistent with similarly sized municipalities. Furthermore, the traditional services provided by the Township are currently being provided through shared services agreements which is considered to be municipal best practice and more cost effective for municipalities to share the costs of providing a service.

   The Township does not provide for any municipal services that could be categorized as discretionary. Despite the absence of discretionary services, the Township still has the potential to increase upon its effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery based on the opportunities identified later within the report.

   In addition to examining the rationale for service delivery, the Township’s services were subjected to a second categorization as part of the service profile development. Township services were analyzed to determine whether or not each service was being delivered below, at or above standard. Based on the service profiles developed, the entirety of the Township’s services can be considered to be at standard based on KPMG’s analysis of those services.

2. Consistent with municipal best practices, the Township appears to be making good use of shared service agreements to deliver various municipal services.

   Based on a survey conducted by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 92% of Ontario’s municipalities participate in some form of a shared service arrangement. Municipalities participate in shared service agreements for a variety of reasons but the most common reasons are: to reduce operating costs, adopt a more strategic approach to addressing infrastructure needs (share the cost of an asset), and increasing capacity to provide a service.

   Beyond creating an inventory of categorized municipal services, the development of the municipal service profiles included how the Township provides service whether using their own resources, making use of third party service providers and/or the use of a shared service agreement. Based on KPMG’s analysis, 46% of the Township’s services are delivered through shared service agreements including but to not exclusive to fire services, recreation, solid waste management, economic development and land use planning.

   Similar to the rationale for service delivery, the Township’s high level of participation in shared services limits the potential to reduce operating costs.
Key Themes

During the course of our review, a number of themes emerged concerning both positive aspects of the Township and areas of potential improvements which we have summarized below:

3. **There appears to be satisfaction among the community stakeholder groups engaged as part of the review**

   The Township identified stakeholder groups to be engaged as part of the review. In general, all stakeholder groups appear to have good working relationships with the municipality, do not perceive to have any issues regarding communications/interactions with the Township, and appear to be satisfied with the level of service provided by the Township. There appears to be a higher level of satisfaction with respect to the Township’s services associated with the maintenance of the Township’s road network in particular winter maintenance.

   There also appeared to be an acknowledgment that the majority of the issues/challenges that they believe to be facing the community are outside of the Township’s ability to address. The stakeholder groups consistently mentioned that access to reliable and adequate internet services is a challenge but all recognize that the Township may not have the ability to address this.

   Overall, it would appear that the Township is responsive to the needs of the community.

4. **The current complement of services provided by the Township and the organizational structure in place to deliver those services is consistent with similarly sized municipalities**

   Based upon the comparative analysis, the Township’s complement of services is consistent with similarly sized municipalities. In our development of the service profiles, there does not appear to be services that are only being delivered by the Township. Similarly, municipalities of similar size structure themselves in what can be categorized as a function organizational structure model. This is also consistent with the Township’s peer group.

5. **The Township’s operating costs associated with service delivery appear to lower or consistent with similarly sized municipalities**

   Beyond examining the complement of services provided by the Township, KPMG also performed comparative analysis focusing on the operating costs and revenues associated with service delivery. 15 service based indicators were developed and 60% of the indicators placed the Township either below or at the comparator average. While the Township had indicators that were above the average, two of those indicators were related to the cost recovery associated with the delivery of a service – this would be considered to be positive for the Township.

6. **A number of the Township’s processes may benefit from a shift away from manual processes and the implementation of the use of technology.**

   KPMG conducted a series of workshops with Township staff with the objective of breaking down various municipal processes into the individual worksteps required to complete a task. In many cases, it appears that the Township uses more manually based processes such as maintaining records in binders and/or books versus making use of technology. Shifting away from manual worksteps within processes provides the Township with the ability to potentially free up capacity to address other organizational needs as well as reducing potential risk and/or duplication of work efforts.
Township of Armour
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Chapter V – Organizational Design
# Organizational Design

## Organization Types Comparison Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>USE WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **FUNCTIONAL**    | - Knowledge sharing within unit  
                   - High functional specialization  
                   - Efficiency & economies of scale  
                   - Standardization | - Limited decision making capacity  
                   - Communication across functions is difficult  
                   - Coordination across functions is difficult  
                   - Less responsive to end user needs | - Single line of business  
                   - Common standards are required  
                   - Highly regulated  
                   - Core capability is based in functional expertise or economies of scale |
| **PRODUCT/PROGRAM** | - Speed of product development cycle  
                     - Product excellence  
                     - Product diversification  
                     - Operating freedom | - Duplication of effort  
                     - Lost economies of Scale  
                     - Multiple customer points | - Product features are competitive advantage  
                     - Multiple products for separate market segments  
                     - Short product life cycles |
| **CUSTOMER**      | - Customization  
                   - Relationship building  
                   - Solutions not just products | - Knowledge sharing is limited  
                   - Duplication of effort  
                   - Lost economies of Scale | - Buyers/customers have power  
                   - Customer knowledge is a competitive advantage  
                   - Rapid customer service is key  
                   - Rapid product cycles are key |
| **GEOGRAPHIC**    | - Responsive to regional customer needs  
                   - Relationship building  
                   - Selective centralization-decentralization | - Mobilization & sharing resources is difficult  
                   - Sharing knowledge is difficult  
                   - Multiple points of contact for clients  
                   - Internal competition for resources  
                   - Client relationships belong to who? | - Smaller efficient scale exists  
                   - High cost of transport  
                   - Just-in-time delivery is critical  
                   - Need to locate close to supply source |

---

1 Adapted from Designing Your Organization, Amy Kates and Jay R. Galbraith, 2007
## Organization Types Comparison Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Use When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Process**       | • Process excellence  
                   • TQ (total quality)  
                   • Cycle time reduction  
                   • Continuous Improvement  
                   • Easy measurement  
                   • Cost reductions  | • Coordination between processes is often difficult  | • Short product life  
                   • Rapid development cycles  
                   • Cost reduction is critical  | |
| **Matrix**        | • Single point of interface for customer  
                   • Cross selling  
                   • Value-added systems & solutions  
                   • Product focused  
                   • Multiple distribution channels  | • Internal competition for resources  
                   • Price disagreements  
                   • Customer needs disagreements  
                   • Marketing belongs  
                   • Conflicting metrics  
                   • Complex accounting  | • Multiple product lines and multiple market segments  
                   • Global customers  
                   • Competitive advantage is in combined customer and product excellence  |
Organizational Design

Comparative Staffing Analysis

The following chart is the comparative analysis of the Township’s staffing levels and the comparator group. Based on the analysis performed, the Township’s staffing levels are relatively consistent with the comparator group. While the Township’s full-time staffing levels appears to be higher than the average, the Township has 11 full-time equivalents (“FTEs”) but has reported 17 FTEs because 6 FTEs associated with the delivery of shared services are counted as Township employees. Based on that distinguishing matter, the Township’s FTEs are the median with the comparator group and below the comparative average.

Organizational Structure Analysis

For the purposes of the reader, the current organizational structure for the Township could be categorized as a functional model whereas the Township is organized around major services/activity groups. This organizational structure is consistent with similarly sized municipalities. Functional models bring the following advantages and disadvantages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge sharing within unit</td>
<td>• Limited decision making capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High functional specialization</td>
<td>• Communication across functions is difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficiency &amp; economies of scale</td>
<td>• Coordination across functions is difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standardization</td>
<td>• Less responsive to end user needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on our analysis of the Township’s organizational structure, the number of opportunities for change with respect to the organizational structure appear to be limited. The following items provide the rationale as to why there appear to be limited opportunities for structural change:

• The current organizational structure and direct reports to the Clerk-Treasurer-Administrator is consistent with optimal organizational structure based on the nature of the services and reporting lines; and

• The Township’s organizational structure is consistent with similarly sized municipalities.
Chapter VI – Service Based Opportunities for Consideration
Service Based Opportunities for Consideration

This section presents the opportunities identified during the course of the service delivery and organizational review. The opportunities contained within the report are considered to described at a high level and as such, the potential financial and non-financial benefits were determined on an incremental basis.

From our perspective, we suggest that the potential benefits from these opportunities could be in the form of either capacity benefits or financial benefits:

- **Capacity benefits** result from workload reductions achieved through efficiency gains, allowing Township personnel to focus on other activities. Given that this results in a redirection of staff, as opposed to a reduction in staff, capacity benefits do not result in direct cost savings.

- **Financial benefits** refer to efficiency gains that provide incremental cost savings to the Township through reductions in operating costs as well any opportunities that may provide Township increases in other revenue sources (e.g. user fees).

For the purposes of the reader, the opportunities presented in the following table are not presented in any prioritized order.
## Service Based Opportunities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Opportunity</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Anticipated Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Efficiency</td>
<td>Explore the potential of increasing the frequency of tendering.</td>
<td>The Township has a number of contracts for services and materials including professional services (legal, insurance, etc.) and operational services (public works related works). During the course of the review, the information shared with KPMG indicates that the Township may not be tendered as frequently as they could be. Instead of a formal tender process, the Township undertakes an informal approach to tendering whereas current costs are benchmarked against municipal peers and overall contract costs are monitored by the Clerk-Treasurer-Administrator. Increasing the frequency of tendering for services is a municipal best practice, allows the Township to test the market and ensure the municipality is receiving best value for purchased goods and services.</td>
<td>Enhanced decision-making and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Level Adjustment</td>
<td>Explore the potential of reducing the number of allowable garbage bags at the municipal landfill site</td>
<td>Each year, eligible residents (registered residential property owners) are issued a landfill pass card. The landfill cards provide access to residents to the landfill site and allow residents to dispose of up to 40 bags of residential waste annually. Any additional bags are charged for at $3 per bag. An emerging trend in the municipal sector is a shift to reduce the amount of residential waste allowed for disposal in an effort to have residents utilize other streams of waste management. Typically, municipalities approach a change in solid waste management on an incremental basis (e.g. moving from two bags weekly to one bag weekly to one bag bi-weekly over time). To the extent the Township may want to approach a change in residential waste, the allocated 40 bags per year could be incrementally reduced to 26 bags per year which would align with 1 bag of waste every two weeks.</td>
<td>Potential capacity gains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Service Based Opportunities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Opportunity</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Anticipated Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Service Delivery</td>
<td>Explore the potential of sharing building services with neighbouring communities</td>
<td>Based on information shared during the course of the review, the Township previously shared building services with another municipality. The Township may wish to explore the potential of sharing the service with another partner municipality to maximize the capacity of the resource while sharing the costs associated with the provision of the mandatory service.</td>
<td>Enhanced decision-making and service delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process Based Opportunities for Consideration

Introduction – How to read this chapter

For each process under review, we have provided process maps that outline the individual worksteps undertaken as part of the process in Chapter VII. These maps are outlined in flowchart form and are intended to assist in understanding (i) the individual worksteps performed by Township personnel; (ii) the sequential ordering of the worksteps; and (iii) decision points included in the process.

Where an area for potential improvement has been identified, they have been indicated in the process maps through the following markers:

- **P**: Process inefficiencies, which may include duplication of efforts, manual vs. automated processes and the performance of work with nominal value
- **S**: Client service limitations, representing aspects of the Township’s operations that may adversely impact on customer satisfaction
- **F**: Financial risk, representing areas where the Township’s system of internal controls is insufficient to prevent the risk of financial loss
- **L**: Litigation risk, consisting of potential areas where the Township’s processes may expose it to risk, including areas where existing measures to mitigate risk are considered insufficient

Included with the process maps are the potential areas for improvements, as well as potential courses of action that could be adopted by the Township to address the identified issues.

Please note that the implementation of any and/or all of the process based opportunities may be limited with respect to the size of the organization, the ability to invest in technology and/or access to information technology support and services.
## Budget – Township of Armour – 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - November</th>
<th>December - January</th>
<th>February - March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo to department heads – budgets submitted by Nov 30th</td>
<td>Departmental budgets reviewed with Department Heads</td>
<td>By-law passed to approve budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget guidance memo</td>
<td>Amendments requested?</td>
<td>Approved Budget (by-law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council reviews budget, consulting with Dept. Heads as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy-Clerk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Heads</strong></td>
<td>Proposed budgets drafted (excl. full/part time payroll)</td>
<td>Approved Budget (by-law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Departmental Budgets</td>
<td>Budget posted on Township website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates/changes made to Departmental Budget</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Process Based Opportunities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential Course of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As described above, Department Heads prepare a preliminary budget</td>
<td>A key part of budgeting is a “look back” to ensure that budget is aligned to performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on the prior year. While necessity of spend within each line-item</td>
<td>Basic KPIs for each department should be determined and monitored to allow for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is carefully considered, there are limited “look back” activities</td>
<td>- Benchmarking and “right sizing” against publicly available data, such as FIR data for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performed with respect to operational efficiencies. For example, Key</td>
<td>comparative municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicators are not regularly calculated and assessed</td>
<td>- Tracking of performance trends, such as improvements in performance which can be used as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against available benchmarked data (such as comparative</td>
<td>a tool by management to cascade better practices across the organization; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>municipalities).</td>
<td>- Monitoring of declining performance to ensure that budget increases are not in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to additional waste or inefficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Process Based Opportunities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential Course of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All property tax bills are currently manually prepared and sent by mail. This results in additional time and postage costs incurred by the Township. | Allow users to receive bills electronically through email or “epost” through Canada Post. System generated emails can be produced that will send user’s their bills electronically reducing costs associated with post and the time required to prepare and mail the bills.  
*Note: The Township may not be in a position to fully implement this opportunity as a result of access/usage to information technology services and support within the community.* |
# Process Based Opportunities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Previous Potential Course of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Purchase Requisition (PR) is the internal process of obtaining approval for an expenditure. Currently, the Township does not require a PR, or any formal approval outside of the annual budgeting process, for purchases under $5,000 (except for professional services). While the amount spent may be within budget, no single employee should have the authority to commercially bind the Township without a second set of eyes; furthermore, a lack of PR approval increases the risk of inappropriate or fraudulent use of funds, in small amounts.</td>
<td>The Township should consider requiring a Purchase Requisition for each expenditure. To ensure an efficient process, the existing ERP Information System should be used to “workflow” the PR, enabling a quick digital approval from the designated second-level authority. The individual approving the PR should be senior to, and independent of, the department which is requesting the purchase, such as the Deputy Treasurer or Treasurer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purchasing – Procedures for Requesting Tenders – Township of Armour – 2020

**Council**

- **Bidder withdraw?**
  - No
  - Yes
- **Written request by bidder to withdraw tender**
- **Proposal re-submitted by tenderer**
- **Enveloped initialed with date and time**
- **Listing of tenders (confidential)**
- **Opening of tenders at deadline**
- **Announce number of bids received and tender information**
- **Submit report and recommendation to Council for approval**
- **Provide report to Council with rejection reasons**
- **Award to other bidder**
- **Proceed with contract**
- **End**

**CAO or Designate**

- **Bidder wants to make changes?**
  - Yes
  - No
- **Changes posted on Township of Armour’s website**
- **Changes to contract under call?**
  - Yes
  - No
- **Proposal re-submitted by tenderer**
- **Enveloped initialed with date and time**
- **Listing of tenders (confidential)**
- **Opening of tenders at deadline**
- **Advise unsuccessful bidders of rejection**
- **Advise successful bidder or acceptance**
- **All tenders returned unopened to bidders**
- **Record of tenders opened**
- **Submit report and recommendation to Council for approval**
- **Advise unsuccessful bidders of rejection**
- **Advise successful bidder or acceptance**
- **Record of tenders opened**
- **Submit report and recommendation to Council for approval**
- **Advise unsuccessful bidders of rejection**
- **Advise successful bidder or acceptance**
- **Tenders received from bidders**
- **Tender materials**
- **Bidder submitted tender?**
  - Yes
  - No
- **Review tender recommendation**
- **Accept tender?**
- **End**

**Department Heads**

- **Determine tender requirements**
- **Advertise tender**
  - Yes
  - No
- **Receive requests from tenderers**
- **Provide information to tenderers**
- **Tender materials**
- **Bidder submitted tender?**
  - Yes
  - No
- **Review tender recommendation**
- **Accept tender?**
- **End**
Accounts Receivable – Township of Armour – 2020

**Start**

1. *Invoice requested*

**Deputy Treasurer**

- *Invoice*
  - *Invoice created*
  - *Invoice added to AR listing in front office*
  - *Invoice issued*

2. *Payment received in 30 days?*
   - No: *Past due notice issued*
   - Yes: *Payment received in 30 days?*

3. *Creditor is Armour resident?*
   - No: *Past due notice*
   - Yes: *Added to resident’s tax account*

4. *Bank deposit reviewed*

5. *Cash and cheque deposited to bank*


7. *AR Listing Updated*

**Department Heads**

8. *Start*

9. *Invoice requested*

**Administrative Assistant**

- *Payment received*
  - *Department Head notified*
  - *Bank deposit prepared*
  - *Payment recorded as revenue in GL*
  - *AR Listing Updated*
  - *MuniSoft GL*

**End**

© 2017 KPMG LLP, a Canadian limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative (“KPMG International”), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International.
# Process Based Opportunities for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Previous Potential Course of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong></td>
<td>The Town’s payroll process is heavily paper based with exception reports and payroll registers printed after every version. This results in numerous pages of information that is incorrect or requires updating after review. Consideration should be given to using and saving only electronic versions of payroll information. Electronic signatures can be developed and used for approvals. Saving in printing costs as storage space requirements would also result albeit small given the volume of paper produced by the Township.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2</strong></td>
<td>It was noted employees are provided a choice on a manual vs. electronic pay stub. The dual process followed creates additional work for the finance group. All employees should be provided with an electronic pay stub to ensure one process is followed and to allow for a reduction in the use of paper in the printing of the pay stubs. <em>Note: The Township may not be in a position to fully implement this opportunity as a result of employees who do not possess email addresses.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permitting – Township of Armour – 2020

Start

Owner/representative requests permission to build

Building permit application

Owner/representative provides completed application

Building permit application provided

Completed building permit application

Application review process initiated

Application properly completed?

Application checked for completeness

Additional info required?

Yes

Contact applicant for additional info

Yes

Applicant calls for final inspection upon completion

Inspection passed?

No

Deficiencies fixed by owner/rep

No

Yes

Occupancy permit issued (if appl.)

Inspection passed?

Yes

Logged in GIS

Infrastructure Solutions GIS

End

Yes

Application properly communicated to applicant

Applicant pays fee, picks up permit

Inspection passed?

No

Deficiencies fixed by owner/rep

No

Yes

Inspection passed?

Deficiencies fixed by owner/rep

Yes

Filed (server and paper)
Resident Complaints – Township of Armour – 2020

Administrator

- Start
- Complaint received by email or mail
- Completed complaint form?
- Forwarded to Department Head
- Response evaluated
- Response returned to Dept. Head with instructions
- Administrator reviews results
- Results satisfactory?
- Yes
- No
- Letter/email response
- Response communicated to Administrator
- Complaint is reviewed
- Options to address are communicated to complainant
- Letter/email response
- Response evaluated
- Response satisfactory?
- Yes
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## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### General Government - Mayor and Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>The Mayor provides leadership to Council in fulfilling the requirements of government legislation, as well as the strategic goals and objectives identified by Council. The Mayor also represents the Township, both in the community and externally. The Township provides support to elected officials, allowing them to exercise their responsibilities as municipal councillors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
<th>Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Council</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Effective leadership of Council contributes towards the achievement of strategic goals, objectives and priorities. Councilor's Offices ensures political representation for residents of the Township and supports elected officials in addressing constituency matters and issues.</td>
<td>For the purposes of potential key performance indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor budgeted total levy for Mayor and Council (governance) compared to other municipalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>$ 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE's</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Basis of Delivery

- **Mandatory** - The position of Mayor, along with Elected officials, is a requirement under the Municipal Act.
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile
**General Government - Mayor and Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Client</td>
<td>A party that receives a service output and a service value.</td>
<td>• Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents and organizations in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Client</td>
<td>A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly.</td>
<td>• Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
<td>The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.</td>
<td>(1) Leadership of Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Advocacy and promotion of the Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Political representation, including resolution of constituency matters and issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Administrative and clerical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Delivery Model</td>
<td>How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used.</td>
<td>Own resources - The function of Mayor and Council is provided through the Township's own resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile
#### General Government - Mayor and Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$114,075</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$114,075</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$114,075</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$114,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Township of Armour

Municipal Service Profile
General Government - Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>Administration is responsible for providing a wide range of statutory, operational and advisory duties as set out in the Municipal Act as well as providing effective and efficient administrative support to Council, the public and staff to ensure the Township’s administrative and financial operations progress in an efficient, orderly, and lawful manner. Responsible for human resources, emergency management, health &amp; safety, strategic direction and communications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Internal and external</td>
<td>Administration contributes to the overall sustainability of the Township and ensures that all aspects of the Township is working at maximum efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Operating Costs $</th>
<th>Revenues $</th>
<th>Net Levy $</th>
<th>FTE’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Above Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential – Pursuant to Section 289 of the Municipal Act, 2001, all Ontario municipalities may appoint a chief administrative officer (administrator) who shall be responsible for, exercising general control and management of the affairs of the municipality for the purpose of ensuring the efficient and effective operation of the municipality.</td>
<td>For the purposes of potential key performance indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor compliance with provincial legislation and budgeted total levy for administration compared to other municipalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

**General Government - Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client</th>
<th>Indirect Client</th>
<th>Service Output</th>
<th>Primary Delivery Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Client</td>
<td>A party that receives a service output and a service value.</td>
<td>Township Council</td>
<td>Residents who benefit from the informed decision-making</td>
<td>(1) Strategic planning &amp; analysis</td>
<td>How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Client</td>
<td>A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly.</td>
<td>Township Employees</td>
<td>Other levels of government</td>
<td>(2) Implementation of Council's decisions</td>
<td>Own resources - The function of Administrator or CAO is predominantly provided through the Township's own resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
<td>The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client's need.</td>
<td>Third parties involved in transactions with the Township</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Ratepayers satisfaction with services provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Third parties receiving support from the Township</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Government reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (1) Strategic planning & analysis
- (2) Implementation of Council's decisions
- (3) Ratepayers satisfaction with services provided
- (4) Government reporting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of General Government budget</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$162,141</td>
<td>$(11,886)</td>
<td>$150,255</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

$162,141 $(11,886) $150,255 1.3
Township of Armour

Municipal Service Profile
General Government - Clerks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>The Township’s Clerk’s function fulfills the statutory requirements as outlined within the Municipal Act as well as the services necessary to support efficient and effective governance. This includes the preparation and distribution of meeting agendas and minutes and attendance in meetings to provide support for both Council and committees. The Clerk is also responsible for the oversight of municipal elections every four years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>The Clerks function is responsible for providing support to Council in the conducting of effective and efficient meetings in compliance with all related provincial legislation and by doing so, ensuring Council operates in an accountable and transparent manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external</td>
<td>For the purposes of potential key performance indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor compliance with provincial legislation and budgeted total levy for administration compared to other municipalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Section 228 of the Municipal Act requires all municipalities to appoint a clerk with the formal duties of the Clerk established within the legislation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>$179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE’s</td>
<td>$176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Delivery Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Service/Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of General Government budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election (less transfers to reserves - $4,262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### General Government - Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>Finance provides financial leadership, planning, advice, guidance (i.e. policies) and reporting to</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internal and external stakeholders as well as transactional services relating to accounts payable,</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accounts receivable, general ledger, banking, payroll and tangible capital assets. Finance is also</td>
<td>Above Standard</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsible for the development of the Township's budget, oversees the preparation of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Township's financial statements and Financial Information Return ('FIR') and managing the Township's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investments and debt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Organizational Unit        |                                                                                                       |               |                   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|                   |
| Finance                     |                                                                                                       |               |                   |

| Type of Service             | Service Value                                                                                                                                                 |               |                   |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|                   |
| Internal and external       | Finance contributes to financial sustainability and flexibility by undertaking financial planning and analysis in connection with the Township's decisions and strategies. |               |                   |

| Budget (in thousands)       |                                                                                                       |               |                   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|                   |
| Operating Costs             | $ 183                                                                                                 |               |                   |
| Revenues                    | $(125)                                                                                               |               |                   |
| Net Levy                    | $ 58                                                                                                 |               |                   |
| FTE's                       | 1.3                                                                                                  |               |                   |

**Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking**

For the purposes of potential key performance indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor compliance with provincial legislation and budgeted total levy for administration compared to other municipalities.

**Basis for Delivery**

**Mandatory** – Pursuant to Section 286(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, all Ontario municipalities are required to appoint a treasurer "who is responsible for the handling of all financial affairs of the municipality on behalf of and in a manner directed by the council of the municipality."
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile
**General Government - Finance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client&lt;br&gt;A party that receives a service output and a service value.</th>
<th>Indirect Client&lt;br&gt;A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly.</th>
<th>Service Output&lt;br&gt;The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.</th>
<th>Primary Delivery Model&lt;br&gt;How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township Council</td>
<td>• Township Council</td>
<td>• Township Employees</td>
<td>• Third parties involved in financial transactions with the Township</td>
<td>• Third parties receiving financial support from the Township</td>
<td>• Residents who benefit from the financial decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Employees</td>
<td>(1) Financial planning &amp; analysis including budgeting</td>
<td>(2) Property taxation</td>
<td>(3) Financial transaction processing</td>
<td>(4) Financial reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties involved in financial transactions with the Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties receiving financial support from the Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents who benefit from the financial decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other levels of government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Own resources** - The function of Treasurer is predominantly provided through the Township's own resources.
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile
#### General Government - Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Financial Information (2020 Budget)</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of General Government</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$ 182,663</td>
<td>$ (125,235)</td>
<td>$ 57,428</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 182,663</td>
<td>$ (125,235)</td>
<td>$ 57,428</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Township of Armour

## Municipal Service Profile

### Public Works - Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>$ 860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$ (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>$ 851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE's</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Overview

The Roads Department maintains municipal roads and bridges, which involves grading, repairing and improving road and bridge structures, maintaining signs, culverts, ditches and shoulders, snow clearing and sanding in the winter months and dust control and grading during the rest of the year.

### Service Value

The Township’s Public Works function contributes towards the overall delivery of public works functions, including transportation and environmental services in a manner that ensures public health and safety in Armour. Public Works also contributes towards the community’s economic development by ensuring the supporting services are provided on a reliable and cost effective basis.

### Basis for Delivery

**Mandatory** – Section 44(1) of the Municipal Act establishes the Township’s responsibility to keep highways or bridges under its jurisdiction “in a state of repair that is reasonable in the circumstances”. Ontario Regulation 239/02: Minimum Maintenance Standards for Municipal Highways (which has been amended by Ontario Regulation 47/13) provides further clarification by establishing minimum maintenance standards for a range of road network maintenance activities.

### Basis of Delivery

- Mandatory
- Essential
- Traditional
- Discretionary

### Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking

The potential performance indicators for this profile would be monitoring performance against its internal service level standards in order to ensure compliance with the established service level standards and operating costs per lane kilometre.
### Township of Armour

#### Municipal Service Profile

##### Public Works - Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>component list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Direct Client             | A party that receives a service output and a service value.               | • Users of the Township's road network  
|                           |                                                                           | • Pedestrians using the Township's sidewalk network                           |
| Indirect Client           | A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving     | * Township residents and other parties that benefit from effective transportation (e.g. individuals requiring ambulance services) |
|                           | the service output directly.                                              |                                                                                |
| Service Output            | The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client's need.         | (1) Winter roads maintenance  
|                           |                                                                           | (2) Summer roads maintenance  
|                           |                                                                           | (3) Roadside maintenance  
|                           |                                                                           | (4) Bridge maintenance  
|                           |                                                                           | (5) Sidewalk maintenance  
|                           |                                                                           | (6) Fleet maintenance  
|                           |                                                                           | (7) Traffic signal maintenance  
|                           |                                                                           | Street lighting |
| Primary Delivery Model    | How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used. | Own Resources - The Township's roads operations is delivered predominantly with the use of its own resources. |
**Township of Armour**

**Municipal Service Profile**
Public Works - Roads

### Financial Information (2020 Budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$859,621</td>
<td>$(9,000)</td>
<td>$850,621</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $859,621 $(9,000) $850,621 5.0
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### Solid Waste Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Unit</td>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Service</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>$426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>($267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>$159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE’s</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Overview

The Township provides access to a waste disposal site. The site operates on two seasonal schedules - the winter schedule which consists of five days of operating hours (Thursday to Monday) from the hours of 11:00 to 5:00 and a summer schedule where the days remain the same with an additional hour in the morning (10:00 to 5:00). Armour manages the landfill for three municipalities, Armour, Ryerson and Burk’s Falls. Armour and Ryerson do not have curbside collection for garbage, but Burk’s Falls does. The Landfill can only receive waste which is produced within the three municipalities.

### Service Value

Solid waste management contributes towards the environmental health of the Township by ensuring the effective collection and disposal of residential and non-residential waste/garbage received at landfill sites. This provides public health protection to residents by effectively managing solid waste contaminants.

Open landfill management contributes towards the environmental health of the Township by ensuring the safe and effective long-term disposal of solid waste.

### Basis for Delivery

**Essential** – The provision of effective solid waste management services is critical to ensuring the public health and safety of residents. Under the Municipal Act, there is no requirement for municipalities to maintain solid waste management systems. Where municipalities choose to maintain these systems, the provisions of the related environmental compliance and Provincial legislation, including but not limited to the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Regulation 232/98: Landfilling Sites, dictate service level requirements for municipalities.

### Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking

The potential performance indicators for this profile would be monitoring compliance with legislation, diversion rate and operating costs per household.

### Service Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Municipal Service Profile
### Solid Waste Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Client</td>
<td>A party that receives a service output and a service value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential and non-residential users of waste management facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Client</td>
<td>A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents, non-resident sectors and visitors to the Township that benefit from effective solid waste services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
<td>The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Operation of the waste disposal site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Delivery Model</td>
<td>How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined - Garbage and recycling collection are performed by external service provider Waste Management, operation of the landfill is performed by the Township.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Municipal Service Profile

### Solid Waste Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRI R Waste Management</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>$346,995</td>
<td>$(183,750)</td>
<td>$163,245</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour's Environmental Services</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$79,123</td>
<td>$(83,537)</td>
<td>$(4,414)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$426,118</td>
<td>$(267,287)</td>
<td>$158,831</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour
### Municipal Service Profile
#### Parks and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>The Township maintains Township parks, beaches and water access points, picnic sites, the Chetwynd Cemetery, and the Katrine Community Centre. The Armour, Ryerson and Burk's Falls Arena is a shared service between the three municipalities. Library services are provided through the Burk's Falls, Armour and Ryerson Union Public Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Community facilities provide accessible, inclusive, welcoming, quality spaces for community recreational programming, activities, rentals/events and neighbourhood gatherings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>The potential performance and benchmarking indicators for this profile would be monitoring the level of cost recovery achieved by facility and/or by activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Operating Costs $248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Revenues $12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Net Levy $236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>FTE's -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour
### Municipal Service Profile
#### Parks and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client</th>
<th>Indirect Client</th>
<th>Service Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Direct Client**       | A party that receives a service output and a service value.               | - Residents of the Township who access community facilities                                      | - Residents and visitors                                                                          | (1) Access to recreational facilities  
                          |                                                                            | - Residents of the Township who participate in community events and programs                   |                                                                                                                                                | (2) Community events and activities  
                          |                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                | (3) Library operations  
                          |                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                | (4) Museum operations  
                          |                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                | (5) Facility maintenance (indoor and outdoor)  
                          |                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                | **Shared service** - Recreational services are provided through shared service agreements.  
| **Indirect Client**     | A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly. |                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                |
| **Service Output**      | The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.         |                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                |
| **Primary Delivery Model** | How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used. |                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                |
## Township of Armour
### Municipal Service Profile
#### Parks and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arena</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>$90,823</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$90,823</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Program</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Society/Museum</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$(12,000)</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>$57,994</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$57,994</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$247,517</td>
<td>$(12,000)</td>
<td>$235,517</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### Fire Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>The Fire Department is responsible for ensuring the health and safety of residents through the provision of programs and services focusing on three areas: education, prevention and suppression. Fire services are currently shared by the Township of Ryerson, Village of Burk's Falls and Township of Armour. The Burk's Falls &amp; District Fire Department provides fire services for the Township. A composite staffing model is used, with a Fire Chief and Deputy Fire Chief/Fire Prevention Officer supported by volunteer fire fighters and radio operators.</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above Standard</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>The Fire Department seeks to promote a safe community through public education and prevention and the deployment of resources when required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>$218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>($1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>$217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE's</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basis for Delivery

**Mandatory** – Section 2(1) of the Fire Prevention and Protection Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c.4 (the ‘FPPA’) sets out that every municipality is required to establish a program in the municipality which must include public education with respect to fire safety and certain components of fire prevention and provide such other fire protection services as it determines may be necessary in accordance with its needs and circumstances.

Township of Ryerson administers the service. The Township approves the annual budget provided to them. Given the relationship where the Township does not play a role in the overall operation and/or efficiency, performance indicators and benchmarking are not applicable.
### Municipal Service Profile

#### Fire Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client</th>
<th>Indirect Client</th>
<th>Service Output</th>
<th>Primary Delivery Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Client</td>
<td>A party that receives a service output and a service value.</td>
<td>• Residents of the Township who receive fire services</td>
<td>• Property owners that are subject to fire inspections</td>
<td>• Township residents and visitors</td>
<td>(1) Fire incident response and operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Third parties (OFMEM) involved in fire and emergency service operations with the township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Fire education and prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Client</td>
<td>A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Emergency management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
<td>The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Delivery Model</td>
<td>How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Shared service</strong> - Fire services are provided by The Burk's Falls &amp; District Fire Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of delivery models may be used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Township of Armour

#### Municipal Service Profile

**Fire Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Financial Information (2020 Budget)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>$ 217,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 217,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Municipal Service Profile
### Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Public Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Unit</td>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Service</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>$109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$(61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE’s</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Overview
Building Services provide an efficient system of building permit approvals which minimize hazards to persons and property by ensuring that all construction within the Township adheres to provincial and municipal regulations. This section issues building, plumbing, demolition, occupancy and other permits governed by the Ontario Building Code.

### Service Value
Through inspections, Building Services ensures that projects are designed and constructed in accordance with the terms and conditions of applicable municipal and legislative requirements.

### Basis for Delivery
Mandatory – Pursuant to Section 3.1 of the Building Code Act ('BCA'), municipalities are mandated the responsibility to enforce the BCA and in doing so, are required to appoint a chief building officer and such inspectors under Section 3(2) of the BCA.

### Basis of Delivery
- Mandatory
- Essential
- Traditional
- Discretionary

### Service Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Level</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Delivery</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking
For the purposes of potential key performance and benchmarking indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor compliance to the legislation and level of cost recovery achieved through fees.
## Municipal Service Profile
### Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client</th>
<th>Indirect Client</th>
<th>Service Output</th>
<th>Primary Delivery Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Client</td>
<td>A party that receives a service output and a service value.</td>
<td>- Individuals or companies undertaking construction, renovation or other building-related projects that require permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Indirect Client   | A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly. | - Individuals purchasing homes on the resale market  
- Development community |
| Service Output    | The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client's need. | (1) Reviews of construction plans as part of the building permit issuance process  
(2) Inspections during construction  
(3) Final occupancy inspections |
| Primary Delivery Model | How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used. | **Own resources** - The Building department, including the Chief Building Official, is provided through the Township's own resources. |
# Municipal Service Profile
## Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$ 109,257</td>
<td>$(61,000)</td>
<td>$ 48,257</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $ 109,257 $ (61,000) $ 48,257 1.0
**Township of Armour**

**Municipal Service Profile**  
**By-Law Enforcement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>By-law Enforcement is responsible for the investigation and enforcement of all our municipal bylaws. The By-law Enforcement Officer is responsible for monitoring and enforcing property standards, animal control, zoning regulations, excessive noise, illegal dumping and woodlands conservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By-Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>By-law Enforcement and Property Standards contribute towards health and safety, consumer protection, nuisance control and quality of life. All citizens benefit from the enforcement of by-laws as the result is an increased level of public safety, neighbourhood satisfaction, community pride and an overall positive impact on quality of life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Service Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs $92</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues $37</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy $55</td>
<td>Above Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE's 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basis for Delivery**  
*Essential* – By-law enforcement and property standards contribute towards the health and safety of residents, as well as the protection of property.

**Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking**  
For the purposes of potential key performance and benchmarking indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor time required to resolve an issue from time of receipt to resolution and level of cost recovery achieved through fees.
### Township of Armour

**Municipal Service Profile**  
**By-Law Enforcement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Client</td>
<td>A party that receives a service output and a service value.</td>
<td>• Residents lodging complaints with respect to by-law non-compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Property owners of residential rental units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents of residential rental units licensed by the Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Animal owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Client</td>
<td>A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly.</td>
<td>• Residents of, and visitors to, the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
<td>The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.</td>
<td>(1) Resolution of non-compliance with By-Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Trailer licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Animal licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Delivery Model</td>
<td>How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used.</td>
<td><strong>Own resources</strong> - The By-Law Enforcement department is provided through the Township's own resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### By-Law Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By-Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$89,300</td>
<td>$(36,000)</td>
<td>$53,300</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$2,860</td>
<td>$(1,200)</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $92,160 $ (37,200) $54,960 1.0
Township of Armour

Municipal Service Profile
Emergency Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>Emergency Management provides leadership, guidance and direction to ensure the safety of the community by engaging in mitigation, prevention and preparedness for an emergency. Emergency Management is a legislative service that focuses on (i) emergency operations and training (response plans, infrastructure, best practices, training), and (ii) business continuity, public education, awareness and notification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external</td>
<td>Emergency Management contributes towards the safety of residents of the community through prevention mitigation and response to community risks and emergencies. In addition, Emergency Management also works to ensure the continuity of municipal services in the event of a disruption, ensuring that physical locations, business practices and continuity of government is maintained during disruptions and emergency events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs $15</td>
<td>For the purposes of potential key performance indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor compliance with the legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues $-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy $15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory – Section 2.1 of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act requires all municipalities to develop an emergency management program that involves an emergency plan, training programs, public education and other elements as required by the Province.
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### Emergency Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Direct Client              | A party that receives a service output and a service value.                 | • Mayor and Council  
 • Township employees  
 • Residents of the Township  
 • Emergency management partners |
| Indirect Client            | A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly. | • Residents of the Township |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
<td>The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Delivery Model</td>
<td>How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Primary Delivery Model

- Own Resources - Emergency management is predominantly provided with the Township's own resources.
### Township of Armour

**Municipal Service Profile**  
**Emergency Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Financial Information (2020 Budget)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Management</strong></td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Own Resources</td>
<td>$14,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Township of Armour

#### Municipal Service Profile

**Planning & Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Unit</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Service</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (in thousands)</td>
<td>Operating Costs $47, Revenues $12, Net Levy $35, FTE's -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service Overview

Planning involves the general design of the municipality through the land use planning process. Land use planning enables the municipality to establish goals and objectives for growth and development. Municipal Planning provides general information with respect to current land use issues and undertakes the review and processing of a variety of development applications, Official Plan, Zoning, Subdivision, Lot Control and Site Plans submitted to the municipality. They provide consultative assistance to the public and the development industry on planning-related issues, processing of development applications and the planning legislative process.

#### Service Value

Planning Services promotes strategic growth and policy through land use planning. Through this process, the interests and objectives of individual property owners are balanced with the interests and objectives of the Township of Armour in alignment with the Provincial Policy Statement.

#### Basis for Delivery

**Mandatory** – The Planning Act establishes the responsibility for municipalities to make local planning decisions that will determine the future of their community. The Planning Act also requires municipalities to ensure planning decisions and planning documents are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
<th>Mandatory</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking

For the purposes of potential key performance indicators, we suggest that the Township monitor cost recovery achieved through fees and operating costs per household.
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile
Planning & Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client</th>
<th>Indirect Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Direct Client              | A party that receives a service output and a service value. | • Residents and/or members of the development community  
                              • Township departments affected by planning issues |
| Indirect Client            | A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly. | • Residents of the Township who benefit from a comprehensive and planned approach to growth in the community |
| Service Output             | The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client's need. | (1) Management of applications under the Planning Act  
                              (2) Clarifications regarding land use designations or policies in the Official Plan  
                              (3) Clarifications regarding zone categories and provisions in the Zoning By-Law |
| Primary Delivery Model     | How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used. | **Shared Service** - Planning services are provided through the Southeast Parry Sound Planning Board. |
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile
Planning & Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Service/Process</th>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Non-Taxation Revenue</th>
<th>Net Levy Requirement</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>$ 46,500</td>
<td>$ (12,000)</td>
<td>$ 34,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 46,500</td>
<td>$ (12,000)</td>
<td>$ 34,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### Regional Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Service Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Economic Development within the Township of Armour implements economic development strategies and initiatives that will promote and encourage business growth, economic sustainability, and investment within the community. Economic Development is provided in conjunction with ACED (The Almaguin Community Economic Development) which delivers economic development services throughout the Almaguin Highlands Region. The Township of Armour administers Economic Development for 11 partners in the Almaguin Region. Armour takes direction from the ACED Board on how to administer the department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (in thousands)</th>
<th>Service Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>Economic development initiatives focus on improving the economic well-being and quality of life for the community by retaining and creating jobs, supporting the development of the community and growing the tax base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Levy</td>
<td>$(257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE's</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Delivery</th>
<th>Proposed Key Performance Indicators and Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>For the purposes of potential key performance indicators, economic development is delivered on a regional basis and therefore, performance indicators and benchmarking are not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Unit</th>
<th>Basis of Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Economic Development</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

- **External Economic Development initiatives focus on improving the economic well-being and quality of life for the community by retaining and creating jobs, supporting the development of the community and growing the tax base.**

**Program Details:**

- **Planning & Development**
  - Economic Development within the Township of Armour implements economic development strategies and initiatives that will promote and encourage business growth, economic sustainability, and investment within the community. Economic Development is provided in conjunction with ACED (The Almaguin Community Economic Development) which delivers economic development services throughout the Almaguin Highlands Region. The Township of Armour administers Economic Development for 11 partners in the Almaguin Region. Armour takes direction from the ACED Board on how to administer the department.

**Budget Details:**

- **Operating Costs**: $277
- **Revenues**: $(257)
- **Net Levy**: $20
- **FTE's**: -
## Township of Armour

### Municipal Service Profile

#### Regional Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Component</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direct Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Client</td>
<td>A party that receives a service output and a service value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Client</td>
<td>A set of parties that benefits from a service value without receiving the service output directly.</td>
<td>Residents of the Township who benefit from the services provided, Economic development partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Output</td>
<td>The output of a service that fulfills a recognized client’s need.</td>
<td>(1) Linkages between the Township and potential investors, (2) Strategic initiatives, (3) Financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Delivery Model</td>
<td>How the service is predominantly delivered, recognizing that a combination of delivery models may be used.</td>
<td><strong>Shared Service</strong> - Economic development is provided through Planning and Development and is done so with dedicated internal resources, in conjunction with ACED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Service/Process</td>
<td>Basis for Delivery</td>
<td>Delivery Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Economic Development (ACED)</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Share of shared service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>