



2ND ANNUAL NOVA SCOTIA MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Authored by:
**Jamie Newman &
Rick Audas**

© Atlantic Institute for Market Studies
Halifax, Nova Scotia
June 2011



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT US	III
WHY A MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT?	1
WHAT IS THE MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT AND WHAT DOES IT ASSESS?	2
HOW DOES YOUR MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT MEASURE UP OVERALL	4
HOW TO READ THE SUMMARY PERFORMANCE REPORT.....	4
HOW DOES YOUR MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT MEASURE UP ON THEIR SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES	9
MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY CATEGORIES	9
HOW TO READ THE COMPLETE PERFORMANCE REPORT	10
WHAT IS THE MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT IN DETAIL?	21
WHAT IS INCLUDED AND WHY?.....	21
HOW ARE OVERALL AND FINAL GRADES AND RANKS CALCULATED?	29
HOW THE DISTANCE FROM THE AVERAGE TRANSLATES INTO A GRADE?	31
FAQS.....	32
HARD NUMBERS.....	34
HOW TO READ THE HARD NUMBERS DATASETS.....	34



ABOUT US

The Atlantic Institute for Market Studies (AIMS) is an independent, non-partisan, social and economic policy think tank based in Halifax. The Institute was founded by a group of Atlantic Canadians to broaden the debate about the realistic options available to build our economy. AIMS was incorporated as a non-profit corporation under Part II of the *Canada Corporations Act* and was granted charitable registration by Revenue Canada as of October 3, 1994; it recently received US charitable recognition under 501(c)(3) effective the same date.

The Institute's chief objectives include:

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

Board of Directors

Chair: John Risley; *Vice-Chairs:* Dianne Kelderman; Vaughn Sturgeon

Chairman Emeritus: Purdy Crawford; *Past Chair:* John F. Irving

Directors: Charles Cirtwill, Brian Lee Crowley; Stephen Emmerson, Wadih Fares, Greg Grice, Douglas G. Hall, David Hooley, Louis J. Maroun, Don Mills, Perry Newman, Andrew Oland, Peter Oram, Elaine Sibson, Heather Tulk

Treasurer: Martin MacKinnon; *Secretary:* Fae Shaw

President & CEO: Charles R. Cirtwill

Advisory Council

George Bishop, Angus A. Bruneau, George T. H. Cooper, Purdy Crawford, Ivan E. H. Duvar, Peter C. Godsoe, James Gogan, Frederick E. Hyndman, Bernard Imbeault, Phillip R. Knoll, Colin Latham, Hon. Peter Loughheed, Norman Miller, Gerald L. Pond, John Risley, Cedric E. Ritchie, Joseph Shannon, Allan C. Shaw, Paul Sobey

Board of Research Advisors

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

Isabel B. Anderson; Professor J. Colin Dodds, President Saint Mary's University; Professor Charles S. Colgan, Professor Doug May, Memorial University of Newfoundland; Professor James D. McNiven, Dalhousie University; Professor Robert A. Mundell, Nobel Laureate in Economics, 1999

2000 Barrington Street, Suite 1302, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 3K1

Telephone: (902) 429-1143; fax: (902) 425-1393

E-mail: aims@AIMS.ca; Web site: www.AIMS.ca



WHY A MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT?

Municipal governments are responsible for many things that impact us on a daily basis. They dispose of our garbage, supply us with clean water, maintain our parks, trails and roads, and protect our families from fire and crime. These services are not free – we pay for them with our property taxes and, to a certain extent through our income and sales taxes. In doing so, we have the right to know the efficiency and effectiveness with which our municipal governments serve us.

You may say, “I know how good my municipal government is. I live here. I use the services. I am an expert.” You are right, you are an expert on how your municipal government is serving you; however, you likely have little idea about how others are serving its citizens. You may be accustomed to paying a certain amount of taxes and receiving a certain level of services but you may be paying more than your neighbouring communities and receiving worse services. This report informs you of how well your municipal government measures up to other Nova Scotian municipalities. To be clear, this report does not assess the quality of your community or the residents within it.

This is AIMS’ *Second Annual Nova Scotia Municipal Performance Report*. We provide this resource because we know you have little time to look through the amount of information required to fully understand our municipal governments’ performance. We believe this is a problem because, without your informed scrutiny, tax dollars can be wasted and poor services can suffice. When we have access to credible assessments, are interested in how our tax-dollars are being used and are willing to take action to demand better, governments are held accountable and encouraged to improve, where possible.

We encourage everyone to look at this report and understand, in detail, how municipal governments are assessed and then use this information to applaud fine work, when applause is warranted; or, demand better, when the evidence indicates that better could and should be delivered. Know how well your tax dollars are being spent by taking the time to understand the results presented in this report. After all, taxes are forced investment and it is always good to keep an eye on your investments.



WHAT IS THE MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT AND WHAT DOES IT ASSESS?

The *Second Annual Nova Scotia Municipal Performance Report* is a compilation of information from 2006 to 2008. It reveals the performance of municipal governments at fulfilling their responsibilities. We only use information that is provincially comparable, from credible sources and relevant to what is being assessed. We have calculated grades and ranks to make comparison of the fifty-five Nova Scotian municipalities quick and convenient.

We categorize performance into two main categories: **Efficiency** and **Effectiveness**. **Efficiency** examines how municipalities spend their dollars and **Effectiveness** examines the extent to which a service or policy achieves its intended result. We consider municipal governments good when they fulfill their responsibilities at a high-level while limiting costs, which is represented by top ranks and high grades, in this report.

A municipal government's responsibilities are divided into seven categories: **Governance and Finance, Taxation, Safety and Protection, Transportation, Environment, Economic Development, and Recreation and Culture**. We assess governments' ability to fulfill these responsibilities using a number of indicators, which are information about your municipalities that reveal the efficiency or effectiveness of municipal government operations.¹ An average of these indicators is calculated to arrive at an overall Efficiency and Effectiveness score² for each category (e.g. Governance and Finance). The average of all categories Efficiency and Effectiveness scores is used to produce Overall Efficiency and Effectiveness scores. The Overall Efficiency and Effectiveness scores are then averaged to produce the Final grades and ranks.³

We recognize that not all municipal governments have the same opportunities to succeed. To account for this, we consider the context in which municipal governments operate, specifically: the geographic, demographic, wealth and previous municipal financial characteristics that impact municipal government performance. We call these 'Inputs' and use them to predict the performance of each municipal government on each category. The difference between how they actually perform and their predicted performance make up the 'In-Context' grades and ranks.

This being said, we encourage all municipal governments to strive for success regardless of their circumstances, which is why we also provide the actual results unadjusted for

¹ For a description of each indicator, how it was calculated and why it is included follow this link to the [Indicator Description Tables](#)

² Scores are numbers representing the performance of municipalities relative to other municipalities.

³ For an illustration of how the indicators build to overall and Final scores, follow this link to the [Indicator Pyramid](#)



circumstances. This data is used to calculate ‘**Absolute**’ scores, which indicate how your municipality performs based on the hard numbers alone.

We provide a third set of scores that are the average of the ‘**In-Context**’ and ‘**Absolute**’. We call these ‘**Total**’ scores and they represent a melding of our two perspectives: there are circumstances that affect performance that are outside the control of municipal governments; however, this should not prevent them from achieving the best possible for their citizens.

These scores are converted to ranks and grades to present the comparison in a manner that is common to most.

Ranks – indicate the position of the municipal government with regards to its performance with ‘1’ being the highest rank and ‘55’ – if all municipalities are included and none of the lowest ranks have identical scores – being the lowest.

Grades – indicate the level of achievement of the municipal government using a typical School Letter Grading system with ‘A+’ being the best possible grade and ‘F’, the worst. Grades are assigned consistently for all municipalities and represent the relative distance from the average.⁴ In addition to the ranks, grades indicate the distance between subsequent municipalities. Take the top and second ranked municipality, if the top ranked has an ‘A+’ and the second ranked, a ‘B+’ the top ranked is performing significantly better; whereas, when the top ranked gets a ‘B+’ and the second ranked, a ‘B+’, performance is much closer between the two.

This section provides an overview of what the report means. For a deeper understanding of the process to create the report and what is included we encourage you to follow this link to the [What is the Municipal Performance Report in Detail](#) section.

⁴ For a more detailed description of how the grades are calculated follow this link to the [How the Distance from the Average Translates into a Grade](#) section.



HOW DOES YOUR MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT MEASURE UP OVERALL

How your municipal government measures up to all others in Nova Scotia is presented below in the Summary Performance Report. The results provide insight into your municipality's overall performance be it overall Efficiency – keeping costs low, or overall Effectiveness – delivering high quality services. The 'Final' column is the overall rank and grade. These results provide a good overview of whether your municipality can control costs, deliver high-quality services, both or none. Municipalities appear in order of their 'Final' rank with the top overall Nova Scotian municipality appearing first.

HOW TO READ THE SUMMARY PERFORMANCE REPORT

The illustration below describes the various aspects of the Summary Performance Report. Please read the descriptions of each aspect of the table prior to looking at the results to improve your understanding.

The brackets beneath the column titles indicate the number of municipalities with grades and ranks (1st number) and the total number of municipalities in the study (2nd number).

'Final' grades and ranks compare overall performance.

'Absolute' grades and ranks assess performance based solely on the actual results (e.g. the lowest costs achieves the best Efficiency rank and grade).

'Efficiency' grades and ranks assess overall ability to conduct business in a cost-effective manner.

'Effectiveness' grades and ranks the overall ability to satisfy responsibilities.

Municipality	Final (55 of 55)		Type of Score	Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
	G	R		G	R	G	R
Stellarton	B	1	Absolute	B	7	B	8
			In-Context	B	1	B+	2
			Total	B	2	B	3
Parrsboro	B	2	Absolute	B-	11	B	4
			In-Context	B	4	B+	1
			Total	B	7	B	1
Digby County	B	3	Absolute	B	4	B	11
			In-Context	B	9	B	5
			Total	B	3	B	6
Barrington	B	4	Absolute	B	9	B	7
			In-Context	B-	20	B	6
			Total	B	10	B	4

G = Grade, R = Rank, S = Score – only used in the Raw data sets

'In-Context' grades and ranks assess performance adjusted to consider circumstances that municipal governments cannot necessarily control.

'Total' grades and ranks are an average of the 'Absolute' and 'In-Context' scores.

Grades assess the relative ranking of municipalities but unlike 'ranks' they indicate how much better or worse a municipality is than others.

'Ranks' display performance relative to other municipalities. '1' indicates the top rank and '55' (if all municipalities are included), the bottom.



SUMMARY PERFORMANCE REPORT							
Municipality	Final (55 of 55)		Type of Score	Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
	G	R		G	R	G	R
Stellarton	B	1	Absolute	B	7	B	8
			In-Context	B	1	B+	2
			Total	B	2	B	3
Parrsboro	B	2	Absolute	B-	11	B	4
			In-Context	B	4	B+	1
			Total	B	7	B	1
Digby County	B	3	Absolute	B	4	B	11
			In-Context	B	9	B	5
			Total	B	3	B	6
Barrington	B	4	Absolute	B	9	B	7
			In-Context	B-	20	B	6
			Total	B	10	B	4
Antigonish County	B	5	Absolute	B-	13	B	2
			In-Context	B-	38	B+	3
			Total	B-	23	B	2
Cumberland	B	6	Absolute	B	2	B-	19
			In-Context	B	11	B-	25
			Total	B	4	B-	22
Richmond	B	7	Absolute	B-	19	B	3
			In-Context	B-	26	B	9
			Total	B-	19	B	7
Lunenburg County	B	8	Absolute	B	5	B-	16
			In-Context	B	15	B-	23
			Total	B	6	B-	17
Mahone Bay	B-	9	Absolute	B-	26	B	13
			In-Context	B	2	B-	26
			Total	B-	11	B-	15
Hants West	B-	10	Absolute	B	1	C+	36
			In-Context	B	14	B-	34
			Total	B	5	B-	33
Lockeport	B-	11	Absolute	C+	35	B-	15
			In-Context	B	8	B	10
			Total	B-	22	B	11
Halifax Regional Municipality	B-	12	Absolute	B-	21	B	6
			In-Context	B-	27	B-	28
			Total	B-	24	B	12
Truro	B-	13	Absolute	C+	38	B	10
			In-Context	B	13	B-	15
			Total	B-	26	B	10



Municipality	Final (55 of 55)		Type of Score	Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
	G	R		G	R	G	R
Colchester	B-	14	Absolute	B-	16	B-	18
			In-Context	B-	23	B-	18
			Total	B-	14	B-	18
Lunenburg	B-	15	Absolute	C+	43	B	9
			In-Context	B	5	B-	21
			Total	B-	27	B-	13
Chester	B-	16	Absolute	C+	34	B	1
			In-Context	C+	48	B	8
			Total	C+	45	B	5
Inverness County	B-	17	Absolute	B	3	C+	43
			In-Context	B	6	C+	43
			Total	B	1	C+	46
Argyle	B-	18	Absolute	B	8	C+	37
			In-Context	B-	31	B-	31
			Total	B-	12	B-	32
Trenton	B-	19	Absolute	C+	45	B-	20
			In-Context	B-	36	B	4
			Total	C+	43	B	9
Amherst	B-	20	Absolute	B-	27	C+	34
			In-Context	B	10	B-	24
			Total	B-	17	B-	29
Digby	B-	21	Absolute	C+	40	B-	30
			In-Context	B-	16	B	11
			Total	B-	30	B-	20
Bridgewater	B-	22	Absolute	C+	42	B-	17
			In-Context	B-	17	B-	20
			Total	B-	33	B-	19
St. Mary's	B-	23	Absolute	B	10	B-	27
			In-Context	C+	43	B-	36
			Total	B-	20	B-	28
Kings County	B-	24	Absolute	B-	22	B-	24
			In-Context	B-	33	B-	30
			Total	B-	28	B-	26
Annapolis County	B-	25	Absolute	B-	25	B-	21
			In-Context	C+	42	B-	14
			Total	B-	34	B-	16
Shelburne County	B-	26	Absolute	B-	18	B-	28
			In-Context	C+	45	B-	22
			Total	B-	29	B-	25
Hantsport	B-	27	Absolute	C	49	B	5
			In-Context	B-	37	B	13
			Total	C+	48	B	8



Municipality	Final (55 of 55)		Type of Score	Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
	G	R		G	R	G	R
Guysborough County	B-	28	Absolute	C+	46	B-	14
			In-Context	B-	29	B	12
			Total	C+	42	B-	14
Canso	B-	29	Absolute	C+	31	C	54
			In-Context	B	7	B	7
			Total	B-	16	B-	35
Cape Breton Regional Municipality	B-	30	Absolute	B-	15	C+	41
			In-Context	B-	30	B-	33
			Total	B-	18	B-	37
Yarmouth County	B-	31	Absolute	B-	23	B-	23
			In-Context	C+	49	B-	16
			Total	C+	39	B-	21
Kentville	B-	32	Absolute	C+	41	B-	22
			In-Context	B-	24	B-	27
			Total	C+	35	B-	23
Queens Regional Municipality	B-	33	Absolute	C+	30	C+	38
			In-Context	B-	19	B-	35
			Total	B-	25	B-	38
Pictou County	B-	34	Absolute	B	6	C+	50
			In-Context	B-	18	C+	46
			Total	B	9	C+	51
Berwick	B-	35	Absolute	B-	24	B	12
			In-Context	B-	35	C+	52
			Total	B-	31	B-	31
Stewiacke	B-	36	Absolute	C+	32	B-	31
			In-Context	C+	41	B-	29
			Total	C+	38	B-	27
Middleton	B-	37	Absolute	C+	33	B-	32
			In-Context	B	12	C+	50
			Total	B-	21	C+	42
Yarmouth	B-	38	Absolute	C	50	B-	29
			In-Context	B-	25	B-	17
			Total	C+	47	B-	24
Victoria County	B-	39	Absolute	B-	12	C+	46
			In-Context	B-	22	C+	45
			Total	B-	13	C+	49
Hants East	B-	40	Absolute	B-	14	C+	49
			In-Context	B-	28	C+	41
			Total	B-	15	C+	48
Windsor	C+	41	Absolute	C+	36	C+	35
			In-Context	B-	34	C+	40
			Total	C+	37	C+	40



Municipality	Final (55 of 55)		Type of Score	Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
	G	R		G	R	G	R
Springhill	C+	42	Absolute	C+	44	C+	42
			In-Context	B-	40	B-	32
			Total	C+	46	C+	39
Pictou	C+	43	Absolute	C+	37	C+	44
			In-Context	B-	39	B-	38
			Total	C+	41	C+	41
Westville	C+	44	Absolute	C+	28	C+	51
			In-Context	C+	46	B-	37
			Total	C+	40	C+	43
Antigonish	C+	45	Absolute	C+	29	C+	45
			In-Context	B-	32	C+	48
			Total	B-	32	C+	50
Wolfville	C+	46	Absolute	C	53	B-	25
			In-Context	B-	21	C+	44
			Total	C+	49	B-	36
Port Hawkesbury	C+	47	Absolute	C	48	B-	26
			In-Context	C+	47	C+	42
			Total	C+	50	B-	34
Clark's Harbour	C+	48	Absolute	C+	39	C+	48
			In-Context	C+	44	B-	39
			Total	C+	44	C+	44
New Glasgow	C+	49	Absolute	C	51	C+	40
			In-Context	C+	50	B-	19
			Total	C	52	B-	30
Clare	C+	50	Absolute	B-	20	C	52
			In-Context	C+	52	C+	49
			Total	C+	36	C	53
Bridgetown	C	51	Absolute	C	52	C+	47
			In-Context	C+	53	C+	51
			Total	C	53	C+	52
Mulgrave	C	52	Absolute	C-	54	C+	39
			In-Context	C	54	C+	47
			Total	C	54	C+	45
Oxford	C	53	Absolute	C+	47	C	53
			In-Context	C+	51	C-	54
			Total	C+	51	C	54
Shelburne	C	54	Absolute	B-	17	F	55
			In-Context	B	3	D	55
			Total	B	8	D	55
Annapolis Royal	D	55	Absolute	F	55	C+	33
			In-Context	C-	55	C	53
			Total	F	55	C+	47



HOW DOES YOUR MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT MEASURE UP ON THEIR SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES

The Summary Performance Report provides a glimpse into the performance of your municipal governments but does not indicate performance with regards to delivering specific services. Typically, municipal governments have areas where they perform well and areas where they perform poorly. This variation is represented as mediocre overall grades (e.g. Bs and Cs). The more severe fluctuations appear in the Complete Performance Report, which reveal the quality and cost-effectiveness of the municipal services that affect us on a daily basis. These results are telling of where attention should be directed or where exemplary performance should be emulated by other municipal governments.

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY CATEGORIES

The Municipal Government Responsibility Categories represent the typical functions of municipal governments.

Governance and Finance

Governance and Finance assesses a municipal government's ability to keep its administrative and legislative costs low while being able to generate revenue and keep debt manageable. Municipalities with high ranks and grades on this variable are able to generate more revenue and keep lower debts than other municipalities while efficiently conducting their legislative and administrative responsibilities.

Taxation

Taxation assesses tax policy and administration. For Efficiency, we look at the tax burden on people and businesses. For Effectiveness, we look at the value of commercial and residential property. Municipalities with high ranks and grades have manageable tax burdens and high value property.

Safety and Protection

Safety and Protection assesses fire and police services. The costs per capita of police and fire services are used to represent Efficiency. Annual crime rates per 10,000 population and monetary damage caused by fire are used to represent Effectiveness. Municipalities with high ranks and grades have low costs while maintaining low crime rates and low rates of monetary damage caused by fire.

Transportation

Transportation assesses the transportation network. The cost per kilometer of transportation infrastructure is used to assess Efficiency. No provincially comparable information was available to assess Effectiveness of transportation services.



Environment

Environment assesses garbage collection and disposal, water supply and distribution, and sewage diversion. We again look at the cost of each service considering the varying demands on the services across municipalities to assess Efficiency. For Effectiveness, we look at the number of boil water alerts issued, water tests with dangerous levels of bacteria and number of waste water and sewage main backups. Municipalities with high ranks and grades keep costs low while maintaining clean drinking water and functional sewage infrastructure.

Economic Development

Economic Development assesses the ability to stimulate economic activity. The costs per capita for planning and zoning and community development services are used to represent Efficiency. The population growth overall and of immigrants is used to assess Effectiveness. Municipalities with high ranks and grades keep costs low while inducing demographic growth which typically indicates economic growth.

Recreation and Culture

Recreation and Culture assesses trails, parks, libraries and other recreation and cultural facilities. The cost of recreation and cultural services per capita is used to represent Efficiency. No provincially comparable information was available to assess Effectiveness of recreation and cultural services.

HOW TO READ THE COMPLETE PERFORMANCE REPORT

To understand how to read this report, please refer to the [How to Read the Summary Performance Report](#) illustration. The design and components are the same with a few exceptions:

Some municipalities did not have enough information available to assign grades and ranks. We consider these results to be not applicable which is represented by ‘n/a’s in the table.⁵ We were unable to collect any provincially comparable indicators for two categories: Transportation Effectiveness and Recreation and Culture Effectiveness.

There is no overall grade and rank to sort municipalities by performance – as is done for the Summary Performance Report. The results are presented in alphabetical order.

Multiple categories are included in the same row. The colours indicate which grades and ranks belong to which category. There are two parts: the first containing Governance and Finance, Taxation and Economic Development and the second, Safety and Protection, Transportation, Environment, and Recreation and Culture.

⁵ To understand the decisions made regarding inclusion of grades and ranks based on the number of indicators required, please follow this link to the [Indicator Pyramid](#)



COMPLETE PERFORMANCE REPORT - PART 1

Municipality		Governance and Finance				Taxation				Economic Development			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
Amherst	Absolute	B-	15	B	21	B	13	C+	37	C+	36	B	12
	In-Context	B	14	B	8	B-	29	B-	28	C+	40	B+	7
	Total	B-	13	B	6	B-	19	C+	33	C+	40	B	18
Annapolis County	Absolute	B-	11	C-	51	C	49	C+	38	C+	41	B+	10
	In-Context	B-	22	B-	36	B-	28	B-	29	C+	39	B+	8
	Total	B-	15	B-	38	C+	44	C+	36	C+	39	B-	20
Annapolis Royal	Absolute	F	55	A+	1	C+	37	A+	1	F	55	F	52
	In-Context	D	50	B	5	A+	1	B	13	F	55	F	55
	Total	F	54	B+	4	B+	4	A+	2	F	55	F	55
Antigonish	Absolute	C+	31	B	23	B	5	A	4	B-	31	F	55
	In-Context	C+	33	C-	53	B+	3	A-	2	B	22	F	54
	Total	C+	34	C-	51	B+	7	A	3	B	22	D	53
Antigonish County	Absolute	C+	32	D	53	B-	19	B	16	B-	29	A	2
	In-Context	C+	41	B	19	B	10	B+	5	C	49	A-	5
	Total	C+	37	B-	29	B	12	B+	13	C	49	B	7
Argyle	Absolute	B-	10	C-	50	B	11	B-	29	B	11	D	48
	In-Context	B-	26	B	11	B-	19	B-	18	B-	33	C-	47
	Total	B-	18	B-	15	B	15	B-	25	B-	33	C+	43
Barrington	Absolute	B-	16	C	42	B-	26	B-	30	B	10	C+	28
	In-Context	C+	40	C	51	B-	21	B-	26	B	21	B	15
	Total	C+	25	C-	52	B-	26	B-	27	B	21	B	16
Berwick	Absolute	C+	20	B-	32	C+	40	C	50	B	20	A-	3
	In-Context	B	13	B	12	C-	54	C	52	C+	42	B	18
	Total	B-	20	B	13	C	51	C	52	C+	42	B	10
Bridgetown	Absolute	F	54	B	24	C-	51	C	49	C	44	F	50
	In-Context	F	55	B-	32	B-	34	C+	45	C+	43	F	52
	Total	F	55	B-	21	C+	45	C+	46	C+	43	C-	51
Bridgewater	Absolute	C+	28	A-	12	C+	36	B-	22	B-	26	B	14
	In-Context	B-	17	B-	38	C+	47	C+	49	B+	9	B+	12
	Total	B-	22	B-	33	C+	39	C+	34	B+	9	B	5
Canso	Absolute	C-	42	B	27	B	9	D	55	B-	33	F	54
	In-Context	C+	39	B+	3	B	11	C-	55	A+	2	B	19
	Total	C	41	B	5	B	10	C-	55	A+	2	B-	32



Municipality		Governance and Finance				Taxation				Economic Development			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
Cape Breton Regional Municipality	Absolute	B-	14	C+	38	B-	22	C+	42	B	5	C	38
	In-Context	B-	23	B-	35	B-	26	B-	22	B-	32	B-	29
	Total	B-	19	B-	42	B-	24	C+	35	B-	32	B-	28
Chester	Absolute	C+	26	B	25	C+	38	A-	9	B-	28	B-	21
	In-Context	C+	37	B	4	C+	46	B-	19	B	15	B+	9
	Total	C+	32	B+	2	C+	42	B+	10	B	15	B	12
Clare	Absolute	B-	17	C-	49	B-	24	B-	25	F	54	C-	44
	In-Context	C+	38	B-	24	B-	27	B-	17	F	54	C+	36
	Total	C+	24	B-	28	B-	28	B-	22	F	54	D	54
Clark's Harbour	Absolute	F	52	B	29	B	6	C+	34	C-	48	F	53
	In-Context	F	54	B	9	B	9	C+	39	C	50	C-	49
	Total	F	53	B	14	B	8	C+	39	C	50	D	52
Colchester	Absolute	B	3	C	43	B-	25	C	48	B+	3	B+	11
	In-Context	B	9	B-	26	B-	22	C+	46	B	23	B	21
	Total	B	4	B-	24	B-	23	C+	45	B	23	B	6
Cumberland	Absolute	B-	13	C	44	C+	33	B	19	C+	40	C+	31
	In-Context	B-	24	B-	43	C+	43	B-	21	C+	48	B-	24
	Total	B-	17	C+	46	C+	36	B-	20	C+	48	C+	39
Digby	Absolute	D	48	A-	14	C+	41	B-	31	B-	34	C+	29
	In-Context	C	45	B	14	C+	42	B-	31	B+	10	B	17
	Total	C-	47	B	11	C+	40	B-	30	B+	10	B-	22
Digby County	Absolute	B	8	C-	47	C+	35	B-	21	B	7	B-	20
	In-Context	B	12	B	15	B-	30	B	10	B	16	B+	10
	Total	B	8	B-	16	B-	31	B	14	B	16	B	9
Guysborough County	Absolute	D	46	A+	2	A	1	A-	7	D	52	C-	45
	In-Context	B-	20	B	6	B+	4	B	9	C+	41	C	43
	Total	C	39	B-	25	A-	1	B+	6	C+	41	C-	49
Halifax Regional Municipality	Absolute	B	4	A	11	B	12	B	14	C+	39	B+	7
	In-Context	B-	28	B-	31	B-	33	B-	24	B-	34	B-	25
	Total	B-	11	B	10	B-	22	B-	18	B-	34	B-	21
Hants East	Absolute	C+	29	C	46	C+	39	C	45	B	22	C+	24
	In-Context	B-	31	C+	49	C+	40	C+	42	B-	31	C+	37
	Total	C+	30	C	49	C+	37	C+	43	B-	31	B-	31



Municipality		Governance and Finance				Taxation				Economic Development			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
Hants West	Absolute	B-	12	D	54	B	15	C+	43	B	19	B	17
	In-Context	B-	21	B-	37	B-	25	C+	40	B-	30	B	16
	Total	B-	14	C+	45	B-	20	C+	42	B-	30	B	14
Hantsport	Absolute	D	47	A+	3	B+	4	A+	2	B	16	A-	5
	In-Context	B-	30	B-	28	B+	5	A	1	A-	7	B	22
	Total	C	40	B-	40	B+	6	A+	1	A-	7	B+	3
Inverness County	Absolute	B	5	C-	48	C	45	B-	24	B	8	C	39
	In-Context	B	8	B-	42	C+	41	B	12	B	19	C+	41
	Total	B	5	C+	47	C+	47	B	16	B	19	B-	33
Kentville	Absolute	C	36	A-	15	B-	30	B-	20	C+	35	B	18
	In-Context	B-	18	B	21	C+	49	C+	47	B	17	B-	30
	Total	C+	36	B-	26	C+	38	B-	32	B	17	B-	23
Kings County	Absolute	B	7	C-	52	C+	34	C+	39	B	23	B-	23
	In-Context	B-	27	B-	34	B-	36	C+	44	B-	36	B-	27
	Total	B-	12	B-	34	B-	33	C+	41	B-	36	B-	24
Lockeport	Absolute	F	53	A	10	B-	16	B-	28	B+	4	A-	4
	In-Context	D	52	B-	30	A	2	B-	16	A+	1	A-	4
	Total	F	52	B-	27	B+	5	B-	23	A+	1	A-	2
Lunenburg	Absolute	C+	25	A+	5	C	46	A-	8	C+	37	C+	25
	In-Context	B+	1	B-	39	B-	35	B	11	A-	6	C-	46
	Total	B	9	B-	41	C+	41	B+	7	A-	6	B-	35
Lunenburg County	Absolute	B	2	C	45	B-	17	A-	6	B	18	C+	33
	In-Context	B-	16	B-	25	B	12	A-	3	B-	28	C+	32
	Total	B	6	B-	19	B	14	A-	5	B-	28	B-	30
Mahone Bay	Absolute	C	37	A+	6	C-	55	A	5	C	45	C	40
	In-Context	B	11	C+	45	C+	39	B	14	B+	8	C-	48
	Total	C+	31	B-	23	C	50	B+	8	B+	8	C+	41
Middleton	Absolute	C+	21	B+	19	B-	31	C+	41	C-	49	B-	19
	In-Context	B+	5	C+	47	B	13	C	51	C	53	C+	38
	Total	B-	10	B-	39	B-	29	C+	47	C	53	C	45
Mulgrave	Absolute	F	50	A	9	A-	2	B-	23	B+	2	C	36
	In-Context	C-	48	B-	22	B+	6	B	15	A	4	C	45
	Total	D	50	B-	22	B+	2	B-	21	A	4	B	17



Municipality		Governance and Finance				Taxation				Economic Development			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
New Glasgow	Absolute	C+	23	B	26	B-	20	C+	33	B-	30	C	37
	In-Context	B-	25	B-	27	B-	31	B-	25	B-	27	B-	28
	Total	B-	23	B-	32	B-	25	B-	29	B-	27	B-	37
Oxford	Absolute	C-	39	B+	16	B	7	B+	12	B-	27	D	49
	In-Context	C+	36	B-	29	B-	24	B	8	B-	29	F	53
	Total	C	38	B-	37	B	13	B+	12	B-	29	C	48
Parrsboro	Absolute	D	44	B-	30	C	44	C	44	B-	32	A+	1
	In-Context	C+	42	B+	2	B	14	B-	32	B+	12	A+	1
	Total	C	44	B+	3	C+	35	C+	40	B+	12	A	1
Pictou	Absolute	F	51	B-	33	C-	53	C	52	B	21	C+	34
	In-Context	F	53	B	16	C	53	C+	38	B	25	C+	40
	Total	F	51	B-	17	C-	54	C	49	B	25	B-	34
Pictou County	Absolute	B	1	D	55	B-	23	C+	36	B	6	C-	43
	In-Context	B	7	B-	41	B	18	C+	34	B	24	C	44
	Total	B	2	C+	44	B-	17	C+	38	B	24	C+	38
Port Hawkesbury	Absolute	D	45	A	8	B-	18	B	17	B-	25	C+	35
	In-Context	D	51	D	55	B-	23	B+	4	C+	46	D	50
	Total	D	48	C-	53	B-	21	B+	11	C+	46	C+	44
Queens Regional Municipality	Absolute	B-	9	B+	20	B-	29	B	15	D	51	D	47
	In-Context	B+	3	C+	48	B-	38	C+	35	C	51	C+	31
	Total	B	3	B-	35	B-	30	B-	24	C	51	C-	50
Richmond	Absolute	C-	40	B-	36	A-	3	A	3	C	42	C+	27
	In-Context	C	44	B-	40	B	8	B+	6	B-	26	B+	11
	Total	C	42	B-	30	B+	3	A-	4	B-	26	B-	27
Shelburne	Absolute	C	35	B+	18	B	14	B-	32	B	15	D	46
	In-Context	B	15	B	20	B	7	B-	30	A	3	C+	39
	Total	C+	28	B-	18	B	9	B-	31	A	3	B-	26
Shelburne County	Absolute	C+	24	C	40	C-	52	B	18	B	9	B	13
	In-Context	C+	35	D	54	C-	55	B-	20	B+	11	A-	3
	Total	C+	27	D	55	C-	55	B-	19	B+	11	B+	4
Springhill	Absolute	B-	19	B	28	C	47	C-	54	B	24	B	15
	In-Context	B-	19	B-	33	C	52	C	53	B	20	A-	6
	Total	B-	21	B-	43	C	52	C-	54	B	20	B	8



Municipality		Governance and Finance				Taxation				Economic Development			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
St. Mary's	Absolute	C-	38	B-	34	B	10	B+	13	B	13	C+	32
	In-Context	C	47	C	50	B-	32	B-	23	B	13	B	20
	Total	C-	45	C	50	B-	18	B	15	B	13	B	15
Stellarton	Absolute	B	6	B-	31	B-	21	C	46	C+	38	B+	8
	In-Context	B+	2	C-	52	B	17	C+	43	B-	37	A-	2
	Total	B	1	C-	54	B-	16	C+	44	B-	37	B	11
Stewiacke	Absolute	C-	43	B-	35	C+	42	C	51	B	14	B	16
	In-Context	C+	43	B-	23	C+	44	C+	50	B	14	B-	26
	Total	C	43	B-	36	C+	43	C	51	B	14	B	13
Trenton	Absolute	F	49	B+	17	B-	28	C	47	C	46	B-	22
	In-Context	C	46	A-	1	C+	45	C+	48	C+	38	B+	13
	Total	D	49	B+	1	C+	34	C	48	C+	38	B-	29
Truro	Absolute	B-	18	A-	13	B-	27	B-	26	C-	47	B+	6
	In-Context	B+	4	B	18	B-	20	C+	37	C+	47	B+	14
	Total	B	7	B	12	B-	27	B-	28	C+	47	B-	25
Victoria County	Absolute	C+	27	C+	37	C	50	C+	40	B+	1	C	42
	In-Context	C+	34	B	10	C	51	C	54	A-	5	C+	33
	Total	C+	29	B	7	C	53	C	50	A-	5	B-	19
Westville	Absolute	C+	30	C	39	C	43	C-	53	B	17	F	51
	In-Context	C+	32	B	17	C	50	C+	41	B-	35	D	51
	Total	C+	33	B-	20	C	48	C	53	B-	35	C	47
Windsor	Absolute	C+	22	B	22	B-	32	B-	27	C	43	C+	26
	In-Context	B	6	C+	44	B-	37	B-	27	C+	45	C+	34
	Total	B-	16	C+	48	B-	32	B-	26	C+	45	C+	40
Wolfville	Absolute	C	34	A	7	C-	54	B+	11	F	53	B+	9
	In-Context	B	10	C+	46	B	16	C+	36	C+	44	C+	35
	Total	C+	26	B-	31	C+	46	B	17	C+	44	C+	42
Yarmouth	Absolute	C	33	A+	4	B	8	B+	10	D	50	C+	30
	In-Context	B-	29	B	13	B	15	B+	7	C	52	B-	23
	Total	C+	35	B	8	B	11	B+	9	C	52	C	46
Yarmouth County	Absolute	C-	41	C	41	C	48	C+	35	B	12	C	41
	In-Context	C-	49	B	7	C+	48	C+	33	B	18	C+	42
	Total	C-	46	B	9	C	49	C+	37	B	18	B-	36



COMPLETE PERFORMANCE REPORT - PART 2

Municipality		Safety & Protection				Transportation				Environment				Recreation & Culture			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (47 of 55)		Efficiency (52 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)		Efficiency (39 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
Amherst	Absolute	F	52	C+	40	B-	33	n/a	n/a	B+	7	C	47	B-	26	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	50	B-	27	A-	1	n/a	n/a	B	9	C-	46	B+	7	n/a	n/a
	Total	C-	51	C+	36	B	9	n/a	n/a	B	9	C-	46	B	15	n/a	n/a
Annapolis County	Absolute	A-	4	B-	16	B+	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	32	C-	44	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	33	B-	36	B	19	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	18	D	52	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	13	B-	26	B	13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	29	D	50	n/a	n/a
Annapolis Royal	Absolute	F	55	B-	19	C+	44	n/a	n/a	F	39	F	54	D	48	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	F	55	B+	4	F	51	n/a	n/a	F	39	C-	48	A-	6	n/a	n/a
	Total	F	55	B	7	C-	48	n/a	n/a	F	39	F	54	C+	33	n/a	n/a
Antigonish	Absolute	B-	25	C+	33	B-	40	n/a	n/a	C	36	B	25	C+	29	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B+	4	B	8	C	47	n/a	n/a	D	37	B-	29	B-	22	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	14	B-	20	C+	44	n/a	n/a	D	37	B	26	B-	30	n/a	n/a
Antigonish County	Absolute	B+	10	B	6	B	21	n/a	n/a	C+	32	B	28	B	16	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	41	B+	6	B-	25	n/a	n/a	C+	34	B	15	B-	21	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	25	B+	4	B	23	n/a	n/a	C+	34	B	24	B	17	n/a	n/a
Argyle	Absolute	A-	2	n/a	n/a	C	46	n/a	n/a	B-	19	B	1	A-	5	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B+	6	n/a	n/a	D	49	n/a	n/a	B-	24	B	20	B-	20	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	1	n/a	n/a	C-	49	n/a	n/a	B-	24	B	15	B+	10	n/a	n/a
Barrington	Absolute	B	13	A+	1	B	24	n/a	n/a	B	15	B	1	B	19	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	14	A+	2	C+	37	n/a	n/a	B	13	B+	3	B-	33	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	9	A+	2	B-	31	n/a	n/a	B	13	B+	3	B-	23	n/a	n/a
Berwick	Absolute	C+	36	n/a	n/a	B-	38	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	22	B-	27	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	30	n/a	n/a	B+	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F	53	C+	42	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	31	n/a	n/a	B	24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	43	C+	35	n/a	n/a
Bridgetown	Absolute	C+	33	B	8	B+	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C+	41	C+	28	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	51	B+	5	B	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	44	B+	13	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	46	B	5	B+	7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	42	B-	21	n/a	n/a
Bridgewater	Absolute	D	50	C+	38	C+	41	n/a	n/a	B	8	B	1	D	46	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	43	C+	38	B	22	n/a	n/a	A-	2	B+	10	C+	45	n/a	n/a
	Total	C-	49	C+	39	B-	37	n/a	n/a	A-	2	B+	9	C	46	n/a	n/a
Canso	Absolute	C+	35	n/a	n/a	B+	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	C	38	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	17	n/a	n/a	B-	32	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	A+	1	B-	37	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	28	n/a	n/a	B	19	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	A-	1	C+	39	n/a	n/a



Municipality		Safety & Protection				Transportation				Environment				Recreation & Culture			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (47 of 55)		Efficiency (52 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)		Efficiency (39 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
Cape Breton Regional Municipality	Absolute	B-	30	B-	23	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	32	B-	25	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	37	B-	35	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	32	B-	36	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	35	B-	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	33	B-	28	n/a	n/a
Chester	Absolute	F	54	B-	27	B	28	n/a	n/a	B	11	B	22	B-	23	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	D	54	B-	30	C+	36	n/a	n/a	B+	7	B	19	C	48	n/a	n/a
	Total	F	54	B-	32	B-	32	n/a	n/a	B+	7	B	19	C+	37	n/a	n/a
Clare	Absolute	B	14	n/a	n/a	B+	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F	53	B+	10	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	19	n/a	n/a	C+	41	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F	52	B-	30	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	12	n/a	n/a	B-	27	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F	52	B	14	n/a	n/a
Clark's Harbour	Absolute	B	21	n/a	n/a	B	18	n/a	n/a	C	35	B	1	B+	9	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	A-	2	n/a	n/a	B-	24	n/a	n/a	C-	36	B	21	B+	8	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	7	n/a	n/a	B	20	n/a	n/a	C-	36	B	16	B+	7	n/a	n/a
Colchester	Absolute	B+	7	B-	20	C-	48	n/a	n/a	C+	28	B	20	B-	22	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	22	B-	28	C	43	n/a	n/a	B-	22	B	23	B-	29	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	10	B-	25	C	46	n/a	n/a	B-	22	B	20	B-	25	n/a	n/a
Cumberland	Absolute	B+	11	B	11	A-	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	A+	2	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	15	B	12	B+	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	34	A-	5	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	8	B	11	B+	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	25	A	3	n/a	n/a
Digby	Absolute	C+	37	C+	31	B-	35	n/a	n/a	B-	21	B-	31	C	36	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	A-	1	B-	31	B-	23	n/a	n/a	C+	29	B+	7	B+	11	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	16	B-	33	B-	29	n/a	n/a	C+	29	B	23	B-	26	n/a	n/a
Digby County	Absolute	B	15	B+	5	A-	1	n/a	n/a	B	9	B	1	A-	7	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	32	B	10	B-	27	n/a	n/a	B	12	B+	8	B+	12	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	22	B	6	B	10	n/a	n/a	B	12	B+	7	B+	6	n/a	n/a
Guysborough County	Absolute	C+	42	B+	4	B	20	n/a	n/a	F	38	B	1	C+	35	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	47	B-	21	B	13	n/a	n/a	B-	26	B+	11	C+	43	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	47	B	9	B	14	n/a	n/a	B-	26	B+	10	C+	38	n/a	n/a
Halifax Regional Municipality	Absolute	C+	41	B-	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	14	B-	30	C+	33	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	31	B-	22	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	25	B-	35	B-	28	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	36	B-	28	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	25	B-	31	C+	32	n/a	n/a
Hants East	Absolute	B	18	C	42	B	22	n/a	n/a	B-	27	C+	38	B+	11	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	38	C	44	B	14	n/a	n/a	C+	28	B-	28	B	18	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	27	C	43	B	16	n/a	n/a	C+	28	B-	34	B	12	n/a	n/a



Municipality		Safety & Protection				Transportation				Environment				Recreation & Culture			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (47 of 55)		Efficiency (52 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)		Efficiency (39 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
Hants West	Absolute	A-	3	B	13	B+	8	n/a	n/a	B-	17	C	43	A-	3	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B+	8	B-	20	B	9	n/a	n/a	B-	23	C+	39	B	19	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	2	B	14	B+	5	n/a	n/a	B-	23	C	41	B+	8	n/a	n/a
Hantsport	Absolute	C	47	C+	35	C-	47	n/a	n/a	B	12	C	45	F	55	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	23	B	9	C	45	n/a	n/a	B	14	D	51	F	55	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	42	B-	21	C-	47	n/a	n/a	B	14	C-	48	F	55	n/a	n/a
Inverness County	Absolute	B+	6	B-	21	B	29	n/a	n/a	B	16	C-	49	A+	1	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	26	B-	34	B-	34	n/a	n/a	B	19	C-	47	A	2	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	11	B-	27	B-	33	n/a	n/a	B	19	C-	49	A+	1	n/a	n/a
Kentville	Absolute	C	45	C+	30	B-	37	n/a	n/a	C+	29	B	29	C-	42	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	16	B	11	B-	28	n/a	n/a	B	20	B-	27	C+	41	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	33	B-	23	B-	36	n/a	n/a	B	20	B	28	C	43	n/a	n/a
Kings County	Absolute	B+	12	B-	22	D	50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	B	20	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	34	B-	32	B	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	24	C+	44	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	21	B-	29	C	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	18	B-	29	n/a	n/a
Lockeport	Absolute	B-	31	C+	36	B+	16	n/a	n/a	B+	6	B-	32	D	47	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	48	B-	23	C+	35	n/a	n/a	A-	3	B	22	B-	31	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	43	C+	34	B-	26	n/a	n/a	A-	3	B-	30	C	44	n/a	n/a
Lunenburg	Absolute	C	46	B	14	B-	39	n/a	n/a	B-	22	B	1	C-	43	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	24	B	13	B-	33	n/a	n/a	B	15	B+	6	B-	26	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	41	B	12	B-	38	n/a	n/a	B	15	B+	6	C+	40	n/a	n/a
Lunenburg County	Absolute	B	17	B-	28	B+	15	n/a	n/a	C+	30	B-	36	A-	8	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	20	C+	40	B	6	n/a	n/a	C+	32	B-	37	B	16	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	19	C+	35	B	8	n/a	n/a	C+	32	B-	36	B+	9	n/a	n/a
Mahone Bay	Absolute	C+	39	C+	34	B	32	n/a	n/a	B+	3	B	1	A-	4	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	45	B	17	C	44	n/a	n/a	A	1	A-	2	A+	1	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	45	B-	30	C+	42	n/a	n/a	A	1	B+	2	A	2	n/a	n/a
Middleton	Absolute	B-	27	B-	29	B	26	n/a	n/a	B-	18	C+	40	C+	30	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	28	B	16	B	12	n/a	n/a	B+	8	C-	49	B+	10	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	30	B-	22	B	17	n/a	n/a	B+	8	C	44	B-	22	n/a	n/a
Mulgrave	Absolute	C+	38	n/a	n/a	F	52	n/a	n/a	B-	25	C	44	F	53	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	40	n/a	n/a	F	52	n/a	n/a	C+	30	C-	50	F	53	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	44	n/a	n/a	F	52	n/a	n/a	C+	30	C-	47	F	54	n/a	n/a



Municipality		Safety & Protection				Transportation				Environment				Recreation & Culture			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (47 of 55)		Efficiency (52 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)		Efficiency (39 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
New Glasgow	Absolute	F	53	C	44	F	51	n/a	n/a	B-	23	B	25	D	49	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	46	C+	37	C-	48	n/a	n/a	C+	35	B+	12	C	47	n/a	n/a
	Total	C-	50	C+	42	D	51	n/a	n/a	C+	35	B	17	C-	48	n/a	n/a
Oxford	Absolute	C-	48	C-	46	C+	42	n/a	n/a	B-	20	D	51	F	52	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	D	53	C-	46	C+	39	n/a	n/a	A-	4	F	54	F	54	n/a	n/a
	Total	D	53	C-	46	C+	43	n/a	n/a	A-	4	F	53	F	53	n/a	n/a
Parrsboro	Absolute	A-	1	C-	45	B+	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	A-	6	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	18	C	43	B	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	16	A	3	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	4	C	45	B+	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	12	A-	4	n/a	n/a
Pictou	Absolute	B	23	B-	24	B+	7	n/a	n/a	B+	5	C	42	C-	41	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	13	B	18	B+	2	n/a	n/a	B	17	C+	40	C+	38	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	18	B-	19	B+	1	n/a	n/a	B	17	C+	40	C	42	n/a	n/a
Pictou County	Absolute	B	22	B	10	B-	34	n/a	n/a	B	13	D	50	B+	15	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	49	B-	25	B-	30	n/a	n/a	B	11	C-	45	B-	27	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	32	B-	15	B-	35	n/a	n/a	B	11	C-	50	B	16	n/a	n/a
Port Hawkesbury	Absolute	B-	28	A-	3	B-	36	n/a	n/a	C	33	C+	39	F	54	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	44	A-	3	B	20	n/a	n/a	B-	27	C+	38	C+	39	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	37	A-	3	B-	28	n/a	n/a	B-	27	C+	38	D	51	n/a	n/a
Queens Regional Municipality	Absolute	B	19	B	9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	26	C	46	B-	24	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	11	B	15	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	18	B-	31	B-	25	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	15	B	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	18	C+	39	B-	24	n/a	n/a
Richmond	Absolute	B	16	B	12	B	23	n/a	n/a	C	34	B	19	B+	12	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	29	B-	29	B	21	n/a	n/a	C+	31	B	25	B-	23	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	23	B-	17	B	18	n/a	n/a	C+	31	B	22	B	13	n/a	n/a
Shelburne	Absolute	B-	24	C-	47	B	17	n/a	n/a	B+	4	F	55	C-	40	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B+	9	D	47	C+	38	n/a	n/a	B+	5	F	55	B-	24	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	17	D	47	B-	30	n/a	n/a	B+	5	F	55	C+	36	n/a	n/a
Shelburne County	Absolute	B+	9	B-	17	A-	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	C+	31	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B+	5	B-	33	C+	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	13	C-	50	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	3	B-	24	B	22	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	11	C	45	n/a	n/a
Springhill	Absolute	D	51	C+	32	B+	13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	32	C	39	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C	52	C+	41	B	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	30	C+	40	n/a	n/a
	Total	C-	52	C+	38	B	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	32	C	41	n/a	n/a



Municipality		Safety & Protection				Transportation				Environment				Recreation & Culture			
		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (47 of 55)		Efficiency (52 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)		Efficiency (39 of 55)		Effectiveness (55 of 55)		Efficiency (55 of 55)		Effectiveness (0 of 55)	
		G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R
St. Mary's	Absolute	B+	5	n/a	n/a	B	19	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	B	18	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	12	n/a	n/a	C	46	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	36	C	46	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	5	n/a	n/a	B-	39	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	27	B-	31	n/a	n/a
Stellarton	Absolute	B-	26	A+	2	B	27	n/a	n/a	A-	2	B	1	B+	14	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B+	7	A+	1	B	7	n/a	n/a	B+	6	B+	5	A-	4	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	24	A+	1	B	15	n/a	n/a	B+	6	B+	4	B+	5	n/a	n/a
Stewiacke	Absolute	B+	8	n/a	n/a	C-	49	n/a	n/a	B-	24	B	1	B	21	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	10	n/a	n/a	F	50	n/a	n/a	C+	33	B	26	B	17	n/a	n/a
	Total	B+	6	n/a	n/a	D	50	n/a	n/a	C+	33	B	21	B	18	n/a	n/a
Trenton	Absolute	C+	40	B-	25	B+	9	n/a	n/a	A-	1	B	20	F	50	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	A-	3	B+	7	B	8	n/a	n/a	B	16	B+	4	C-	49	n/a	n/a
	Total	B	20	B	13	B+	4	n/a	n/a	B	16	B+	5	D	52	n/a	n/a
Truro	Absolute	B-	32	C+	37	C+	43	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	C	37	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B	21	C+	39	B	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B+	9	B	14	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	29	C+	40	B-	34	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B+	8	B-	27	n/a	n/a
Victoria County	Absolute	C+	34	C+	39	B+	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	48	B+	13	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	42	C+	42	B-	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	42	B	15	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	40	C+	41	B	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	C	45	B+	11	n/a	n/a
Westville	Absolute	B-	29	B-	18	A-	4	n/a	n/a	C-	37	B	24	C+	32	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	C+	39	B	19	B+	4	n/a	n/a	D	38	B	14	B-	32	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	34	B-	16	B+	3	n/a	n/a	D	38	B	14	C+	34	n/a	n/a
Windsor	Absolute	C+	43	C	41	B	30	n/a	n/a	B	10	B	27	D	45	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	27	B-	24	B	15	n/a	n/a	B-	21	C+	41	C-	51	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	38	C+	37	B	21	n/a	n/a	B-	21	B-	37	C-	49	n/a	n/a
Wolfville	Absolute	C	44	B-	15	B	25	n/a	n/a	C+	31	F	52	F	51	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	25	B-	26	B-	31	n/a	n/a	B	10	C	43	B-	35	n/a	n/a
	Total	C+	39	B-	18	B-	25	n/a	n/a	B	10	C-	51	C-	47	n/a	n/a
Yarmouth	Absolute	D	49	C	43	C+	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	37	C+	34	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	35	C	45	B-	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	33	B+	9	n/a	n/a
	Total	C	48	C	44	C+	41	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B-	35	B-	19	n/a	n/a
Yarmouth County	Absolute	B	20	B	7	B	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	1	B	17	n/a	n/a
	In-Context	B-	36	B	14	C	42	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	17	B-	34	n/a	n/a
	Total	B-	26	B	8	C+	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	B	13	B-	20	n/a	n/a



WHAT IS THE MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT IN DETAIL?

A summary of how the report is created and what's included is provided above. Now that you have looked through the results, you may have some additional questions that were not answered in the description up front. Even if you don't have unanswered questions, we encourage you to look through this to gain a deeper understanding of the results.

WHAT IS INCLUDED AND WHY?

The Indicator Description Tables identify the indicators comprising each category, where the information was collected and why the indicator is included. These are important resources for gaining insight into specifically what this report assesses. Efficiency and effectiveness are typical categories for assessing any service provider; it is the individual indicators that reveal how this report is tailored to assess municipal governments and their specific responsibilities. Also it is important to understand why we believe each indicator is important so you can assess for yourself the legitimacy of each category and ultimately the overall grades and ranks.

The first column identifies the category, the second column lists the indicators that comprise each, the third, describes the indicator including how it was calculated, the fourth, identifies where the indicator came from and the fifth, why it was included. The brackets in the second column indicate the years the information represents. If there are no brackets, the information represents 2006-2008.



INPUTS				
	Indicator	What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?
People and Place	Population	Total population of the municipality	2006 Census	All inputs are included to consider different challenges or opportunities facing or enjoyed by municipalities due to their circumstances. Considering these circumstances focuses assessment on only aspects of performance for which Municipal governments can directly control. All of these inputs are used to contextually adjust scores represented by the In-Context scores.
	Area of Municipality	Total area in square kms of the municipality	2006 Census	
	Dwelling Count	Total number of dwellings within the municipality	2006 Census	
	Dwelling Density	Number of dwellings divided by total area	2006 Census	
	Dependency Ratio	The number of dependents (0-19 and 65+ years of age) for every 100 of the working population (20 - 64). The top-ranked municipality has the highest dependency ratio.	2006 Census	
	Immigrants	Proportion of immigrants to total population	2006 Census	
	Municipal Roads	Total number of kms of municipal roads within the municipality	n/a	
	Snowfall	Average amount of snowfall per year in cms	n/a	
	Traffic Volumes	Amount of cars travelling the municipal roads on a regular basis	n/a	
SES	Socio-Economic Status	A number of characteristics indicating the relative wealth (human and economic capital) of residents.	2006 Census	
Financial History	Revenues (04-05)	Total annual revenue per capita for years prior to the assessment period	NS Municipal Relations Database	
	Debt (04-05)	Total capital debt per capita for years prior to the assessment period	NS Municipal Relations Database	
	Commercial Tax Assessment (04-05)	Total non-residential property tax assessment per capita for years prior to the assessment period	NS Municipal Relations Database	
	Total Tax Assessment (04-05)	Total property tax assessment per capita for two years prior to the assessment period	NS Municipal Relations Database	
	Transfers	Amount of revenue transferred from other sources per year per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	
	Own Source Revenue	Amount of annual revenue from own sources (e.g. property taxes)	n/a	
	Capital Assets	Total value of all property or other capital assets	n/a	



Performance Indicators / Outcomes

The Performance Indicators / Outcomes are used to directly assess the performance of municipalities.

GOVERNANCE & FINANCE				
Indicator		What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?
Efficiency	Administrative Costs	Total annual administrative costs per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	An efficient municipality keeps costs as low as possible to administer municipal services
	Change in Admin Costs	Change in administrative costs from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Legislative Costs	Total annual legislative costs per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	An efficient municipality keeps costs as low as possible to create municipal legislation
	Change in Leg Costs	Change in legislative costs from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Municipal Staff	Population per municipal staff member	n/a	Salaries constitute a portion of municipal expenditure. Municipalities that can conduct the functions with a low number of staff are efficient
	Councillors	Population per councillor	Municipality Websites	Salaries constitute a portion of municipal expenditure. Municipalities that can conduct their functions with a low number of councillors are efficient
Effectiveness	Revenues	Total annual revenue of the municipality per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	All municipal functions rely on revenue; this outcome assesses a municipality's ability to generate revenue
	Change in Revenues	Total capital debt of the municipality per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Debt	Total outstanding debt of the municipality per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	Debt impedes the ability to fund current and future municipal services. Good performance also indicates the municipalities commitment to financial responsibility.
	Change in Debt	Change in total outstanding debt from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.



TAXATION				
Indicator	What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?	
Efficiency	Residential Tax Burden (RTB)	Average amount of money collected from residents in property taxes annually	NS Municipal Relations Database	A municipality with efficient taxation limits the Residential Tax Burden to minimize taxes negative impact on the economy and create an environment that attracts in-migration
	Change in RTB	Change in residential tax burden from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Commercial Tax Burden (CTB)	Average amount of money collected from business in property taxes annually	NS Municipal Relations Database	A municipality with efficient taxation limits the Commercial Tax Burden on business to minimize taxes negative impact on the economy and create an environment that attracts in-migration
	Change in CTB	Change in commercial tax burden from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
Effectiveness	Commercial Tax Assessment (CTA)	Total non-residential property tax assessment per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	CTA indicates the amount of business within a municipality. It also indicates the ability of the municipality to attract and retain business
	Change in CTA	Change in commercial tax assessment from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Total Tax Assessment (TTA)	Total property tax assessment per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	TTA measures the value of all property within a municipality indicating the strength of the tax base (e.g. higher taxes limit immigration and drive out current residents which reduces the total tax assessment)
	Change in TTA	Change in TTA from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.



SAFETY & PROTECTION				
Indicator	What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?	
Efficiency	Police Service Costs (PSC)	The total annual cost of police services per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	An efficient police service operates at the lowest cost possible.
	Change in PSC	Change in police service costs from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Fire Service Costs (FSC)	The total annual cost of fire services per capita	NS Municipal Relations Database	An efficient fire service operates at the lowest cost possible.
	Change in FSC	Change in fire service costs from year to year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
Effectiveness	Crime Rates	Number of crimes reported annually per 10,000 people living in a municipality	NS Community Counts	An effective police service keeps the community safe. Crime rates indicate the relative safety of a community.
	Change in Crime Rates	Change in the number of crimes reported annually per 10,000 population	NS Community Counts	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Monetary Loss Due to Fire (MLF)	Average monetary damage caused by fires per fire per year	Office of the Fire Marshal	An effective fire service reduces the impact of fire on a community. MLF is an indicator of the impact of fires.
	Change in MLF	Change from year to year in average monetary damage caused by fires per year	Office of the Fire Marshal	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.



TRANSPORTATION				
Indicator		What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?
Efficiency	Transportation Costs	All costs associated with maintaining transportation infrastructure per kilometre	NS Municipal Relations Database	Efficient transportation provides transport services for the lowest cost possible.
	Change in Transportation Cost	Change from year to year in all costs associated with transportation infrastructure	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
Effectiveness	Number of Complaints	Number of formal complaints about transportation infrastructure directed towards the Municipal government or the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure per year	n/a	Effective transportation services keep users happy; complaints indicate severe enough dissatisfaction to take action.
	Quality of Roads	Percent of Roads Rated as being in 'Good' Condition per year	n/a	Effective transportation services keep users happy; survey questions rating the condition of the roads indicate a large group of users' relative satisfaction.



ENVIRONMENT				
Indicator	What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?	
Efficiency	Drinking Water Costs (DWC)	Total operating costs to supply and distribute drinking water per kilometer of water main per year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Efficient distribution and supply of drinking water is doing so at the lowest cost possible
	Change in DWC	Change from year to year in drinking water costs	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Solid Waste Costs	Total operating costs for collection, processing and storing solid waste per ton of waste per year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Efficient disposal, processing and storage of solid waste is doing so at the lowest cost possible.
	Change in Solid Waste Costs	Change from year to year in solid waste costs	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Waste Water Costs	Total operating costs associated with diverting waste water per kilometer of waste water pipe per year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Efficient collection and/or diversion of waste water is doing so at the lowest cost possible.
	Change in Waste Water Costs	Change from year to year in waste water costs	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
Effectiveness	Boil Water Advisories	Number of boil water advisories issued by the Ministry of Environment per year	Nova Scotia Dept of Environment	Supplying clean and safe drinking water is the primary goal of municipal water services. The number of boil water advisories indicates the ability to supply it.
	Water Tests with Bacteria	Percent of water tests revealing potentially dangerous levels of bacteria	Nova Scotia Dept of Environment	It indicates the ability of the municipality to supply clean and safe water
	Waste water Back-ups	Number of reported back-ups of the waste water infrastructure per kilometer of waste water pipe	Nova Scotia Dept of Environment (Only for 2006)	The primary function of Waste Water infrastructure is to divert and/or collect waste water. Back-ups prevent this infrastructure from diverting waste water to collection areas.



ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT				
Indicator	What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?	
Efficiency	Planning and Zoning Costs (PZC)	Total operating costs for Planning and Zoning per capita per year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Efficient Planning and Zoning services conduct their functions at the lowest cost possible.
	Change in PZC	Change from year to year in Planning and Zoning costs	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
	Community Development Costs	Total operating costs for Community Development per capita per year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Efficient Community Development services conduct their functions at the lowest cost possible.
	Change in Community Development Costs	Change from year to year in Community Development costs	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
Effectiveness	Value of Constructure	The total monetary value of new construction per million dollars of total property assessment per year	n/a	Effective economic development induces construction of buildings, infrastructure, houses etc.
	Change in Immigrant Population	Number of immigrants in 2006 as compared to 2001	2006 Census	Many communities are unable to sustain their populations on births alone; attracting immigrants is important to foster economic growth
	Change in Population	Total population in 2006 as compared to 2001	2006 Census	Communities require people to thrive economically; a community attracting new people is effectively developing economic potential.



RECREATION & CULTURE				
Indicator		What is the indicator?	Where did it come from?	Why is it included?
Efficiency	Recreation and Culture Costs	Total operating costs of Recreation and Culture services and facilities per capita per year	NS Municipal Relations Database	Efficient Recreation and Culture services conduct their functions at the lowest cost possible.
	Change in Recreation and Culture Costs	Change from year to year in Recreation and Culture services and facilities costs	NS Municipal Relations Database	Change from year to year focuses the assessment more on current or recent administrations.
Effectiveness	Municipal Outdoor Space	Number of square kilometers of municipally-owned and operated outdoor space per capita	n/a	Parks and other outdoor spaces help keep a community vibrant; Recreation and Culture services are responsible for procuring and maintain outdoor spaces.
	Municipal Trails	Number of kms of recreational trails per capita	n/a	Trails encourage physical activity and help keep a community vibrant; the amount of trails made available is the responsibility of Recreation and Culture services.
	Library Visits	Number of library visit per year per capita	n/a	Libraries are an important facility for accessing and sharing knowledge; the number of library visits per year measures how well these facilities are being utilized.
	Library Cardholders	Proportion of library cardholders in any given year	n/a	Libraries are also important social institutions; the proportion of library cardholders indicates the amount of people who use the library.

HOW ARE OVERALL AND FINAL GRADES AND RANKS CALCULATED?

This report does not grade and rank individual indicators; rather, the indicators are averaged to produce categories. The Indicator Pyramid below illustrates the process used to convert indicator scores into higher category ranks and grades culminating with the Final ranks and grades. They also contain information about the number of indicators required to compute an overall rank and grade for each category, denoted by the brackets below the category title (e.g. ‘2 of 4’ means the municipality must have information for at least two out of the four potential indicators to be given a grade and rank). The connecting lines illustrate the subordinate categories included in superior categories. Categories with no indicators below were not included in the assessment because no information was available.

Final (2 of 2)

Overall Efficiency (4 of 7)

Overall Effectiveness (3 of 5)

Government & Finance Efficiency (3 of 5)

1. Admin Costs
2. Change in Admin Costs
3. Legislative Costs
4. Change in Leg Costs
5. Population per Councilor

Taxation Efficiency (2 of 4)

1. Residential Tax Burden (RTB)
2. Change in RTB
3. Commercial Tax Burden (CTB)
4. Change in CTB

Safety & Protection Efficiency (2 of 4)

1. Police Service Costs (PSC)
2. Change in PSC
3. Fire Service Costs (FSC)
4. Change in FSC

Transportation Efficiency (1 of 2)

1. Transportation Costs (TC)
2. Change in TC

Environment Efficiency (3 of 6)

1. Drinking Water Costs (DWC)
2. Change in DWC
3. Solid Waste Costs (SWC)
4. Change in SWC
5. Waster Water Costs
6. Change in WWC

Economic Development Efficiency (2 of 4)

1. Planning & Zoning Costs (PZC)
2. Change in PZC
3. Community Development Costs (CDC)
4. Change in CDC

Culture & Recreation Efficiency (1 of 2)

1. Recreation and Cultural Costs (RCC)
2. Change in RCC

Government & Finance Effectiveness (2 of 4)

1. Total Revenue
2. Change in Revenue
3. Outstanding Debt (OD)
4. Change in OD

Taxation Effectiveness (2 of 4)

1. Total Property Tax Assessment (PTA)
2. Change in PTA
3. Commercial Property Tax Assessment (CTA)
4. Change in CTA

Safety & Protection Effectiveness (1 of 2)

1. Crime Rates
2. Change in Crime Rates
3. Monetary Damage Caused by Fire (MDCF)
4. Change in MDCF

Transportation Effectiveness

Environment Effectiveness (2 of 3)

1. # of Boil Water Advisories
2. % of Water Tests with Dangerous Levels of Bacteria
3. # of Backups in Waste Water Infrastructure

Economic Development Effectiveness (1 of 2)

1. Change in Total Population
2. Change in Immigrant Population

Culture & Recreation Effectiveness



HOW THE DISTANCE FROM THE AVERAGE TRANSLATES INTO A GRADE?

Ranks and grades are presented to explain municipal government performance in a common way. How the ranks are calculated is easy to explain – they are the position of municipal governments’ performance relative to all other municipal governments. The calculation of grades is a little more complicated and deserves a more detailed description than provided above.

Grades are dependent on intervals of Z-scores. Think of Z-scores as numbers indicating the distance of municipal government performance from the average with ‘0’ being the average, negative numbers indicating below average performance and positive, above; the larger the number, the better. Z-scores mean little to most people, so we convert these scores into the more familiar School Letter Grading system. This conversion relies on setting upper and lower bounds of Z-scores for each letter grade. Below is a diagram illustrating which scores fall under which grades. Any Z-score between the upper and lower bound receives the grade indicated. $-\infty$ means negative infinite or the lowest number conceivable, $+\infty$ means infinite or the highest number conceivable.

Upper Bound	Letter Grade	Lower Bound
-1.51	F	$-\infty$
-1.18	D	-1.50
-0.84	C-	-1.17
-0.51	C	-0.83
-0.18	C+	-0.50
0.16	B-	-0.17
0.49	B	0.17
0.82	B+	0.50
1.16	A-	0.83
1.49	A	1.17
$+\infty$	A+	1.50

These numbers or Z-scores can be confusing; so in summary, the grades assigned to different municipal governments represent their distance from the average. If they are below average, they receive a C+ to an F, above average, B to A+ and average, B-.



FAQs

FAQs are frequently asked questions that were not specifically addressed above. We encourage you look through them and if your question is not included please contact us for the answer. Contact Jamie Newman at jamieneuman@aims.ca or 902-429-1143 extension 230.

1. Provide an example of the affect of the Inputs on the different types of grades and ranks (e.g. Absolute, In-Context and Total).

Annapolis Royal had the highest property values per capita in Nova Scotia but is only the 22nd most wealthy municipality. These are two inputs which impact the Taxation Efficiency category which uses the tax burden on residents as an indicator; the higher the burden, the worse the performance. In Annapolis Royal's case, tax burdens will be higher – not necessarily because of tax rates controlled by the Municipal government but rather - due to disproportionately higher property values possessed by residents with average wealth. This is not to say the entire burden is explained by property values and wealth but, from the outset, Annapolis Royal has a disadvantage.

If Annapolis Royal is not advantaged by any other Inputs, the '**In-Context**' scores will be improved because we expect poorer performance. These circumstances have no effect on the '**Absolute**' scores. The '**Total**' scores will be improved by less than the In-Context scores because they are an average of 'Absolute' and 'In-Context' scores.

The opposite would be true for a municipality whose residents are wealthy but property values are relatively low. In-Context and Total scores will be less than Absolute scores.

2. If 'Total' scores are an average of Absolute and In-Context, why are some 'Total' ranks not between the 'Absolute' and 'In-Context' ranks?

Adjustments impact each municipality differently depending on the significance of their advantages or disadvantages, according to their 'Inputs'. This means some municipalities have greater advantages or disadvantages than others. In-Context these municipalities may pass or sink below other municipalities in the rankings with less significant adjustments. So Total ranks will not always be between the Absolute and In-Context ranks, it is all dependent on the movement of municipalities around them. Grades, on the other hand, are not dependent on other municipalities. They will always be either the same as the In-Context or Absolute grades or in between them.

3. You say I can use this report to improve my community by raising my concerns to council. How do I get them to listen to me?

This report uses the type of information good councils use to make decisions. It is now in your hands. The report may verify that your municipality is doing fairly well and you feel content. Maybe it reveals you are paying higher rates for lower quality services and feel your municipal government can do much better. If you feel strongly enough to act,



you can go to your council meeting and voice your concerns. If you do not get a satisfactory response and/or resolution, there a number of alternative ways to have your concerns considered. You can organize a group of citizens that share the same concern and voice your concerns as a united front. You can write opinion pieces for newspapers or start a blog or use other online social media to have your concerns shared immediately. If you can wait for municipal elections, you can vote for alternative councilors that share your concerns. If there is no option you like, you can run yourself. Or you can move to another municipality that performs well at providing the services you are concerned about. There are a number of ways to have your concerns heard. This report is your resource for identifying or verifying those concerns. How you use it is up to you.

4. Socio-Economic Status (SES) as an Input is a vague concept, what is included in the SES indicator and how is it calculated?

Socioeconomic Status (SES) uses a number of measures to capture the social and economic conditions that exist within a municipality. Using census data from Statistics Canada, the SES score is a single number derived from a 10 point scale. The higher the number, the better a relative SES is to the rest of the province. The following ten data items comprise the SES score:

Positive Factors		Negative Factors
-Employment Rate	-Participation Rate	-Unemployment Rate
-Proportion of Adults with Post Secondary Education	-Proportion of Labour Force in High Status Occupations	-Proportion of Adults without a high school diploma
-Median Income	-Average Property Value	-Proportion of Single Parent Families
-Average Monthly Rent		

5. Specifically, how are the grades assigned?

Grades are assigned using a consistent statistical process. In plain language, we determine how far above or below the average each municipality performs. We attribute a number indicating this distance from the average. These numbers or scores are then converted into grades based on number intervals with the average receiving a B-. When performance is relatively similar for all municipal governments the scores will hover around B-, significant variation in performance is revealed when municipal governments receive A's, D's and/or F's. Most of the scores in the Summary Performance Report hover around B-. These average scores for most municipal governments speak to there being no perfect municipality at fulfilling all of its responsibilities. Likewise, there is no municipality that does not perform at least above average in some aspect of municipal governance.



HARD NUMBERS

For those of you interested in looking beneath the ranks and grades; below are the actual numbers for each indicator. We refer to the actual numbers as raw data; the raw data are the indicators that are combined to produce the higher level categories comprising the [Complete](#) and [Summary Performance Reports](#). For your purposes, they provide a more detailed understanding of performance and also describe the municipality in greater detail. For instance, if you are interested in the average crime rates from 2006–2008 for your municipality, this information is contained in the Safety and Protection raw data set.

HOW TO READ THE HARD NUMBERS DATASETS

Refer to the [How to Read the Summary Performance Report](#) diagram to understand how to navigate the datasets below. A few differences to keep in mind are the ‘S’ columns are the raw scores, the ‘R’, are ranks. The ranks do not indicate which municipal governments are best or worst, they indicate the highest and lowest scores, with the highest score receiving a rank of ‘1’ and the lowest, ‘55’. The numbers in the brackets contained in the header row indicate the years the information represents. At the very bottom of each dataset are the average, maximum and minimum scores for the column above. These statistics are included to be used for reference purposes.



PEOPLE & PLACE															
Municipality	Population (2006)		Area of District (Sq. KM) (2006)		Population Density (2006)		Dwelling Count (2006)		Dwelling Density (2006)		Dependency Ratio (2006-2008)		Percentage of Immigrants to Total Population (2006)		
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	
Amherst	9505	18	12	32	791	3	4152	18	345.42	3	68.6	16	2%	41	
Annapolis County	18242	8	3171	5	6	46	7627	8	2.41	46	65.8	25	6%	10	
Annapolis Royal	444	55	2	55	218	25	250	55	122.55	23	69.5	14	21%	1	
Antigonish	4236	31	5	47	823	2	1828	31	354.95	2	73.7	7	6%	9	
Antigonish County	14600	11	1450	18	10	42	5293	14	3.65	44	61.3	46	4%	26	
Argyle	8656	21	1527	17	6	47	3375	22	2.21	47	62.2	43	2%	49	
Barrington	7331	25	632	23	12	38	2987	25	4.73	37	60.5	49	2%	48	
Berwick	2454	40	7	42	361	15	938	42	137.94	19	83.8	1	2%	45	
Bridgetown	972	49	4	49	275	23	450	49	127.12	22	80.0	4	6%	8	
Bridgewater	7944	24	14	31	584	7	3595	21	264.34	6	64.8	34	4%	18	
Canso	911	50	5	46	168	27	377	51	69.56	27	62.2	43	1%	54	
Cape Breton	105928	2	2433	8	44	33	43591	2	17.27	33	65.8	27	2%	51	
Chester	10821	15	1121	21	10	43	4644	16	4.14	41	61.3	46	5%	13	
Clare	8813	20	853	22	10	40	3699	20	4.34	40	60.5	49	2%	40	
Clark's Harbour	860	53	3	52	297	20	375	52	129.31	21	70.6	10	2%	42	
Colchester	36837	4	3569	4	10	41	14455	4	4.05	43	64.0	37	3%	29	
Cumberland	16021	9	4222	2	4	51	6683	9	1.58	50	68.6	16	3%	33	
Digby	2092	42	3	50	666	5	966	41	307.64	4	66.7	23	4%	16	
Digby County	8038	23	1656	16	5	48	3359	23	2.03	48	65.8	27	3%	28	
Guysborough County	4681	30	2111	10	2	54	2042	28	0.97	54	64.8	34	1%	52	
Halifax	372858	1	5490	1	68	31	160580	1	28.24	31	53.1	55	7%	6	
Hants East	22401	6	1788	14	13	37	8070	7	4.51	38	57.9	54	4%	23	
Hants West	13881	12	1238	20	11	39	5462	12	4.41	39	59.6	53	3%	34	
Hantsport	1191	47	2	54	559	9	509	47	238.97	9	71.6	9	6%	7	
Inverness County	14896	10	3815	3	4	50	5923	10	1.55	51	67.6	20	4%	27	
Kentville	5815	27	17	28	335	18	2558	27	147.44	17	61.4	45	4%	15	
Kings County	47994	3	2089	11	23	34	18944	3	9.07	34	64.8	34	4%	20	
Lockeport	646	54	2	53	278	22	276	54	118.97	24	80.5	3	8%	5	
Lunenburg	2317	41	4	48	578	8	988	40	246.38	8	70.6	10	9%	4	
Lunenburg County	25164	5	1759	15	14	36	10402	5	5.91	36	60.5	49	4%	21	
Mahone Bay	904	51	3	51	289	21	425	50	135.78	20	71.6	8	11%	3	
Middleton	1829	44	5	45	336	17	882	43	162.13	14	80.0	4	6%	11	
Mulgrave	879	52	18	26	49	32	353	53	19.82	32	69.5	12	1%	53	
New Glasgow	9455	19	10	36	952	1	4162	17	419.13	1	65.8	27	3%	32	
Oxford	1178	48	11	34	109	28	500	48	46.47	28	67.6	20	3%	38	



Municipality	Population (2006)		Area of District (Sq. KM) (2006)		Population Density (2006)		Dwelling Count (2006)		Dwelling Density (2006)		Dependency Ratio (2006-2008)		Percentage of Immigrants to Total Population (2006)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Parrsboro	1401	46	15	29	94	29	660	45	44.35	29	82.3	2	6%	12
Pictou	3813	33	8	41	480	11	1546	34	194.71	11	68.6	15	3%	37
Pictou County	21982	7	2797	7	8	44	8748	6	3.13	45	60.5	49	3%	35
Port Hawkesbury	3517	37	8	40	434	13	1391	37	171.52	13	62.3	42	2%	44
Queens	11212	14	2387	9	5	49	5378	13	1.97	49	63.9	38	3%	39
Richmond County	9740	17	1244	19	8	45	5053	15	4.06	42	68.6	16	2%	46
Shelburne	1879	43	9	38	209	26	851	44	94.56	26	61.3	46	4%	17
Shelburne County	4828	28	1818	13	3	53	1990	30	1.09	52	63.9	38	3%	30
Springhill	3941	32	11	33	353	16	1595	33	143.05	18	65.8	25	2%	50
St. Mary's	2587	39	1910	12	1	55	1117	39	0.58	55	68.6	19	2%	43
Stellarton	4717	29	9	39	525	10	2041	29	227.03	10	65.8	27	3%	31
Stewiacke	1421	45	18	27	80	30	592	46	33.50	30	69.5	12	4%	19
Trenton	2741	38	6	44	457	12	1123	38	187.17	12	63.9	38	2%	47
Truro	11765	13	38	25	313	19	5557	11	147.67	16	65.8	27	5%	14
Victoria	8217	22	2867	6	3	52	2977	26	1.04	53	63.1	41	4%	24
Westville	3805	34	14	30	264	24	1539	35	106.95	25	65.8	27	1%	55
Windsor	3709	36	9	37	409	14	1449	36	159.93	15	75.9	6	4%	25
Wolfville	3772	35	6	43	585	6	1687	32	261.55	7	65.8	27	13%	2
Yarmouth	7162	26	11	35	678	4	3129	24	296.42	5	66.8	22	3%	36
Yarmouth County	10459	16	585	24	18	35	4082	19	6.97	35	65.8	24	4%	22
Average	16608		960		234		6968		101.50		66.8		4%	
Min	444		2		1		250		0.58		53.1		1%	
Max	372858		5490		952		160580		419.13		83.8		21%	



FINANCIAL HISTORY										
Municipality	Total Property Assessment Per Capita (2004-05)		Non-Residential Assessment Per Capita (2004-05)		Outstanding Debt Per Capita (2004-05)		Total Revenue Per Capita (2004-05)		Transfers Per Capita (2006-2008)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Amherst	\$37,367	38	\$13,667	23	\$431	12	\$1,262	20	\$116	26
Annapolis County	\$36,923	39	\$5,162	52	\$94	43	\$582	51	\$67	39
Annapolis Royal	\$93,774	1	\$18,981	9	\$238	28	\$3,025	1	\$152	18
Antigonish	\$60,888	7	\$17,183	14	\$183	32	\$1,138	27	\$136	22
Antigonish County	\$36,855	40	\$6,278	47	\$111	40	\$523	55	\$32	52
Argyle	\$39,130	33	\$7,986	39	\$0	49	\$562	53	\$29	53
Barrington	\$39,574	31	\$10,383	32	\$245	26	\$699	43	\$34	51
Berwick	\$45,791	22	\$16,144	16	\$549	8	\$1,214	25	\$50	45
Bridgetown	\$34,032	46	\$7,474	40	\$425	13	\$1,088	30	\$200	12
Bridgewater	\$58,865	9	\$25,041	5	\$469	10	\$1,566	10	\$77	36
Canso	\$22,218	54	\$7,130	41	\$167	37	\$1,226	22	\$437	1
Cape Breton	\$27,018	52	\$5,318	51	\$324	20	\$903	37	\$173	13
Chester	\$70,574	4	\$9,054	37	\$179	35	\$908	36	\$140	21
Clare	\$41,575	27	\$9,895	34	\$0	49	\$554	54	\$44	47
Clark's Harbour	\$34,880	44	\$11,377	27	\$104	41	\$1,123	28	\$166	17
Colchester	\$39,979	29	\$9,627	35	\$439	11	\$741	41	\$69	37
Cumberland	\$48,214	19	\$11,241	28	\$96	42	\$725	42	\$107	30
Digby	\$39,091	34	\$12,277	24	\$329	19	\$1,458	15	\$170	14
Digby County	\$31,992	48	\$6,538	45	\$0	49	\$631	47	\$108	28
Guysborough County	\$54,054	14	\$58,910	1	\$0	49	\$1,814	2	\$125	25
Halifax	\$59,804	8	\$14,446	20	\$933	2	\$1,537	11	\$65	42
Hants East	\$38,351	35	\$5,750	48	\$0	49	\$654	46	\$39	49
Hants West	\$37,825	37	\$5,438	50	\$0	49	\$569	52	\$40	48
Hantsport	\$64,505	6	\$31,169	3	\$181	33	\$1,737	3	\$66	40
Inverness County	\$35,510	42	\$8,784	38	\$36	46	\$608	48	\$66	41
Kentville	\$55,948	11	\$17,651	12	\$504	9	\$1,614	7	\$125	24
Kings County	\$46,712	20	\$10,776	31	\$187	31	\$582	50	\$16	55
Lockeport	\$34,162	45	\$11,393	26	\$224	29	\$1,434	16	\$319	5
Lunenburg	\$58,105	10	\$16,482	15	\$298	22	\$1,694	4	\$68	38
Lunenburg County	\$52,289	15	\$6,826	42	\$319	21	\$668	44	\$18	54
Mahone Bay	\$72,670	2	\$18,781	10	\$254	24	\$1,569	9	\$245	9
Middleton	\$46,194	21	\$14,186	21	\$647	5	\$1,461	14	\$167	16
Mulgrave	\$37,885	36	\$19,573	8	\$809	3	\$1,571	8	\$300	6
New Glasgow	\$41,491	28	\$14,170	22	\$207	30	\$1,218	24	\$85	34
Oxford	\$50,159	18	\$26,876	4	\$551	7	\$1,303	19	\$58	43



Municipality	Total Property Assessment Per Capita (2004-05)		Non-Residential Assessment Per Capita (2004-05)		Outstanding Debt Per Capita (2004-05)		Total Revenue Per Capita (2004-05)		Transfers Per Capita (2006-2008)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Parrsboro	\$27,004	53	\$4,433	53	\$27	47	\$996	34	\$337	4
Pictou	\$27,657	50	\$5,569	49	\$332	18	\$1,086	31	\$201	11
Pictou County	\$45,426	23	\$15,448	18	\$90	44	\$588	49	\$44	46
Port Hawkesbury	\$43,311	26	\$17,243	13	\$1,735	1	\$1,395	17	\$133	23
Queens	\$54,960	13	\$15,662	17	\$385	16	\$1,220	23	\$411	2
Richmond County	\$70,724	3	\$45,350	2	\$152	39	\$1,195	26	\$261	8
Shelburne	\$35,605	41	\$11,110	29	\$281	23	\$1,377	18	\$357	3
Shelburne County	\$45,015	24	\$10,374	33	\$5	48	\$782	40	\$100	32
Springhill	\$27,153	51	\$3,084	54	\$421	14	\$1,106	29	\$167	15
St. Mary's	\$55,644	12	\$24,632	6	\$0	49	\$861	38	\$85	35
Stellarton	\$35,140	43	\$11,056	30	\$176	36	\$1,078	32	\$112	27
Stewiacke	\$32,691	47	\$6,772	43	\$180	34	\$1,005	33	\$144	19
Trenton	\$30,397	49	\$6,548	44	\$243	27	\$1,491	13	\$266	7
Truro	\$52,031	17	\$21,708	7	\$651	4	\$1,525	12	\$107	29
Victoria	\$52,132	16	\$14,912	19	\$251	25	\$977	35	\$104	31
Westville	\$20,487	55	\$2,453	55	\$338	17	\$785	39	\$212	10
Windsor	\$39,840	30	\$11,667	25	\$160	38	\$1,233	21	\$100	33
Wolfville	\$67,406	5	\$9,218	36	\$418	15	\$1,673	5	\$55	44
Yarmouth	\$44,376	25	\$18,721	11	\$552	6	\$1,615	6	\$143	20
Yarmouth County	\$39,486	32	\$6,375	46	\$81	45	\$664	45	\$37	50
Average	\$44,925		\$13,715		\$291		\$1,138		\$136	
Min	\$20,487		\$2,453		\$0		\$523		\$16	
Max	\$93,774		\$58,910		\$1,735		\$3,025		\$437	



SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Municipality	Employment Rate (2006)		Participation Rate (2006)		Unemployment Rate (2006)		Proportion of Adults without highschool diploma (2006)		Proportion of Adults with Post Secondary Ed. (2006)		Proportion of Labour Force in High Status Occupations (2006)		Proportion of One Parent Families (2006)		Average Household Income (Average 2006 & 2007)		Average Property Value (2006)		Average Monthly Rent (2006)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Amherst	54.6	17	60.6	18	10.0	30	29.9	36	43.0	38	47.1	16	21.6	14	\$43,238	44	\$102,559	42	\$576	14
Annapolis County	50.5	32	57.0	35	11.2	24	32.1	24	46.3	24	37.7	40	12.0	46	\$42,695	46	\$128,331	27	\$531	34
Annapolis Royal	36.6	55	40.2	55	9.1	38	28.9	39	54.2	9	65.6	3	19.0	20	\$44,747	41	\$245,158	3	\$554	26
Antigonish	56.2	13	62.2	12	9.7	32	19.7	52	54.7	8	52.1	8	26.5	2	\$54,699	5	\$177,683	7	\$551	27
Antigonish County	61.1	4	67.3	5	9.2	37	25.4	47	55.2	5	47.9	12	13.8	38	\$57,650	2	\$136,737	19	\$624	7
Argyle	55.1	16	61.7	15	10.7	25	41.6	6	41.9	41	34.0	46	10.3	53	\$53,175	9	\$117,360	35	\$499	41
Barrington	51.7	29	62.0	13	16.6	3	51.0	3	26.8	54	22.7	53	16.2	29	\$49,732	21	\$121,800	29	\$483	47
Berwick	52.3	26	57.9	33	9.5	34	27.3	43	51.5	12	47.6	14	13.5	40	\$47,095	26	\$133,172	22	\$601	8
Bridgetown	44.3	50	51.1	50	13.5	14	31.6	28	40.8	42	45.0	20	21.4	16	\$43,601	43	\$106,251	40	\$499	41
Bridgewater	44.3	50	59.2	25	13.5	14	31.6	28	40.8	42	44.9	21	15.7	31	\$48,338	24	\$134,044	21	\$573	17
Canso	37.9	54	44.4	54	14.7	12	51.9	1	31.2	53	27.9	51	23.6	9	\$37,093	53	\$55,681	55	\$501	39
Cape Breton	44.8	48	53.3	45	15.9	8	30.2	35	45.9	29	47.5	15	24.6	4	\$46,533	28	\$87,395	50	\$570	18
Chester	53.3	22	58.3	32	8.5	42	32.6	18	48.3	21	40.6	28	10.7	51	\$51,587	11	\$209,559	5	\$569	21
Clare	59.5	8	51.7	49	12.9	16	42.0	5	42.4	39	36.1	44	14.2	36	\$46,022	33	\$141,332	17	\$501	39
Clark's Harbour	49.0	39	63.1	10	23.4	2	51.7	2	24.2	55	21.5	54	21.8	11	\$46,234	31	\$85,145	51	\$450	52
Colchester	58.7	9	63.5	8	7.5	48	30.4	34	45.3	31	39.3	33	13.7	39	\$50,204	17	\$137,894	18	\$564	23
Cumberland	50.3	34	56.6	37	11.3	23	32.9	16	46.3	24	40.2	30	13.0	42	\$46,297	29	\$99,204	44	\$484	46
Digby	49.1	38	55.6	40	11.6	22	32.8	17	37.0	47	39.6	32	22.6	10	\$35,858	55	\$123,503	28	\$451	51
Digby County	51.0	30	58.6	29	12.8	17	38.8	12	38.3	45	32.8	48	14.5	34	\$42,931	45	\$120,632	30	\$536	32
Guysborough County	44.9	47	53.4	44	16.0	7	43.3	4	38.1	46	33.3	47	16.7	25	\$42,360	47	\$97,515	46	\$345	55
Halifax	64.5	1	68.9	2	6.3	53	19.5	53	57.1	3	57.9	5	16.5	28	\$63,015	1	\$212,942	4	\$712	1



Municipality	Employment Rate (2006)		Participation Rate (2006)		Unemployment Rate (2006)		Proportion of Adults without highschool diploma (2006)		Proportion of Adults with Post Secondary Ed. (2006)		Proportion of Labour Force in High Status Occupations (2006)		Proportion of One Parent Families (2006)		Average Household Income (Average 2006 & 2007)		Average Property Value (2006)		Average Monthly Rent (2006)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Hants East	63.0	3	67.5	4	6.7	51	30.5	32	46.3	24	42.9	25	12.2	45	\$56,322	3	\$156,288	12	\$675	2
Hants West	55.8	15	61.1	16	8.7	41	32.2	23	45.6	30	39.0	34	13.2	41	\$50,605	14	\$134,281	20	\$575	15
Hantsport	59.7	5	63.2	9	5.5	54	22.5	51	53.5	11	52.8	7	11.1	50	\$55,176	4	\$147,983	14	\$525	36
Inverness County	49.5	37	58.8	27	15.8	9	31.9	25	46.3	24	38.5	35	14.9	32	\$50,495	15	\$119,079	33	\$492	43
Kentville	59.7	5	64.6	7	7.5	48	19.5	53	58.6	2	53.9	6	17.8	23	\$50,113	18	\$158,796	10	\$570	18
Kings County	57.9	12	62.8	11	7.8	46	30.5	32	47.0	23	38.2	38	14.6	33	\$50,308	16	\$156,866	11	\$598	12
Lockeport	50.5	32	57.4	34	13.8	13	31.7	27	43.6	36	21.1	55	12.8	44	\$38,819	52	\$84,898	52	\$456	50
Lunenburg	49.0	39	53.7	42	8.3	44	28.0	41	55.0	7	44.6	23	11.7	48	\$49,070	22	\$196,782	6	\$646	4
Lunenburg County	54.3	19	60.1	19	9.6	33	34.3	15	46.0	28	40.0	31	10.6	52	\$49,853	20	\$162,347	9	\$600	9
Mahone Bay	46.0	43	49.3	52	6.8	50	24.5	50	55.6	4	66.2	2	16.7	25	\$46,965	27	\$291,604	1	\$584	13
Middleton	45.8	44	51.8	48	11.9	19	28.3	40	54.1	10	59.2	4	17.3	24	\$43,626	42	\$130,798	25	\$536	32
Mulgrave	59.7	5	67.6	3	10.6	26	31.9	25	48.6	20	30.0	50	20.0	19	\$49,925	19	\$93,511	47	\$450	52
New Glasgow	56.2	13	60.9	17	7.6	47	26.3	45	49.3	17	52.1	8	21.3	17	\$51,818	10	\$119,946	32	\$550	29
Oxford	63.6	2	70.1	1	8.4	43	26.2	46	48.7	19	47.7	13	9.4	55	\$44,933	40	\$92,191	48	\$551	27
Parrsboro	41.7	53	45.7	53	9.5	34	32.6	18	47.4	22	45.7	17	21.3	17	\$37,048	54	\$116,439	36	\$421	54
Pictou	53.3	22	58.6	29	9.0	39	24.7	48	49.7	14	41.8	26	21.5	15	\$51,514	12	\$154,693	13	\$600	9
Pictou County	54.6	17	60.0	20	10.6	26	29.4	37	49.6	15	38.4	36	12.0	46	\$53,194	8	\$116,255	37	\$475	48
Port Hawkesbury	58.6	10	65.4	6	10.3	28	24.7	48	55.1	6	45.7	17	18.5	21	\$54,407	6	\$120,203	31	\$646	4
Queens	45.6	45	52.1	47	12.2	18	38.8	12	38.4	44	38.4	36	14.0	37	\$45,406	39	\$118,344	34	\$550	29
Richmond County	44.6	49	53.6	43	16.5	4	31.0	30	50.1	13	36.8	43	14.3	35	\$45,661	37	\$99,858	43	\$487	45
Shelburne	52.2	27	59.1	26	11.7	20	39.1	10	36.3	50	44.9	21	24.3	6	\$41,464	49	\$108,801	39	\$516	37
Shelburne County	50.1	35	59.8	23	16.1	5	41.5	7	36.7	48	27.9	51	11.2	49	\$45,664	36	\$128,587	26	\$471	49



Municipality	Employment Rate (2006)		Participation Rate (2006)		Unemployment Rate (2006)		Proportion of Adults without highschool diploma (2006)		Proportion of Adults with Post Secondary Ed. (2006)		Proportion of Labour Force in High Status Occupations (2006)		Proportion of One Parent Families (2006)		Average Household Income (Average 2006 & 2007)		Average Property Value (2006)		Average Monthly Rent (2006)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Springhill	43.4	52	51.1	50	15.4	10	35.2	14	42.4	39	34.7	45	21.7	12	\$41,046	50	\$71,867	54	\$531	34
St. Mary's	48.1	41	57.0	35	15.3	11	40.5	9	33.8	52	30.2	49	10.3	53	\$41,947	48	\$91,304	49	\$489	44
Stellarton	53.7	20	59.9	22	10.3	28	27.6	42	49.5	16	45.4	19	24.1	7	\$46,224	32	\$104,463	41	\$561	24
Stewiacke	52.7	24	55.6	40	5.2	55	32.6	18	45.0	32	37.3	41	16.7	25	\$47,765	25	\$114,194	38	\$655	3
Trenton	58.1	11	62.0	13	6.4	52	30.9	31	43.7	35	38.0	39	24.4	5	\$45,522	38	\$97,720	45	\$570	18
Truro	53.6	21	58.7	28	8.8	40	27.2	44	49.1	18	49.6	10	21.7	12	\$46,238	30	\$132,142	24	\$600	9
Victoria	45.5	46	60.0	20	26.2	1	32.3	22	44.2	34	37.1	42	16.2	29	\$48,811	23	\$132,947	23	\$516	37
Westville	52.5	25	58.4	31	9.9	31	29.3	38	44.9	33	41.2	27	24.1	7	\$45,678	35	\$81,385	53	\$550	29
Windsor	47.8	42	52.2	46	8.0	45	32.5	21	43.1	37	49.0	11	28.5	1	\$45,796	34	\$168,422	8	\$575	15
Wolfville	50.9	31	56.1	38	9.4	36	12.9	55	63.5	1	66.7	1	18.3	22	\$54,400	7	\$247,841	2	\$638	6
Yarmouth	52.2	27	56.0	39	11.7	20	39.1	10	36.3	50	43.2	24	25.8	3	\$39,773	51	\$144,677	15	\$567	22
Yarmouth County	50.1	35	59.8	23	16.1	5	41.5	7	36.7	48	40.3	29	13.0	42	\$50,959	13	\$141,461	16	\$557	25
Average	51.8		58.1		11.3		32.1		45.5		42.2		17.2		\$47,448		\$132,925		\$545	
Min	36.6		40.2		5.2		12.9		24.2		21.1		9.4		\$35,858		\$55,681		\$345	
Max	64.5		70.1		26.2		51.9		63.5		66.7		28.5		\$63,015		\$291,604		\$712	



GOVERNANCE & FINANCE

Municipality	Total Revenue per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Total Revenue per Capita (Average Annual Percent Change 2006-2008)		Administrative Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Administrative Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Legislative Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Legislative Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Debt Outstanding Per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Debt Outstanding Per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Municipal Debt as a Proportion of Total Property Tax Assessment (Average 2006-2008)		Municipal Debt as a Percentage of Total Property Tax Assessment (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Sales of Service Revenue Per Capita (2006)		Population per Councillor (2004-2008)			
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
	Amherst	\$1,435	21	9%	12	\$138	26	1%	42	\$21	27	-2%	51	\$407	26	22%	27	0.01	23	13%	24	\$1,336	23	1358	17	
Annapolis County	\$674	51	6%	21	\$89	44	3%	36	\$16	40	3%	33	\$187	43	50%	19	0.01	39	19%	23	\$639	50	1649	10		
Annapolis Royal	\$4,538	1	-1%	52	\$620	1	18%	10	\$73	2	8%	16	\$503	23	417%	4	0.00	44	210%	7	\$4,668	1	74	54		
Antigonish	\$1,420	23	5%	36	\$79	48	-6%	48	\$31	14	10%	12	\$399	27	404%	5	0.01	40	193%	8	\$1,342	22	605	36		
Antigonish County	\$623	53	6%	28	\$65	52	11%	23	\$15	41	19%	6	\$211	42	38%	24	0.01	38	12%	26	\$606	53	1424	16		
Argyle	\$689	50	7%	20	\$89	45	-11%	53	\$23	25	1%	42	\$0	54	0%	38	0.00	54	n/a	n/a	\$643	49	962	25		
Barrington	\$852	42	4%	40	\$92	43	3%	35	\$18	33	5%	25	\$169	44	476%	2	0.00	43	443%	2	\$819	43	1047	22		
Berwick	\$1,251	32	6%	29	\$114	34	0%	44	\$27	19	0%	45	\$395	28	4%	36	0.01	28	3%	29	\$1,192	30	351	41		
Bridgetown	\$1,407	24	13%	4	\$261	6	60%	2	\$42	9	40%	2	\$616	17	74%	17	0.02	11	50%	15	\$1,227	27	139	50		
Bridgewater	\$1,724	12	6%	25	\$131	28	17%	12	\$16	39	6%	18	\$892	8	43%	20	0.02	13	39%	17	\$1,642	11	1135	19		
Canso	\$1,361	27	3%	43	\$231	8	14%	15	\$35	12	0%	43	\$151	46	-2%	49	0.01	36	-13%	38	\$1,332	24	130	51		
Cape Breton	\$1,006	38	8%	17	\$94	42	24%	7	\$11	51	5%	24	\$507	22	124%	12	0.02	9	87%	11	\$966	38	6015	2		
Chester	\$1,367	25	23%	2	\$126	31	17%	11	\$13	45	8%	15	\$648	15	-9%	51	0.01	25	-32%	46	\$1,036	37	1534	14		
Clare	\$700	49	8%	16	\$87	47	4%	33	\$17	37	6%	20	\$145	47	0%	38	0.00	46	n/a	n/a	\$637	51	1102	21		
Clark's Harbour	\$1,310	29	2%	45	\$184	15	13%	17	\$81	1	13%	8	\$391	29	6%	34	0.01	26	-10%	37	\$1,281	25	123	53		
Colchester	\$844	43	7%	18	\$65	51	-2%	45	\$6	54	8%	13	\$336	34	-4%	50	0.01	31	-13%	39	\$797	45	3011	4		
Cumberland	\$842	44	2%	47	\$88	46	6%	30	\$15	41	4%	32	\$94	48	128%	11	0.00	48	44%	16	\$805	44	1602	11		
Digby	\$1,644	14	9%	11	\$131	27	26%	5	\$57	3	1%	40	\$723	13	18%	29	0.02	6	4%	28	\$1,528	17	418	39		
Digby County	\$756	47	6%	31	\$107	36	3%	34	\$17	35	-3%	52	\$0	54	0%	38	0.00	54	n/a	n/a	\$726	47	1597	12		
Guysborough County	\$2,589	2	26%	1	\$275	4	7%	28	\$41	10	1%	38	\$2,667	1	255%	7	0.04	4	33%	19	\$856	40	1782	8		
Halifax	\$1,838	11	20%	3	\$166	17	3%	38	\$8	53	7%	17	\$1,001	5	0%	47	0.02	10	-8%	36	\$1,556	15	15528	1		
Hants East	\$805	46	0%	51	\$106	37	12%	18	\$13	47	13%	7	\$333	35	239%	9	0.01	30	251%	5	\$1,954	4	669	35		



Municipality	Total Revenue per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Total Revenue per Capita (Average Annual Percent Change 2006-2008)		Administrative Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Administrative Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Legislative Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Legislative Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Debt Outstanding Per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Debt Outstanding Per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Municipal Debt as a Proportion of Total Property Tax Assessment (Average 2006-2008)		Municipal Debt as a Percentage of Total Property Tax Assessment (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Sales of Service Revenue Per Capita (2006)		Population per Councillor (2004-2008)		
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
Hants West	\$606	54	1%	50	\$60	53	21%	8	\$13	47	4%	28	\$71	49	0%	38	0.00	49	n/a	n/a	\$701	48	2483	5	
Hantsport	\$2,322	3	9%	9	\$269	5	-12%	54	\$48	6	1%	39	\$630	16	425%	3	0.01	34	360%	3	\$2,088	2	170	48	
Inverness County	\$735	48	4%	39	\$78	49	2%	41	\$12	50	4%	28	\$312	38	0%	38	0.01	37	n/a	n/a	\$619	52	4347	3	
Kentville	\$1,636	15	5%	34	\$144	24	-4%	47	\$23	24	19%	5	\$920	6	30%	26	0.02	8	22%	22	\$1,562	14	831	28	
Kings County	\$670	52	8%	14	\$55	55	9%	24	\$6	54	8%	13	\$239	40	42%	21	0.01	41	29%	21	\$769	46	1936	7	
Lockeport	\$1,849	10	-5%	54	\$275	3	16%	14	\$55	4	21%	4	\$343	33	-1%	48	0.01	27	-19%	43	\$1,877	7	129	52	
Lunenburg	\$2,022	5	2%	48	\$110	35	14%	16	\$18	34	6%	21	\$910	7	100%	15	0.01	18	52%	14	\$1,992	3	331	42	
Lunenburg County	\$838	45	9%	8	\$71	50	6%	31	\$13	44	-4%	53	\$351	32	-26%	54	0.01	35	-30%	45	\$584	55	1540	13	
Mahone Bay	\$2,005	6	8%	15	\$163	19	3%	39	\$28	16	11%	10	\$259	39	165%	10	0.00	47	105%	9	\$1,877	8	n/a	n/a	
Middleton	\$1,515	19	2%	46	\$162	20	6%	32	\$20	29	-2%	50	\$581	18	3%	37	0.01	16	-2%	32	\$1,487	18	261	45	
Mulgrave	\$1,876	9	-2%	53	\$360	2	-4%	46	\$52	5	4%	27	\$664	14	-13%	52	0.02	12	-24%	44	\$1,948	5	176	47	
New Glasgow	\$1,361	26	5%	35	\$130	29	11%	21	\$21	27	3%	35	\$416	25	108%	14	0.01	29	93%	10	\$1,281	26	1351	18	
Oxford	\$1,619	16	6%	27	\$152	22	6%	29	\$30	15	12%	9	\$865	9	114%	13	0.01	15	72%	12	\$1,545	16	168	49	
Parrsboro	\$1,290	30	10%	6	\$240	7	49%	3	\$23	23	2%	37	\$20	52	0%	38	0.00	52	n/a	n/a	\$1,144	33	280	43	
Pictou	\$1,196	33	3%	44	\$117	33	233%	1	\$9	52	0%	47	\$314	36	20%	28	0.01	21	11%	27	\$1,189	31	953	26	
Pictou County	\$595	55	4%	41	\$58	54	-9%	52	\$13	47	0%	44	\$57	50	0%	38	0.00	51	n/a	n/a	\$1,084	36	974	24	
Port Hawkesbury	\$1,902	8	7%	19	\$206	13	34%	4	\$32	13	6%	18	\$2,012	2	50%	18	0.04	2	30%	20	\$1,811	10	703	32	
Queens	\$1,491	20	6%	26	\$98	40	3%	37	\$17	37	0%	47	\$553	19	10%	31	0.01	22	-17%	41	\$1,409	20	1118	20	
Richmond County	\$1,127	36	4%	38	\$210	11	21%	9	\$26	21	5%	22	\$225	41	-19%	53	0.00	45	-19%	42	\$830	42	690	33	
Shelburne	\$1,525	18	1%	49	\$150	23	0%	43	\$40	11	1%	41	\$372	31	15%	30	0.01	24	1%	31	\$1,577	13	268	44	
Shelburne County	\$898	40	10%	7	\$157	21	9%	25	\$27	20	-5%	54	\$13	53	876%	1	0.00	53	809%	1	\$1,196	29	370	40	
Springhill	\$1,311	28	11%	5	\$166	18	-7%	49	\$17	35	2%	36	\$1,153	4	74%	16	0.04	3	57%	13	\$1,181	32	563	37	
St. Mary's	\$1,180	34	-6%	55	\$231	8	-33%	55	\$44	7	4%	31	\$521	21	0%	38	0.01	33	n/a	n/a	\$1,105	34	898	27	



Municipality	Total Revenue per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Total Revenue per Capita (Average Annual Percent Change 2006-2008)		Administrative Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Administrative Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Legislative Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Legislative Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Debt Outstanding Per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Debt Outstanding Per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Municipal Debt as a Proportion of Total Property Tax Assessment (Average 2006-2008)		Municipal Debt as a Percentage of Total Property Tax Assessment (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Sales of Service Revenue Per Capita (2006)		Population per Councillor (2004-2008)		
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
Stellarton	\$1,253	31	5%	33	\$123	32	-7%	50	\$21	26	-8%	55	\$1,713	3	249%	8	0.04	1	224%	6	\$1,222	28	786	29	
Stewiacke	\$1,168	35	5%	32	\$179	16	9%	26	\$43	8	4%	30	\$839	10	41%	22	0.02	5	38%	18	\$1,095	35	203	46	
Trenton	\$1,542	17	4%	42	\$210	12	2%	40	\$19	31	42%	1	\$152	45	5%	35	0.00	42	-6%	35	\$1,470	19	685	34	
Truro	\$1,717	13	9%	10	\$98	41	16%	13	\$14	43	4%	26	\$741	12	0%	46	0.01	14	-4%	34	\$1,602	12	1681	9	
Victoria	\$1,039	37	8%	13	\$128	30	11%	22	\$24	22	3%	34	\$312	37	-69%	55	0.01	32	-71%	47	\$594	54	2314	6	
Westville	\$931	39	6%	23	\$144	24	25%	6	\$13	45	5%	23	\$376	30	7%	33	0.02	7	1%	30	\$871	39	761	30	
Windsor	\$1,423	22	6%	22	\$202	14	-9%	51	\$19	30	0%	46	\$499	24	345%	6	0.01	19	258%	4	\$1,345	21	742	31	
Wolfville	\$1,935	7	6%	30	\$211	10	8%	27	\$28	17	0%	47	\$787	11	38%	23	0.01	17	-3%	33	\$1,822	9	539	38	
Yarmouth	\$2,034	4	4%	37	\$103	38	12%	19	\$28	18	10%	11	\$548	20	38%	25	0.01	20	13%	25	\$1,941	6	1023	23	
Yarmouth County	\$876	41	6%	24	\$103	39	12%	20	\$18	32	27%	3	\$55	51	9%	32	0.00	50	-16%	40	\$848	41	1472	15	
Average	\$1,367		6%		\$155		12%		\$26		6%		\$520		89%		0.01		70%		\$1,296		1352		
Min	\$595		-6%		\$55		-33%		\$6		-8%		\$0		-69%		0.00		-71%		\$584		74		
Max	\$4,538		26%		\$620		233%		\$81		42%		\$2,667		876%		0.04		809%		\$4,668		15528		



TAXATION

Municipality	Residential Tax Burden (Average 2006-2008)		Residential Tax Burden (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Commercial Taxes as % of Total Property Tax (Average 2006-2008)		Commercial Taxes as % of Total Prop. Tax (Average Percent Change 2006- 2008)		Total Property Assessment per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Total Property Assessment per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Non-Residential Property Assessment per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Non-Residential Property Assessment per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)	
	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R
	Amherst	\$931	26	8%	18	33%	11	5%	17	\$39,047	34	8%	43	\$10,977	17	4%
Annapolis County	\$604	46	9%	10	8%	51	-3%	52	\$35,236	46	20%	19	\$2,709	52	5%	23
Annapolis Royal	\$1,142	16	8%	19	28%	15	3%	32	\$129,168	1	46%	1	\$19,145	5	4%	34
Antigonish	\$692	42	8%	22	26%	24	8%	8	\$63,567	7	43%	2	\$14,856	12	7%	13
Antigonish County	\$662	44	7%	27	11%	46	9%	3	\$38,163	37	21%	18	\$4,055	48	14%	2
Argyle	\$776	37	6%	35	17%	38	9%	2	\$39,412	32	15%	28	\$5,974	36	9%	7
Barrington	\$755	38	6%	33	19%	31	5%	22	\$42,398	24	20%	21	\$7,019	30	4%	29
Berwick	\$1,222	8	7%	28	29%	14	1%	44	\$41,080	29	0%	55	\$10,828	19	1%	50
Bridgetown	\$1,173	11	8%	21	18%	32	-1%	50	\$36,321	44	13%	31	\$5,942	37	1%	49
Bridgewater	\$1,272	5	8%	25	35%	9	2%	35	\$57,219	10	3%	53	\$17,537	7	2%	47
Canso	\$724	39	1%	52	27%	18	3%	33	\$22,586	54	12%	35	\$5,164	40	-5%	54
Cape Breton	\$906	28	5%	46	18%	34	8%	6	\$29,033	50	13%	32	\$4,273	47	8%	9
Chester	\$801	35	10%	7	8%	54	7%	9	\$69,286	5	31%	9	\$6,337	33	10%	4
Clare	\$618	45	9%	12	15%	43	7%	13	\$41,978	27	24%	16	\$5,372	38	6%	14
Clark's Harbour	\$957	25	3%	51	26%	22	9%	4	\$40,788	31	17%	23	\$8,304	27	2%	45
Colchester	\$541	50	4%	47	18%	33	2%	37	\$38,703	36	9%	39	\$6,255	34	2%	43
Cumberland	\$602	47	12%	2	17%	35	3%	31	\$41,145	28	34%	7	\$7,301	29	3%	38
Digby	\$1,023	23	13%	1	28%	17	1%	41	\$40,947	30	14%	29	\$9,629	23	5%	19
Digby County	\$670	43	10%	6	16%	41	3%	29	\$32,938	49	27%	10	\$4,695	43	9%	6
Guysborough County	\$242	55	8%	24	61%	1	1%	43	\$36,480	43	11%	38	\$41,893	1	3%	35
Halifax	\$1,242	7	-11%	54	20%	30	6%	16	\$60,977	9	7%	47	\$11,234	16	8%	10
Hants East	\$860	32	5%	43	9%	50	5%	24	\$38,080	38	9%	40	\$3,042	51	6%	17
Hants West	\$487	52	n/a	n/a	8%	53	6%	14	\$37,114	41	12%	34	\$2,698	53	6%	15
Hantsport	\$1,252	6	6%	38	55%	2	7%	10	\$77,033	4	14%	30	\$38,502	2	11%	3
Inverness County	\$583	48	5%	44	13%	44	-5%	55	\$37,592	40	31%	8	\$4,562	44	5%	21
Kentville	\$1,039	22	9%	15	27%	19	5%	18	\$54,969	12	5%	50	\$12,950	15	6%	16
Kings County	\$704	41	11%	4	16%	39	4%	27	\$46,841	20	7%	46	\$6,364	32	4%	27
Lockeport	\$1,063	20	5%	45	32%	12	5%	20	\$36,686	42	24%	15	\$10,570	20	3%	36
Lunenburg	\$1,665	1	5%	42	23%	26	5%	25	\$68,737	6	27%	12	\$15,473	11	5%	24
Lunenburg County	\$812	34	9%	11	7%	55	14%	1	\$53,047	13	26%	14	\$3,970	49	21%	1
Mahone Bay	\$1,594	2	8%	23	21%	29	0%	47	\$82,492	2	26%	13	\$16,502	9	3%	37
Middleton	\$1,157	12	5%	40	27%	21	4%	28	\$42,188	25	5%	51	\$9,841	21	3%	39
Mulgrave	\$724	40	-7%	53	47%	4	2%	36	\$43,437	22	12%	33	\$17,728	6	2%	42
New Glasgow	\$1,149	15	4%	49	30%	13	6%	15	\$42,157	26	8%	42	\$10,925	18	5%	18
Oxford	\$893	30	9%	9	46%	5	2%	34	\$56,124	11	18%	22	\$20,756	4	1%	48
Parrsboro	\$887	31	9%	16	15%	42	0%	49	\$28,166	52	22%	17	\$4,282	46	2%	44
Pictou	\$1,220	9	12%	3	17%	37	0%	46	\$28,716	51	7%	45	\$4,421	45	4%	32
Pictou County	\$497	51	8%	26	25%	25	1%	42	\$42,470	23	17%	25	\$9,350	25	0%	51
Port Hawkesbury	\$1,212	10	5%	41	36%	8	5%	19	\$47,504	19	17%	24	\$14,384	13	4%	25
Queens	\$576	49	6%	37	21%	28	1%	40	\$52,723	14	27%	11	\$9,272	26	2%	46
Richmond County	\$403	53	8%	20	51%	3	2%	38	\$78,210	3	6%	48	\$30,375	3	8%	8
Shelburne	\$1,047	21	9%	17	28%	16	9%	5	\$36,289	45	12%	36	\$9,411	24	7%	12



Municipality	Residential Tax Burden (Average 2006-2008)		Residential Tax Burden (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Commercial Taxes as % of Total Property Tax (Average 2006-2008)		Commercial Taxes as % of Total Prop. Tax (Average Percent Change 2006- 2008)		Total Property Assessment per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Total Property Assessment per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Non-Residential Property Assessment per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Non-Residential Property Assessment per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
	Shelburne County	\$828	33	11%	5	11%	48	-3%	53	\$45,145	21	34%	5	\$4,861	42	4%
Springhill	\$919	27	10%	8	13%	45	0%	48	\$27,306	53	9%	41	\$2,393	54	0%	52
St. Mary's	\$361	54	7%	31	33%	10	-2%	51	\$47,522	18	41%	3	\$13,723	14	-3%	53
Stellarton	\$1,106	18	6%	34	26%	23	8%	7	\$37,731	39	8%	44	\$8,108	28	2%	41
Stewiacke	\$1,130	17	7%	29	17%	36	4%	26	\$34,316	47	3%	54	\$5,316	39	5%	22
Trenton	\$1,006	24	3%	50	22%	27	5%	23	\$33,339	48	11%	37	\$4,943	41	4%	31
Truro	\$1,153	14	6%	36	36%	7	3%	30	\$50,829	15	4%	52	\$16,112	10	4%	30
Victoria	\$786	36	9%	14	16%	40	-4%	54	\$48,349	17	38%	4	\$6,126	35	-12%	55
Westville	\$1,084	19	6%	39	9%	49	5%	21	\$21,727	55	6%	49	\$1,845	55	4%	33
Windsor	\$1,334	4	7%	32	27%	20	7%	11	\$39,138	33	16%	26	\$9,677	22	7%	11
Wolfville	\$1,484	3	4%	48	11%	47	1%	45	\$62,359	8	34%	6	\$6,892	31	3%	40
Yarmouth	\$1,155	13	7%	30	39%	6	7%	12	\$49,360	16	16%	27	\$17,299	8	9%	5
Yarmouth County	\$896	29	9%	13	8%	52	1%	39	\$39,029	35	20%	20	\$3,145	50	5%	20
Average	\$920		7%		24%		4%		\$46,240		17%		\$10,278		4%	
Min	\$242		-11%		7%		-5%		\$21,727		0%		\$1,845		-12%	
Max	\$1,665		13%		61%		14%		\$129,168		46%		\$41,893		21%	



SAFETY AND PROTECTION

Municipality	Total Police Service Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Total Police Service Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Total Fire Services Op. Costs per Cap (Average 2006-2008)		Total Fire Services Op. Costs per Cap (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Crime Rate Per 10,000 population (2006-2008)		Change in Crime Rate Per 10,000 population (2006-2008)		Monetary Damage Caused by Fire per Fire		Change in Monetary Damage cause by Fire per Fire	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
	Amherst	\$269	11	28%	2	\$135	11	0%	44	1510.63	8	-0.02	22	\$43,937	11	139%
Annapolis County	\$71	52	4%	43	\$49	47	7%	30	542.10	27	-0.02	21	\$19,577	32	111%	17
Annapolis Royal	\$375	1	33%	1	\$301	1	11%	22	1521.99	7	0.14	3	\$48,477	9	-100%	38
Antigonish	\$216	18	8%	24	\$67	40	11%	23	1266.63	11	0.01	12	\$18,381	34	8%	28
Antigonish County	\$65	54	7%	30	\$56	44	15%	15	387.60	36	0.04	6	\$18,919	33	179%	13
Argyle	\$65	55	4%	42	\$51	46	5%	34	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Barrington	\$90	44	6%	38	\$59	43	27%	9	605.67	25	-0.02	25	\$33,483	18	22122%	1
Berwick	\$205	21	17%	6	\$39	53	6%	32	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$24,500	26	n/a	n/a
Bridgetown	\$106	39	15%	9	\$105	20	5%	33	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$84,317	3	-77%	35
Bridgewater	\$301	7	25%	4	\$111	18	5%	36	902.00	17	-0.08	30	\$17,911	35	-100%	37
Canso	\$199	22	8%	27	\$119	16	8%	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cape Breton	\$177	25	7%	28	\$114	17	12%	21	841.99	19	-0.02	19	\$29,522	21	83%	19
Chester	\$94	43	12%	11	\$70	34	342%	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$35,440	16	-37%	31
Clare	\$75	51	10%	15	\$44	51	17%	13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Clark's Harbour	\$122	34	10%	19	\$40	52	42%	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Colchester	\$78	49	5%	39	\$48	49	13%	19	596.87	26	-0.05	29	\$35,007	17	182%	11
Cumberland	\$118	36	3%	49	\$79	28	-3%	49	276.77	39	-0.09	33	\$52,508	7	46%	25
Digby	\$306	6	3%	45	\$110	19	3%	42	1552.17	6	0.05	5	\$42,314	13	284%	9
Digby County	\$111	37	5%	40	\$49	48	37%	6	438.16	32	0.03	7	\$38,089	14	300%	8
Guysborough County	\$151	30	6%	37	\$156	7	40%	5	350.90	37	0.02	10	\$46,688	10	-100%	38
Halifax	\$189	24	8%	26	\$143	9	9%	25	758.60	22	-0.09	32	\$57,493	5	54%	24
Hants East	\$98	42	10%	16	\$69	37	10%	24	729.63	23	-0.20	39	\$25,508	24	161%	14
Hants West	\$78	48	1%	53	\$79	29	-3%	50	320.93	38	-0.03	27	\$12,356	41	-100%	38
Hantsport	\$330	3	3%	50	\$162	6	-1%	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$12,138	43	42%	26
Inverness County	\$105	40	9%	22	\$26	54	-24%	54	432.17	33	-0.09	31	\$31,013	19	301%	7
Kentville	\$279	8	9%	23	\$121	15	5%	35	812.30	20	-0.05	28	\$12,032	44	-59%	33
Kings County	\$85	46	7%	34	\$45	50	25%	10	711.13	24	-0.01	18	\$12,940	40	59%	22
Lockeport	\$157	28	12%	12	\$68	39	28%	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$10,667	46	-100%	38
Lunenburg	\$231	17	3%	48	\$196	3	24%	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$12,279	42	2579%	3
Lunenburg County	\$79	47	7%	36	\$83	27	17%	14	494.27	28	-0.10	35	\$14,824	37	214%	10
Mahone Bay	\$239	15	3%	47	\$144	8	14%	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$15,000	36	-100%	38
Middleton	\$237	16	2%	51	\$133	12	-7%	53	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$14,246	39	789%	4
Mulgrave	\$119	35	9%	21	\$168	5	12%	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$22,500	29	n/a	n/a
New Glasgow	\$334	2	22%	5	\$141	10	6%	31	1475.00	9	-0.09	34	\$30,397	20	-43%	32
Oxford	\$258	12	15%	10	\$131	13	30%	7	2214.57	1	0.00	15	\$14,528	38	152%	15
Parrsboro	\$168	26	-8%	55	\$85	25	-2%	48	932.40	15	-0.20	38	\$6,458	48	-86%	36
Pictou	\$154	29	7%	31	\$93	24	-5%	52	1093.47	13	0.06	4	\$269	50	n/a	n/a
Pictou County	\$87	45	12%	13	\$68	38	18%	12	429.60	34	0.00	14	\$27,239	23	56%	23
Port Hawkesbury	\$167	27	9%	20	\$103	21	8%	27	1104.67	12	0.17	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Queens	\$130	32	11%	14	\$55	45	3%	40	483.80	29	-0.01	17	\$42,569	12	105%	18
Richmond County	\$108	38	7%	33	\$70	35	7%	29	445.93	31	0.00	13	\$8,806	47	180%	12
Shelburne	\$249	13	4%	41	\$60	42	3%	39	1957.47	2	-0.12	36	\$58,507	4	-100%	38
Shelburne County	\$105	41	4%	44	\$69	36	2%	43	474.57	30	-0.17	37	\$106,180	2	454%	6
Springhill	\$273	10	28%	3	\$102	22	8%	28	999.57	14	-0.02	23	\$10,962	45	-76%	34



Municipality	Total Police Service Operating Costs per Capita (Average 2006-2008)		Total Police Service Operating Costs per Capita (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Total Fire Services Op. Costs per Cap (Average 2006-2008)		Total Fire Services Op. Costs per Cap (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Crime Rate Per 10,000 population (2006-2008)		Change in Crime Rate Per 10,000 population (2006-2008)		Monetary Damage Caused by Fire per Fire		Change in Monetary Damage cause by Fire per Fire	
	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R
St. Mary's	\$125	33	7%	32	\$20	55	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$25,000	25	n/a	n/a
Stellarton	\$242	14	7%	35	\$72	32	4%	38	794.23	21	0.43	1	\$564	49	n/a	n/a
Stewiacke	\$76	50	3%	46	\$78	30	4%	37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1,000,000	1	n/a	n/a
Trenton	\$327	4	7%	29	\$71	33	-2%	47	927.10	16	0.00	16	\$20,971	31	-19%	30
Truro	\$314	5	-2%	54	\$126	14	-1%	46	1768.40	3	-0.02	20	\$28,235	22	3779%	2
Victoria	\$143	31	16%	7	\$76	31	15%	16	1581.13	5	0.02	8	\$55,500	6	n/a	n/a
Westville	\$191	23	10%	18	\$84	26	3%	41	871.33	18	0.02	11	\$35,642	15	8%	27
Windsor	\$214	19	8%	25	\$96	23	58%	2	1397.10	10	-0.03	26	\$24,095	27	8%	29
Wolfville	\$273	9	2%	52	\$180	4	-3%	51	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$48,631	8	459%	5
Yarmouth	\$213	20	16%	8	\$231	2	14%	18	1739.47	4	-0.02	24	\$23,759	28	83%	20
Yarmouth County	\$68	53	10%	17	\$65	41	43%	3	388.80	35	0.02	9	\$22,429	30	72%	21
Average	\$175		9%		\$97		17%		926.44		-0.01		\$48,656		742%	
Min	\$65		-8%		\$20		-24%		276.77		-0.20		\$269		-100%	
Max	\$375		33%		\$301		342%		2214.57		0.43		\$1,000,000		22122%	



	TRANSPORTATION				RECREATION & CULTURE			
	Roads and Streets Operating Costs Per km (Average 2006-2008)		Roads and Streets Operating Costs Per km (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Operating Costs for Recreation and Cultural Services Per Capita (2006-2008)		Operating Costs for Recreation and Cultural Services Per Capita Percent Change (2006-2008)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Amherst	\$3,659	17	15%	9	\$128	15	1%	47
Annapolis County	\$2,340	30	n/a	n/a	\$36	45	25%	2
Annapolis Royal	\$6,382	5	18%	7	\$193	8	9%	19
Antigonish	\$4,952	12	n/a	n/a	\$93	25	8%	23
Antigonish County	\$2,112	33	6%	24	\$46	37	5%	32
Argyle	\$1,791	37	101%	4	\$51	36	-2%	51
Barrington	\$2,085	34	9%	20	\$79	30	3%	37
Berwick	\$3,609	19	25%	5	\$87	26	7%	26
Bridgetown	\$1,981	36	n/a	n/a	\$97	23	7%	27
Bridgewater	\$5,846	7	17%	8	\$150	11	12%	10
Canso	\$1,721	39	n/a	n/a	\$79	29	15%	8
Cape Breton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$65	31	8%	22
Chester	\$2,434	29	12%	12	\$53	34	9%	18
Clare	\$1,565	42	n/a	n/a	\$32	47	3%	38
Clark's Harbour	\$2,768	26	-1%	29	\$99	22	-5%	52
Colchester	\$13,965	1	6%	25	\$29	49	11%	13
Cumberland	\$1,014	49	n/a	n/a	\$14	55	-7%	53
Digby	\$3,210	23	22%	6	\$80	28	12%	9
Digby County	\$900	50	n/a	n/a	\$27	50	1%	44
Guysborough County	\$1,521	43	11%	14	\$126	16	6%	30
Halifax	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$113	18	7%	28
Hants East	\$2,121	32	6%	26	\$40	43	3%	40
Hants West	\$1,323	47	-8%	32	\$16	53	n/a	n/a
Hantsport	\$12,834	2	15%	10	\$99	21	34%	1
Inverness County	\$3,117	25	11%	13	\$37	44	-11%	54
Kentville	\$4,317	15	n/a	n/a	\$149	12	9%	16
Kings County	\$10,125	3	n/a	n/a	\$17	52	11%	12
Lockeport	\$3,523	20	-12%	36	\$215	6	5%	34
Lunenburg	\$5,158	11	12%	11	\$225	3	1%	45
Lunenburg County	\$1,620	41	4%	27	\$29	48	2%	41
Mahone Bay	\$5,501	9	-5%	31	\$41	42	-1%	49



	Roads and Streets Operating Costs Per km (Average 2006-2008)		Roads and Streets Operating Costs Per km (Average Percent Change 2006-2008)		Operating Costs for Recreation and Cultural Services Per Capita (2006-2008)		Operating Costs for Recreation and Cultural Services Per Capita Percent Change (2006-2008)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Middleton	\$3,280	21	0%	28	\$101	20	8%	24
Mulgrave	\$5,909	6	229%	1	\$203	7	19%	4
New Glasgow	\$3,642	18	163%	2	\$102	19	21%	3
Oxford	\$6,919	4	9%	16	\$220	4	12%	11
Parrsboro	\$1,427	45	n/a	n/a	\$43	39	-1%	50
Pictou	\$1,474	44	-10%	35	\$217	5	1%	46
Pictou County	\$4,574	14	9%	19	\$15	54	7%	29
Port Hawkesbury	\$4,795	13	9%	17	\$379	1	-1%	48
Queens	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$54	33	9%	20
Richmond County	\$2,042	35	8%	21	\$41	41	3%	39
Shelburne	\$3,137	24	-5%	30	\$140	13	9%	17
Shelburne County	\$1,048	48	n/a	n/a	\$42	40	15%	7
Springhill	\$798	51	9%	18	\$137	14	9%	15
St. Mary's	\$2,753	27	n/a	n/a	\$44	38	6%	31
Stellarton	\$2,703	28	8%	23	\$62	32	1%	43
Stewiacke	\$1,772	38	121%	3	\$95	24	2%	42
Trenton	\$1,648	40	n/a	n/a	\$270	2	4%	36
Truro	\$5,371	10	n/a	n/a	\$120	17	8%	25
Victoria	\$1,424	46	-8%	33	\$27	51	5%	33
Westville	\$615	52	-9%	34	\$35	46	16%	6
Windsor	\$3,226	22	10%	15	\$183	9	8%	21
Wolfville	\$2,297	31	8%	22	\$150	10	18%	5
Yarmouth	\$5,766	8	n/a	n/a	\$87	27	10%	14
Yarmouth County	\$3,745	16	n/a	n/a	\$53	35	5%	35
Average	\$3,536		23%		\$98		7%	
Min	\$615		-12%		\$14		-11%	
Max	\$13,965		229%		\$379		34%	



ENVIRONMENT

Municipality	Drinking Water Operating Costs Per Million Litres of Water Treated Average (06-08)		Drinking Water Operating Costs Per Million Litres of Water Treated Average (Average Annual Percent Change 2006 and 2008)		Operating Costs for Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Per Ton Average (2006 and 2008)		Operating Costs for Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Per Ton Average (Average Annual Percent Change 2006 and 2008)		Wastewater Operating Costs Per km of Wastewater pipe Average (2006-08)		Wastewater Operating Costs Per km of Wastewater pipe Average (Average Annual Percent Change 2006 and 2008)		Number of Wastewater Main Back-ups Per km of Main Average (2006-08)		Number of Boil Water Advisories (2006)		Percent of Water Tests that Contain Bacteria Average (2006-08)	
	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R	\$	R
Amherst	\$550	28	-4%	14	\$313	13	n/a	n/a	\$3,065	36	n/a	n/a	0.04	16	2.00	1	0.0%	18
Annapolis County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	1.00	4	0.0%	18
Annapolis Royal	\$1,951	7	-11%	15	\$630	5	n/a	n/a	\$14,136	6	422%	1	0.40	2	0.00	14	0.8%	3
Antigonish	\$525	29	n/a	n/a	\$981	2	n/a	n/a	\$8,881	12	9%	15	0.04	14	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Antigonish County	\$2,770	6	n/a	n/a	\$346	9	n/a	n/a	\$8,732	13	10%	14	0.05	13	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Argyle	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$476	6	n/a	n/a	\$5,004	28	-22%	29	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Barrington	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$372	8	n/a	n/a	\$10,505	11	-43%	31	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Berwick	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$7,556	17	44%	5	0.02	21	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Bridgetown	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$810	47	n/a	n/a	0.02	20	1.00	4	0.3%	11
Bridgewater	\$650	26	n/a	n/a	\$239	20	n/a	n/a	\$2,930	39	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Canso	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Cape Breton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$317	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	1.00	4	0.0%	18
Chester	\$1,949	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$8,729	14	-43%	32	0.02	19	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Clare	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$7,741	15	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	1.7%	1
Clark's Harbour	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$823	3	n/a	n/a	\$4,911	29	5%	19	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Colchester	\$1,762	9	58%	3	\$108	27	n/a	n/a	\$11,872	7	12%	11	0.01	23	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Cumberland	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Digby	\$1,230	15	25%	5	\$256	18	n/a	n/a	\$7,668	16	7%	17	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.3%	8
Digby County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$238	21	n/a	n/a	\$2,976	37	-8%	26	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Guysborough County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1,190	1	n/a	n/a	\$6,822	20	18%	10	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Halifax	\$582	27	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$6,127	22	4%	21	0.03	17	n/a	14	0.0%	18
Hants East	\$516	31	n/a	n/a	\$277	15	n/a	n/a	\$11,452	8	29%	8	0.07	10	0.00	14	0.3%	11
Hants West	\$1,657	11	7%	9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$7,362	18	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	2.00	1	0.0%	18
Hantsport	\$1,211	16	29%	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$2,627	42	n/a	n/a	0.13	7	1.00	4	0.0%	16
Inverness County	\$524	30	2%	11	\$261	17	n/a	n/a	\$11,040	9	3%	22	0.15	6	0.00	14	0.6%	6
Kentville	\$686	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$14,405	5	8%	16	0.06	11	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Kings County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Lockeport	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$74	28	n/a	n/a	\$5,231	25	-3%	24	0.00	27	1.00	4	0.0%	18
Lunenburg	\$825	20	15%	7	\$141	24	n/a	n/a	\$15,788	4	10%	13	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Lunenburg County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$19	31	n/a	n/a	\$10,587	10	59%	4	0.01	25	1.00	4	0.0%	18
Mahone Bay	\$1,307	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$3,742	35	-46%	33	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Middleton	\$794	23	6%	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$5,789	23	31%	7	0.08	9	0.00	14	0.3%	8
Mulgrave	\$875	19	19%	6	\$126	26	n/a	n/a	\$3,757	34	93%	3	0.06	11	0.00	14	0.6%	5
New Glasgow	\$3,974	4	n/a	n/a	\$300	14	n/a	n/a	\$4,245	33	-47%	35	0.04	14	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Oxford	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$321	10	n/a	n/a	\$6,608	21	-3%	25	0.36	3	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Parrsboro	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Pictou	\$979	18	-3%	13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1,088	46	-11%	27	0.12	8	0.00	14	0.3%	8
Pictou County	\$745	24	n/a	n/a	\$211	22	n/a	n/a	\$5,373	24	5%	18	0.02	21	1.00	4	0.8%	4
Port Hawkesbury	\$803	22	0%	12	\$178	23	n/a	n/a	\$6,955	19	146%	2	0.16	5	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Queens	\$1,004	17	88%	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$4,758	30	4%	20	0.01	23	n/a	14	0.5%	7
Richmond County	\$1,249	14	n/a	n/a	\$262	16	n/a	n/a	\$28,811	2	3%	23	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	16
Shelburne	\$1,304	13	n/a	n/a	\$72	29	n/a	n/a	\$2,969	38	-31%	30	1.06	1	0.00	14	0.9%	2
Shelburne County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$34	30	n/a	n/a	\$59,104	1	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18



Municipality	Drinking Water Operating Costs Per Million Litres of Water Treated Average (06-08)		Drinking Water Operating Costs Per Million Litres of Water Treated Average (Average Annual Percent Change 2006 and 2008)		Operating Costs for Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Per Ton Average (2006 and 2008)		Operating Costs for Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Per Ton Average (Average Annual Percent Change 2006 and 2008)		Wastewater Operating Costs Per km of Wastewater pipe Average (2006-08)		Wastewater Operating Costs Per km of Wastewater pipe Average (Average Annual Percent Change 2006 and 2008)		Number of Wastewater Main Back-ups Per km of Main Average (2006-08)		Number of Boil Water Advisories (2006)		Percent of Water Tests that Contain Bacteria Average (2006-08)	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
Springhill	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$4,382	32	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	1.00	4	0.0%	18
St. Mary's	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Stellarton	\$475	32	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$5,021	27	-47%	34	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Stewiacke	\$5,161	3	-86%	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$2,695	41	33%	6	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Trenton	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$248	19	n/a	n/a	\$2,084	43	-50%	37	0.01	25	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Truro	\$5,712	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1,919	45	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Victoria	\$3,116	5	n/a	n/a	\$781	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	2.00	1	0.2%	13
Westville	\$6,651	1	n/a	n/a	\$316	12	n/a	n/a	\$2,888	40	10%	12	0.03	17	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Windsor	\$804	21	12%	8	\$137	25	n/a	n/a	\$4,616	31	20%	9	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.2%	13
Wolfville	\$1,761	10	130%	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$5,029	26	-19%	28	0.31	4	1.00	4	0.0%	18
Yarmouth	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$18,949	3	-47%	36	0.00	27	1.00	4	0.1%	15
Yarmouth County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$378	7	n/a	n/a	\$2,039	44	n/a	n/a	0.00	27	0.00	14	0.0%	18
Average	\$1,691		18%		\$336		n/a		\$8,080		15%		0.06		0.30		0.1%	
Min	\$475		-86%		\$19		n/a		\$810		-50%		0.00		0.00		0.0%	
Max	\$6,651		130%		\$1,190		n/a		\$59,104		422%		1.06		2.00		1.7%	



ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Municipality	Planning & Zoning Operating Costs Per Capita (2006-2008)		Planning & Zoning Operating Costs Per Capita Percent Change (2006-2008)		Community Development Operating Costs Per Capita (2006-2008)		Community Development Operating Costs Per Capita Percent Change (2006-2008)		Percentage Population Change from 2001-2006		Percentage Immigrant Population Change from 2001-2006	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
	Amherst	\$23	13	9%	20	\$25	13	15%	18	0%	13	21%
Annapolis County	\$22	14	15%	9	\$5	40	209%	5	-2%	23	44%	8
Annapolis Royal	\$141	1	9%	21	\$444	1	65%	8	-19%	55	46%	7
Antigonish	\$22	16	8%	24	\$15	22	0%	32	-11%	53	-53%	52
Antigonish County	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$14	24	39%	10	-2%	21	71%	3
Argyle	\$6	42	20%	7	\$9	31	-35%	49	0%	16	-57%	53
Barrington	\$9	37	9%	22	\$4	43	-10%	41	-4%	37	16%	20
Berwick	\$12	32	-5%	45	\$12	26	4%	26	8%	1	0%	30
Bridgetown	\$43	6	5%	31	\$24	15	-19%	45	-6%	43	-33%	49
Bridgewater	\$16	21	9%	19	\$5	41	15%	17	4%	3	-11%	42
Canso	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$30	9	-27%	47	-8%	47	n/a	30
Cape Breton	\$9	36	-1%	41	\$3	51	n/a	32	-3%	34	-2%	37
Chester	\$20	19	11%	15	\$6	37	8%	23	0%	15	10%	25
Clare	\$13	30	545%	1	\$4	47	-9%	40	-3%	32	-23%	46
Clark's Harbour	\$1	52	367%	2	\$21	17	-37%	50	-9%	50	-33%	49
Colchester	\$2	49	-1%	42	\$4	44	8%	24	1%	11	20%	19
Cumberland	\$14	27	12%	12	\$35	8	104%	6	-1%	20	-7%	41
Digby	\$6	41	-13%	48	\$25	12	248%	4	-1%	18	-5%	39
Digby County	\$3	48	-24%	49	\$12	25	72%	7	-3%	33	30%	12
Guysborough County	\$55	3	-4%	44	\$64	4	34%	12	-9%	51	15%	21
Halifax	\$23	12	5%	30	n/a	n/a	n/a	32	4%	4	12%	24
Hants East	\$16	22	10%	18	\$3	50	10%	21	3%	7	-26%	47
Hants West	\$11	33	14%	10	\$3	53	n/a	32	1%	12	6%	26
Hantsport	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$11	29	-32%	48	-1%	19	50%	5
Inverness County	\$8	38	6%	26	\$4	45	0%	31	-4%	36	1%	29
Kentville	\$31	9	2%	37	\$6	36	4%	27	4%	5	-14%	43
Kings County	\$14	26	22%	6	\$4	46	1%	30	1%	10	-2%	35
Lockeport	\$5	43	-13%	47	\$10	30	-43%	52	-8%	46	100%	2
Lunenburg	\$30	10	-1%	40	\$18	21	-12%	44	-10%	52	58%	4
Lunenburg County	\$12	31	-2%	43	\$5	38	25%	14	-2%	25	-2%	36
Mahone Bay	\$53	4	10%	17	\$4	48	6%	25	-9%	49	33%	10
Middleton	\$44	5	3%	35	\$57	6	14%	19	5%	2	-22%	45
Mulgrave	\$1	50	n/a	n/a	\$5	39	38%	11	-3%	31	0%	30



Municipality	Planning & Zoning Operating Costs Per Capita (2006-2008)		Planning & Zoning Operating Costs Per Capita Percent Change (2006-2008)		Community Development Operating Costs Per Capita (2006-2008)		Community Development Operating Costs Per Capita Percent Change (2006-2008)		Percentage Population Change from 2001-2006		Percentage Immigrant Population Change from 2001-2006	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
	New Glasgow	\$21	17	5%	32	\$11	27	1%	29	0%	14	-21%
Oxford	\$14	29	4%	33	\$22	16	-8%	39	-12%	54	20%	18
Parrsboro	\$21	18	3%	34	\$24	14	-12%	43	-8%	48	167%	1
Pictou	\$15	24	8%	23	\$3	52	0%	32	-2%	24	-5%	38
Pictou County	\$4	45	14%	11	\$7	33	9%	22	-1%	17	-34%	51
Port Hawkesbury	\$14	25	5%	29	\$11	28	1%	28	-5%	42	14%	22
Queens	\$15	23	5%	28	\$26	11	759%	1	-4%	38	-29%	48
Richmond County	\$14	28	6%	27	\$70	3	-8%	38	-5%	41	23%	14
Shelburne	\$3	47	45%	4	\$7	34	-1%	35	-7%	45	-6%	40
Shelburne County	\$1	51	3%	36	\$20	19	-3%	37	-2%	29	33%	10
Springhill	\$7	40	64%	3	\$5	42	19%	16	-4%	35	40%	9
St. Mary's	\$9	35	-44%	50	\$19	20	0%	32	-6%	44	25%	13
Stellarton	\$19	20	7%	25	\$38	7	-10%	42	-2%	28	50%	5
Stewiacke	\$8	39	38%	5	\$4	49	-25%	46	2%	9	0%	30
Trenton	\$23	11	12%	13	\$14	23	363%	3	-2%	30	22%	15
Truro	\$22	15	10%	16	\$27	10	401%	2	3%	8	22%	16
Victoria	\$3	46	n/a	n/a	\$6	35	-39%	51	-5%	39	0%	30
Westville	\$11	34	11%	14	\$2	54	12%	20	-2%	27	-63%	54
Windsor	\$40	7	1%	39	\$20	18	21%	15	-2%	26	4%	28
Wolfville	\$68	2	15%	8	\$59	5	-3%	36	3%	6	13%	23
Yarmouth	\$32	8	1%	38	\$86	2	28%	13	-2%	22	0%	30
Yarmouth County	\$4	44	-11%	46	\$9	32	62%	9	-5%	40	4%	27
Average	\$20		24%		\$26		44%		-3%		10%	
Min	\$1		-44%		\$2		-43%		-19%		-63%	
Max	\$141		545%		\$444		759%		8%		167%	

Atlantic
 Institute for
AIMS
 Market Studies

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