

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Toronto, City of	GTA	ST	0.00%	2.9%	4	2.1%	7	316,491	1	178.2%	10	3.4%	8	0.0%	1	20.0%	3	3.1%	1
Durham, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oshawa, City of	GTA	LT	1.8%	4.5%	9	2.4%	8	198,357	4	118.2%	8	12.0%	3	0.1%	4	15.8%	4	7.9%	5
Pickering, City of	GTA	LT	5.2%	4.0%	8	1.8%	6	333,293	1	126.9%	9	11.0%	4	0.3%	5	15.1%	4	6.4%	4
Ajax, Town of	GTA	LT	1.7%	4.9%	10	1.8%	6	309,695	1	109.7%	6	35.3%	1	0.1%	3	10.6%	5	4.0%	2
Clarington, Municipality of	GTA	LT	23.4%	4.2%	9	2.0%	7	249,866	2	120.2%	8	25.4%	1	0.9%	6	8.9%	6	6.0%	4
Whitby, Town of	GTA	LT	3.1%	4.7%	10	1.8%	6	297,271	1	112.8%	7	42.7%	1	0.1%	4	12.7%	5	4.6%	2
Brock, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	4.6%	10	2.1%	7	209,119	3	108.6%	6	4.4%	7	3.2%	8	6.3%	8	3.2%	1
Scugog, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	4.4%	9	1.7%	6	275,647	2	105.1%	5	17.7%	2	2.1%	7	7.4%	7	4.0%	2
Uxbridge, Township of	GTA	LT	50.9%	4.6%	10	1.6%	6	342,524	1	107.2%	6	18.1%	2	2.2%	8	7.9%	7	4.8%	3
Haldimand, County of	Central	ST	100.0%	3.2%	6	2.3%	8	181,879	4	119.7%	8	12.4%	3	2.8%	8	14.7%	4	8.4%	6
Norfolk, County of	SW	ST	76.7%	3.5%	7	1.9%	7	169,820	5	107.8%	6	10.3%	4	4.7%	9	9.3%	6	4.5%	2
Halton, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Burlington, City of	GTA	LT	2.5%	3.3%	6	1.3%	4	321,442	1	119.6%	8	17.2%	2	0.1%	3	17.0%	3	3.6%	2
Halton Hills, Town of	GTA	LT	18.5%	3.3%	6	1.3%	4	328,206	1	113.1%	7	20.8%	1	0.5%	5	9.5%	6	4.6%	2
Milton, Town of	GTA	LT	29.4%	4.4%	9	1.1%	3	393,052	1	124.3%	9	62.1%	1	0.5%	5	17.3%	3	6.4%	4
Oakville, Town of	GTA	LT	0.8%	3.9%	8	1.2%	3	449,932	1	114.0%	7	21.3%	1	0.0%	2	13.8%	4	3.5%	1
Hamilton, City of	Central	ST	7.3%	4.2%	9	2.9%	9	188,818	4	128.6%	9	8.3%	5	0.3%	5	13.1%	5	3.0%	1
Niagara, Region of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Niagara Falls, City of	Central	LT	3.1%	4.2%	9	2.3%	8	220,128	3	145.3%	10	10.6%	4	0.1%	3	33.6%	1	17.5%	9
Port Colborne, City of	Central	LT	16.2%	4.8%	10	3.3%	10	125,494	8	119.0%	9	3.6%	8	0.4%	5	12.5%	5	11.0%	7
St. Catharines, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	4.6%	10	2.4%	9	170,367	5	120.4%	8	3.4%	8	0.2%	4	14.6%	4	5.4%	3
Welland, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	4.2%	9	2.9%	9	135,041	7	118.4%	8	5.2%	7	0.1%	3	12.2%	5	6.4%	4
Thorold, City of	Central	LT	7.4%	4.0%	9	2.6%	9	174,748	5	122.1%	8	3.5%	8	0.4%	5	16.2%	4	8.4%	6
Fort Erie, Town of	Central	LT	22.6%	4.3%	9	2.4%	8	177,223	5	113.1%	7	6.2%	6	0.2%	4	12.1%	5	7.2%	5
Grimsby, Town of	Central	LT	8.9%	4.7%	10	2.2%	8	245,021	2	111.9%	7	24.3%	1	0.4%	5	8.8%	6	5.2%	3
Lincoln, Town of	Central	LT	44.3%	4.1%	9	2.4%	8	232,907	3	112.4%	7	14.6%	2	2.7%	8	11.0%	5	4.8%	3
Niagara-on-the-Lake, Town of	Central	LT	62.9%	5.9%	10	1.7%	6	360,375	1	118.9%	8	17.2%	2	2.0%	7	14.7%	4	7.4%	5
Pelham, Town of	Central	LT	20.5%	4.5%	9	2.2%	8	240,475	2	107.8%	6	12.0%	3	1.1%	6	4.4%	9	4.0%	2
Wainfleet, Township of	Central	LT	94.6%	4.7%	10	2.5%	9	181,813	5	103.0%	4	5.2%	7	3.1%	8	3.4%	9	3.8%	2
West Lincoln, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	2.3%	8	204,546	3	117.1%	8	13.5%	3	4.1%	8	8.1%	7	5.3%	3
Ottawa, City of	East	ST	8.0%	3.2%	5	2.1%	7	268,515	2	140.5%	10	15.2%	2	0.1%	4	19.7%	3	3.6%	1
Peel, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Brampton, City of	GTA	LT	2.8%	4.4%	9	1.3%	3	336,830	1	108.6%	6	39.5%	1	0.1%	3	18.2%	3	3.5%	1
Mississauga, City of	GTA	LT	0.1%	3.3%	6	1.1%	2	371,490	1	123.5%	9	15.6%	2	0.0%	2	24.5%	2	2.5%	1
Caledon, Town of	GTA	LT	46.5%	3.2%	6	0.9%	2	412,674	1	104.6%	5	17.9%	2	1.3%	7	10.3%	6	3.8%	2
Greater Sudbury, City of	North	ST	13.5%	3.5%	6	3.1%	10	116,338	8	126.1%	9	2.4%	8	0.0%	3	20.0%	3	6.0%	4
Waterloo, Region of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cambridge, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	3.7%	7	2.3%	8	221,172	3	130.1%	9	21.6%	1	0.1%	3	20.3%	2	6.4%	4
Kitchener, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	3.5%	6	2.2%	8	190,451	4	128.3%	9	17.3%	2	0.0%	3	14.7%	4	3.8%	2
Waterloo, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	4.0%	8	2.0%	8	241,773	2	125.1%	9	16.4%	2	0.0%	2	13.9%	4	4.5%	2
North Dumfries, Township of	Central	LT	58.5%	2.8%	4	1.7%	6	348,018	1	123.6%	9	17.7%	2	2.5%	8	21.2%	2	11.6%	7

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Wellesley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	2.1%	7	257,163	2	112.4%	7	20.3%	1	8.0%	9	8.1%	7	2.6%	1
Wilmot, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	1.9%	7	258,244	2	110.4%	7	27.8%	1	3.2%	8	7.3%	7	6.8%	5
Woolwich, Township of	Central	LT	48.4%	3.1%	5	1.7%	6	289,017	1	122.3%	8	27.2%	1	3.4%	8	17.0%	3	7.6%	5
<b>York, Region of</b>	<b>GTA</b>	<b>UT</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Vaughan, City of	GTA	LT	2.3%	5.1%	10	0.9%	2	564,902	1	108.3%	6	35.3%	1	0.1%	3	24.0%	2	3.8%	2
Aurora, Town of	GTA	LT	4.0%	4.1%	9	1.1%	2	392,461	1	103.4%	4	22.4%	1	0.1%	3	12.7%	5	5.3%	3
Markham, Town of	GTA	LT	2.0%	4.7%	10	0.9%	2	466,940	1	105.5%	5	28.3%	1	0.1%	3	16.9%	3	3.4%	1
Newmarket, Town of	GTA	LT	0.0%	3.7%	7	1.1%	2	345,321	1	104.8%	5	22.6%	1	0.0%	2	16.2%	4	6.2%	4
Richmond Hill, Town of	GTA	LT	1.0%	5.1%	10	0.9%	2	450,886	1	102.8%	4	31.5%	1	0.0%	3	10.9%	5	2.7%	1
Whitchurch-Stouffville, Town of	GTA	LT	49.7%	4.4%	9	1.0%	2	494,510	1	103.0%	4	26.5%	1	0.8%	6	8.9%	6	5.9%	4
East Gwillimbury, Town of	GTA	LT	32.0%	3.7%	7	1.0%	2	374,709	1	102.3%	3	16.1%	2	1.4%	7	10.2%	6	7.5%	5
Georgina, Town of	GTA	LT	29.7%	4.8%	10	1.3%	4	236,350	2	101.0%	2	11.4%	3	0.5%	5	5.4%	8	3.0%	1
King, Township of	GTA	LT	48.1%	4.5%	10	1.0%	2	493,891	1	102.4%	3	8.6%	5	2.1%	8	5.0%	8	3.9%	2
<b>Muskoka, District of</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>UT</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Bracebridge, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	1.1%	2	250,100	2	101.2%	2	12.1%	3	0.1%	3	10.7%	5	5.1%	3
Gravenhurst, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.5%	10	1.0%	2	273,291	2	100.4%	2	9.2%	4	0.0%	3	8.8%	6	6.4%	4
Huntsville, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.0%	8	1.0%	2	263,619	2	101.1%	2	14.8%	2	0.1%	3	15.2%	4	6.5%	4
Georgian Bay, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.8%	10	0.7%	1	325,402	1	100.2%	1	6.5%	6	0.2%	4	2.9%	9	3.1%	1
Lake of Bays, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.0%	8	0.6%	1	411,244	1	100.2%	1	9.9%	4	0.2%	4	2.0%	10	3.6%	2
Muskoka Lakes, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.3%	9	0.6%	1	647,216	1	100.5%	2	8.0%	5	0.1%	3	2.2%	10	2.2%	1
<b>Oxford, County of</b>	<b>SW</b>	<b>UT</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Woodstock, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	4.2%	9	3.1%	10	161,359	6	125.9%	9	16.4%	2	0.1%	4	18.5%	3	7.1%	5
Ingersoll, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.5%	7	2.9%	9	168,665	5	132.4%	10	14.4%	2	0.0%	2	22.9%	2	16.3%	8
Tillsonburg, Town of	SW	LT	0.0%	3.9%	8	2.9%	9	163,016	6	127.6%	9	11.4%	3	0.2%	4	18.6%	3	9.7%	6
Blandford Blenheim, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.6%	3	2.1%	7	234,142	3	110.1%	7	1.3%	9	12.9%	10	16.2%	4	16.7%	9
East Zorra-Tavistock, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	2.1%	7	218,021	3	111.6%	7	5.7%	6	14.7%	10	13.8%	4	12.7%	7
Norwich, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	2.4%	9	198,178	4	109.0%	6	9.0%	4	14.7%	10	7.5%	7	3.9%	2
South-West Oxford, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	2.2%	8	198,731	4	114.8%	8	7.1%	6	17.2%	10	12.2%	5	9.5%	6
Zorra, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	2.3%	8	255,380	2	114.0%	7	8.5%	5	19.5%	10	14.4%	4	13.8%	8
<b>Brantford, City of</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>165,730</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>128.3%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Brant, County of</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>232,357</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>113.0%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Bruce, County of</b>	<b>SW</b>	<b>UT</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
South Bruce Peninsula, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.7%	7	1.3%	3	169,117	5	101.1%	2	4.5%	7	0.9%	6	4.8%	9	3.7%	2
Saugeen Shores, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	1.2%	3	202,691	3	102.4%	4	11.2%	4	0.8%	6	7.5%	7	5.1%	3
Arran Elderslie, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.8%	4	1.6%	5	132,151	7	104.4%	5	12.3%	3	9.7%	10	9.7%	6	6.6%	4
Brockton, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.6%	5	144,273	7	105.3%	5	5.2%	7	7.1%	9	10.5%	5	5.2%	3
Northern Bruce Peninsula, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	1.0%	2	203,733	3	108.4%	6	6.0%	6	0.9%	6	6.3%	8	4.3%	2
Huron-Kinloss, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.0%	5	1.2%	3	197,148	4	101.5%	3	9.0%	5	7.4%	9	3.1%	9	3.6%	1
Kincardine, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.6%	3	1.3%	4	211,180	3	114.7%	7	19.8%	1	4.1%	9	23.9%	2	20.2%	9
South Bruce, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.6%	3	1.4%	5	145,765	7	103.0%	4	5.1%	7	16.0%	10	6.8%	7	4.1%	2
<b>Dufferin, County of</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>UT</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Orangeville, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	4.0%	8	1.6%	6	230,431	3	111.2%	7	19.7%	1	0.0%	2	15.2%	4	7.2%	5

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Shelburne, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.3%	10	2.1%	7	202,405	3	113.4%	7	32.9%	1	0.0%	3	15.5%	4	13.1%	8
Mond, Town of	Central	LT	70.6%	4.2%	9	1.3%	3	384,187	1	102.1%	3	11.7%	3	2.1%	7	6.7%	7	5.3%	3
Amaranth, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.5%	3	269,999	2	104.1%	4	14.1%	2	5.7%	9	4.7%	9	4.7%	3
East Garafraxa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.5%	6	1.6%	5	331,975	1	102.2%	3	25.6%	1	8.2%	9	2.5%	10	6.0%	4
Melancthon, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.5%	6	1.6%	5	236,473	2	103.8%	4	22.2%	1	6.3%	9	4.9%	9	5.3%	3
Mulmur, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	1.1%	2	312,085	1	100.5%	2	12.2%	3	5.0%	9	2.8%	10	4.6%	2
East Luther Grand Valley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.5%	5	145,324	7	101.1%	2	8.0%	5	7.4%	9	3.6%	9	5.9%	4
Elgin, County of	SW	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
St Thomas, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	3.5%	6	2.8%	9	137,475	7	126.9%	9	17.3%	2	0.1%	4	17.0%	3	9.8%	6
Aylmer, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.9%	8	2.5%	9	139,587	7	115.2%	8	5.5%	6	0.0%	3	15.9%	4	9.3%	6
Southwold, Township of	SW	LT	87.8%	2.3%	2	2.2%	8	250,217	2	128.9%	9	12.0%	3	13.3%	10	20.0%	3	21.6%	9
Bayham, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	2.2%	8	147,997	7	107.4%	6	12.2%	3	8.8%	10	8.5%	6	7.4%	5
Central Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	48.0%	4.4%	9	2.4%	8	201,651	3	106.8%	6	10.9%	4	5.1%	9	6.5%	8	3.7%	2
Dutton/Dunwich, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	2.0%	7	171,007	5	104.8%	5	12.0%	3	16.1%	10	6.6%	7	7.1%	5
Malahide, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	2.1%	7	201,668	3	118.3%	8	9.8%	4	13.3%	10	14.0%	4	12.8%	8
West Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	2.2%	8	139,714	7	110.2%	7	7.2%	6	11.7%	10	9.5%	6	7.3%	5
Essex, County of	SW	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Windsor, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	4.1%	9	3.1%	10	163,920	6	137.7%	10	9.5%	4	0.0%	3	23.8%	2	7.5%	5
LaSalle, Town of	SW	LT	19.3%	3.6%	7	1.4%	4	250,810	2	102.2%	3	25.2%	1	0.2%	5	7.6%	7	5.7%	4
Amherstburg, Town of	SW	LT	46.7%	3.4%	6	1.5%	5	208,261	3	104.2%	5	10.8%	4	1.7%	7	8.3%	6	4.5%	2
Essex, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.0%	4	1.5%	5	172,828	5	103.9%	4	10.2%	4	3.5%	8	9.5%	6	8.7%	6
Kingsville, Town of	SW	LT	48.6%	2.8%	4	1.2%	3	204,371	3	104.0%	4	15.9%	2	5.0%	9	10.5%	5	5.6%	3
Lakeshore, Town of	SW	LT	46.3%	3.2%	5	1.4%	4	262,256	2	106.8%	6	27.8%	1	3.2%	8	10.3%	6	4.8%	3
Leamington, Municipality of	SW	LT	31.0%	3.9%	8	1.8%	6	178,299	5	109.4%	6	11.1%	4	5.5%	9	15.4%	4	7.4%	5
Tecumseh, Town of	SW	LT	19.2%	2.5%	2	1.4%	4	282,292	1	111.5%	7	6.2%	6	0.7%	5	20.8%	2	4.7%	3
Pelee, Township of	SW	ST	100.0%	0.0%	1	1.3%	4	287,264	1	102.8%	4	13.5%	3	3.0%	8	6.1%	8	10.2%	6
Frontenac, County of	East	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kingston, City of	East	ST	11.1%	4.0%	9	2.3%	8	186,907	4	133.4%	10	8.2%	5	0.1%	4	16.7%	3	6.2%	4
Central Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	1.1%	3	129,456	8	100.0%	1	8.0%	5	0.7%	5	1.9%	10	2.5%	1
Frontenac Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	1.0%	1	0.3%	1	213,104	3	101.7%	3	12.1%	3	2.2%	8	1.6%	10	5.4%	3
North Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.6%	10	1.0%	2	137,281	7	100.1%	1	5.3%	7	0.1%	4	1.8%	10	2.7%	1
South Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	0.8%	1	183,829	4	100.6%	2	11.8%	3	0.7%	5	1.7%	10	1.5%	1
Grey, County of	SW	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Owen Sound, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	3.8%	8	3.2%	10	144,073	7	145.2%	10	0.9%	9	0.0%	2	20.2%	2	11.4%	7
Hanover, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	1.7%	6	140,714	7	111.2%	7	14.1%	2	0.1%	4	18.8%	3	12.6%	7
The Blue Mountains, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.7%	10	0.9%	2	373,977	1	102.1%	3	31.0%	1	0.6%	5	13.8%	4	5.8%	4
Meaford, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.3%	9	1.5%	5	203,605	3	117.9%	8	8.4%	5	2.6%	8	7.1%	7	7.3%	5
Chatsworth, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.6%	3	1.3%	3	160,072	6	102.1%	3	12.5%	3	6.4%	9	4.3%	9	3.6%	2
Southgate, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	1.6%	5	165,492	6	102.6%	4	10.5%	4	7.8%	9	3.8%	9	3.9%	2
Georgian Bluffs, Township of	SW	LT	92.8%	2.8%	4	1.1%	3	209,247	3	103.6%	4	4.8%	7	2.1%	7	7.7%	7	4.4%	2
Grey Highlands, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.0%	4	1.3%	3	202,809	3	104.1%	4	11.7%	3	4.3%	9	5.7%	8	4.2%	2
West Grey, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	1.6%	5	160,749	6	103.5%	4	9.5%	4	5.9%	9	6.6%	8	3.4%	1

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Weight in Overall Composite Indicator		12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%			
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health			
				PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE															
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties					
Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile				
Halliburton, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		
Dysart et al, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.1%	5	0.6%	1	252,185	2	102.8%	4	9.8%	4	0.4%	5	4.9%	9	7.6%	5				
Minden Hills, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	0.8%	1	215,558	3	102.7%	4	7.1%	6	0.1%	3	2.9%	9	2.3%	1				
Highlands East, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.1%	5	1.0%	2	154,794	6	101.2%	2	5.1%	7	0.1%	4	2.5%	10	3.0%	1				
Algonquin Highlands, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	0.7%	1	238,140	2	102.3%	3	4.7%	7	0.0%	2	5.0%	9	5.8%	4				
Hastings, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		
Belleville, City of	East	ST	16.7%	3.9%	8	2.7%	9	153,513	6	134.6%	10	7.9%	5	0.3%	5	23.5%	2	10.1%	6				
Quinte West, City of	East	ST	37.0%	2.9%	4	1.9%	7	141,794	7	122.9%	8	6.2%	6	0.7%	5	15.7%	4	11.3%	7				
Deseronto, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	4.0%	8	1.8%	7	90,139	10	103.1%	4	3.5%	8	0.0%	3	10.5%	5	13.5%	8				
Bancroft, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	4.5%	10	1.5%	5	138,827	7	103.7%	4	2.4%	8	0.2%	4	19.9%	3	10.8%	7				
Faraday, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	1.1%	3	144,363	7	100.1%	1	6.0%	6	0.3%	5	3.7%	9	5.9%	4				
Limerick, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.9%	10	1.1%	2	124,586	8	100.0%	1	-1.1%	9	1.8%	7	1.1%	10	8.2%	6				
Madoc, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.5%	6	1.3%	4	128,506	8	100.8%	2	9.9%	4	4.1%	8	7.0%	7	7.7%	5				
Tudor and Cashel, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.7%	7	1.3%	4	104,840	9	99.7%	1	0.0%	9	1.2%	6	0.9%	10	7.0%	5				
Tyendinaga, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.5%	6	1.3%	4	151,201	7	100.3%	2	13.5%	3	2.5%	8	7.8%	7	8.9%	6				
Wollaston, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.7%	10	1.3%	4	128,042	8	100.1%	1	2.1%	8	0.5%	5	1.1%	10	7.1%	5				
Centre Hastings, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	1.5%	5	128,768	8	100.8%	2	11.1%	4	1.8%	7	7.0%	7	6.4%	4				
Stirling-Rawdon, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.0%	5	1.4%	5	125,274	8	101.1%	2	6.2%	6	4.2%	9	7.9%	7	6.2%	4				
Tweed, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.4%	4	113,423	8	100.8%	2	6.8%	6	1.9%	7	5.8%	8	3.5%	1				
Hastings Highlands, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	4.4%	9	1.1%	2	161,068	6	100.4%	2	3.8%	8	0.2%	4	2.8%	10	2.3%	1				
Carlton Place, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.4%	9	1.3%	4	111,448	9	99.9%	1	3.9%	7	1.2%	6	0.8%	10	8.6%	6				
Marmora and Lake, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	3.7%	7	1.2%	3	126,582	8	100.6%	2	4.4%	7	0.8%	6	5.0%	8	4.9%	3				
Huron, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		
Goderich, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.2%	10	1.8%	6	160,664	6	102.5%	4	6.0%	6	0.0%	1	18.8%	3	10.2%	6				
Bluewater, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	1.1%	3	205,717	3	100.8%	2	8.8%	5	8.8%	10	6.7%	7	5.0%	3				
South Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	1.3%	3	184,319	4	106.5%	6	4.3%	7	12.7%	10	15.9%	4	13.5%	8				
Huron East, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.8%	4	1.2%	3	168,505	5	102.2%	3	8.1%	5	24.3%	10	8.4%	6	4.2%	2				
Howick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	1.4%	4	148,956	7	100.5%	2	7.8%	5	19.4%	10	4.9%	9	5.6%	3				
Central Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	1.3%	4	161,869	6	101.5%	3	8.0%	5	12.2%	10	10.1%	6	10.5%	7				
Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.2%	3	190,183	4	100.5%	2	5.6%	6	13.6%	10	4.3%	9	7.2%	5				
Morris-Turnberry, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.4%	4	174,484	5	102.4%	3	5.4%	7	22.7%	10	12.1%	5	12.6%	7				
North Huron, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.3%	9	2.1%	7	130,359	8	101.7%	3	5.4%	6	7.1%	9	15.0%	4	8.3%	6				
Chatham-Kent, City of	SW	ST	46.7%	3.4%	6	3.1%	10	137,385	7	120.8%	8	4.3%	7	7.2%	9	15.9%	4	3.3%	1				
Lambton, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		
Sarnia, City of	SW	LT	4.3%	3.8%	8	2.7%	9	152,409	6	125.7%	9	3.9%	8	0.4%	5	17.9%	3	6.9%	5				
Lambton Shores, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.9%	8	1.7%	6	191,742	4	106.8%	6	8.6%	5	4.3%	9	9.2%	6	5.9%	4				
Petrolia, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.5%	6	2.3%	8	137,725	7	116.0%	8	27.0%	1	0.2%	4	16.7%	3	12.9%	8				
Plympton-Wyoming, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.5%	2	1.5%	5	204,292	3	106.3%	6	9.5%	4	9.7%	10	5.5%	8	5.4%	3				
Oil Springs, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.1%	2	2.1%	7	93,952	9	105.7%	5	-1.4%	9	3.1%	8	6.6%	7	15.4%	8				
Point Edward, Village of	SW	LT	0.0%	3.1%	5	1.7%	6	269,968	2	131.6%	9	-5.4%	10	0.0%	1	45.5%	1	40.5%	10				
Enniskillen, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.2%	2	1.7%	6	207,151	3	108.6%	6	-5.0%	10	24.6%	10	13.2%	5	15.4%	8				
Dawn-Euphermia, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.3%	2	1.6%	5	270,535	2	120.8%	8	-7.2%	10	25.9%	10	36.4%	1	36.2%	10				

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Warwick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.2%	2	1.6%	5	185,947	4	110.1%	7	0.2%	9	23.7%	10	12.7%	5	10.5%	7
Brooke-Alvinston, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.4%	2	2.2%	8	192,999	4	110.6%	7	-12.9%	10	28.6%	10	21.4%	2	22.0%	9
St. Clair, Township of	SW	LT	45.8%	2.3%	2	2.1%	7	218,429	3	154.9%	10	3.8%	8	6.2%	9	27.7%	1	20.8%	9
Lanark, County of	East	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	NA
Smiths Falls, Separated Town of	East	ST	100.0%	3.5%	7	3.5%	10	118,787	8	134.4%	10	3.8%	8	0.0%	1	24.2%	2	14.0%	8
Carleton Place, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	3.9%	8	2.0%	7	168,915	5	112.0%	7	13.9%	2	0.0%	2	14.1%	4	7.4%	5
Perth, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	4.3%	9	2.5%	9	153,448	6	124.5%	9	8.2%	5	0.0%	2	21.8%	2	12.7%	7
Mississippi Mills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	2.8%	4	1.4%	4	195,215	4	109.6%	6	11.5%	3	1.4%	7	7.1%	7	5.1%	3
Beckwith, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.5%	2	1.2%	3	198,804	4	101.3%	3	13.1%	3	0.7%	5	1.8%	10	3.3%	1
Montague, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	1.5%	5	164,951	6	123.5%	9	16.5%	2	1.2%	6	4.0%	9	5.1%	3
Lanark Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.9%	8	2.0%	7	141,571	7	102.7%	4	10.5%	4	1.0%	6	1.9%	10	2.5%	1
Drummond-North Elmsley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.8%	4	1.3%	4	188,007	4	102.1%	3	15.9%	2	1.3%	7	2.9%	9	3.3%	1
Tay Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	1.9%	7	195,301	4	108.0%	6	8.4%	5	1.0%	6	6.3%	8	7.1%	5
Leeds and Grenville, United Counties of	East	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	NA
Brockville, City of	East	ST	0.0%	3.6%	7	3.3%	10	141,295	7	129.2%	9	8.1%	5	0.0%	2	21.2%	2	10.4%	7
Ganoque, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	3.2%	5	2.4%	8	154,584	6	129.6%	9	5.4%	7	0.0%	2	18.7%	3	10.6%	7
Prescott, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	3.7%	7	3.0%	9	110,684	9	131.3%	9	4.6%	7	0.0%	1	23.8%	2	16.4%	8
Westport, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	4.4%	9	1.6%	6	160,900	6	107.3%	6	3.5%	8	0.1%	4	19.6%	3	14.5%	8
Merrickville-Wolford, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.6%	5	173,979	5	112.0%	7	12.2%	3	1.5%	7	8.3%	6	8.1%	5
Augusta, Township of	East	LT	90.6%	2.6%	3	2.1%	7	178,531	5	110.4%	7	0.4%	9	1.0%	6	9.5%	6	9.7%	6
Front of Yonge, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.4%	2	1.2%	3	164,118	6	106.0%	5	-1.7%	9	0.8%	6	6.7%	7	11.0%	7
North Grenville, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.4%	4	201,848	3	104.2%	5	13.6%	3	0.7%	6	7.3%	7	3.9%	2
Rideau Lakes, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.1%	5	1.1%	3	185,123	4	103.7%	4	7.1%	6	0.8%	6	2.7%	10	2.2%	1
Athens and Rear of Yonge and Escott, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.1%	2	1.2%	3	151,026	7	102.2%	3	4.4%	7	1.1%	6	4.0%	9	4.8%	3
Edwardsburgh/Cardinal, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.7%	6	155,724	6	110.1%	7	0.9%	9	1.6%	7	10.4%	5	8.5%	6
Leeds and the Thousand Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.0%	2	223,167	3	101.4%	3	5.0%	7	0.9%	6	9.0%	6	8.3%	6
Elizabethtown - Kitley, Township of	East	LT	90.8%	2.7%	3	1.3%	4	182,729	4	103.6%	4	2.6%	8	1.4%	7	8.3%	6	6.1%	4
Lennox and Addington, County of	East	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	NA
Greater Napanee, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	2.1%	7	158,206	6	148.5%	10	11.4%	3	1.4%	7	19.0%	3	12.4%	7
Addington Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.1%	9	1.6%	5	103,076	9	102.2%	3	2.6%	8	0.2%	4	4.4%	9	4.6%	2
Loyalist, Township of	East	LT	54.5%	3.6%	7	2.1%	7	181,411	5	124.2%	9	7.5%	6	0.8%	6	12.2%	5	12.9%	8
Stone Mills, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.3%	6	2.4%	8	142,318	7	104.5%	5	8.3%	5	2.5%	8	3.7%	9	3.7%	2
Middlesex, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	NA
London, City of	SW	ST	1.0%	4.0%	8	2.6%	9	167,187	5	124.7%	9	9.6%	4	0.2%	4	15.5%	4	3.3%	1
Newbury, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.1%	5	1.3%	4	96,217	9	110.7%	7	12.0%	3	1.0%	6	15.8%	4	26.5%	9
Middlesex Centre, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.1%	2	291,140	1	102.0%	3	13.5%	3	9.2%	10	10.5%	5	9.1%	6
Lucan Biddulph, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.4%	2	1.2%	3	184,085	4	104.2%	5	9.5%	4	15.9%	10	7.6%	7	6.7%	5
Adelaide Metcalfe, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.0%	5	1.3%	4	261,670	2	104.9%	5	11.6%	3	24.6%	10	14.8%	4	13.1%	8
North Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.4%	4	197,519	4	102.0%	3	10.1%	4	26.2%	10	6.9%	7	5.8%	4
Southwest Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.4%	2	1.4%	4	151,843	6	104.4%	5	5.0%	7	16.3%	10	9.3%	6	6.6%	4
Strathroy - Caradoc, Township of	SW	LT	33.0%	3.5%	7	1.7%	6	177,022	5	107.9%	6	15.8%	2	4.3%	9	15.4%	4	8.7%	6
Thames Centre, Municipality of	SW	LT	65.9%	2.6%	3	1.1%	3	251,463	2	103.4%	4	10.0%	4	9.4%	10	10.4%	6	6.4%	4

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Northumberland, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Cobourg, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	4.9%	10	2.4%	9	193,780	4	117.3%	8	13.0%	3	0.0%	2	17.4%	3	9.5%	6
Brighton, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.9%	8	1.6%	8	176,481	5	119.0%	8	18.2%	2	1.1%	6	10.6%	5	8.2%	6
Trent Hills, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.2%	9	2.2%	8	136,359	7	108.8%	6	2.0%	8	2.5%	8	8.1%	6	4.3%	2
Port Hope, Municipality of	Central	LT	24.9%	4.3%	9	4.3%	8	194,112	4	117.5%	8	11.0%	4	2.0%	7	13.7%	5	7.7%	5
Hamilton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	1.9%	7	195,575	4	102.6%	4	9.4%	4	1.9%	7	3.9%	9	4.6%	2
Alnwick/Haldimand, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.9%	8	1.7%	6	201,108	3	104.6%	5	17.8%	2	2.8%	8	4.6%	9	5.5%	3
Cramahe, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.4%	9	2.5%	9	167,150	5	107.8%	6	8.7%	5	1.9%	7	8.6%	6	5.6%	3
Perth, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Stratford, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	3.6%	7	2.7%	9	179,227	5	128.9%	9	9.7%	4	0.1%	3	15.5%	4	5.3%	3
St. Marys, Town of	SW	ST	100.0%	3.6%	7	2.4%	9	189,043	4	123.5%	9	13.4%	3	0.2%	4	19.8%	3	17.1%	9
North Perth, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.6%	3	1.4%	4	189,926	4	109.6%	6	12.4%	3	13.2%	10	15.0%	4	7.2%	5
Perth East, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.0%	1	1.0%	2	226,699	3	104.1%	4	6.8%	6	20.8%	10	7.8%	7	4.3%	2
Perth South, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.1%	1	1.2%	3	262,977	2	103.2%	4	5.1%	7	28.1%	10	6.1%	8	6.1%	4
West Perth, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.1%	1	1.2%	3	216,093	3	107.2%	6	12.6%	3	23.9%	10	9.3%	6	5.2%	3
Peterborough, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Peterborough, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	4.4%	9	2.4%	9	173,197	5	123.1%	8	8.7%	5	0.0%	2	15.2%	4	5.3%	3
Asphodel-Norwood, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.2%	3	152,920	6	102.0%	3	8.7%	5	3.6%	8	7.4%	7	8.2%	6
North Kawartha, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.7%	10	0.8%	1	237,772	2	100.4%	2	4.3%	7	0.1%	4	1.5%	10	2.7%	1
Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	0.9%	2	236,055	3	101.9%	3	15.6%	2	2.3%	8	11.8%	5	9.6%	6
Douro-Dummer, Township of	Central	LT	82.2%	3.0%	5	0.8%	1	247,767	2	100.3%	2	5.6%	6	1.5%	7	2.2%	10	3.5%	1
Galway-Cavendish-Harvey, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.5%	10	0.9%	1	236,790	2	100.3%	2	9.0%	4	0.2%	4	1.2%	10	2.4%	1
Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	1.1%	3	172,726	5	101.7%	3	3.0%	8	0.3%	5	3.8%	9	4.2%	2
Otonabee-South Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	95.5%	2.6%	3	1.0%	2	184,807	4	101.9%	3	8.7%	5	3.7%	8	7.1%	7	7.4%	5
Smith-Ennismore-Lakefield, Township of	Central	LT	67.2%	2.9%	4	0.9%	1	242,963	2	102.1%	3	10.3%	4	0.7%	5	5.5%	8	2.7%	1
Prescott and Russell, United Counties of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Clarence-Rockland, City of	East	LT	51.3%	3.2%	5	1.5%	5	180,172	5	103.7%	4	23.0%	1	0.9%	6	5.8%	8	3.4%	1
Hawkesbury, Town of	East	LT	0.0%	4.3%	9	2.8%	9	109,295	9	122.6%	8	11.7%	3	0.0%	1	26.4%	2	12.8%	8
Casselton, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	1.6%	5	177,096	5	108.6%	6	32.1%	1	0.1%	3	13.7%	5	11.1%	7
East Hawkesbury, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.7%	6	142,484	7	102.4%	3	6.9%	6	7.4%	9	4.2%	9	8.3%	6
Russell, Township of	East	LT	31.3%	3.3%	6	1.6%	5	214,675	3	104.2%	5	23.2%	1	1.9%	7	6.4%	8	2.9%	1
Alfred and Plantagenet, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.0%	5	1.6%	5	130,564	7	103.8%	4	13.2%	3	2.9%	8	5.9%	8	4.6%	2
Champlain, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.9%	7	136,985	7	110.4%	7	8.8%	5	1.5%	7	8.9%	6	5.5%	3
the Nation, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	1.9%	7	157,380	6	103.7%	4	13.1%	3	7.1%	9	4.9%	9	3.6%	1
Prince Edward, County of	East	ST	100.0%	3.5%	7	1.1%	3	181,136	5	101.4%	3	10.6%	4	1.9%	7	7.7%	7	4.1%	2
Renfrew, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Pembroke, City of	East	ST	0.0%	4.5%	9	3.7%	10	110,232	9	130.6%	9	2.2%	8	0.0%	2	20.7%	2	12.1%	7
Arnprior, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	4.0%	8	2.9%	9	156,827	6	126.1%	9	7.7%	5	0.0%	2	16.8%	3	10.9%	7
Deep River, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	2.6%	3	3.1%	10	137,993	7	158.6%	10	2.7%	8	0.0%	2	26.7%	2	24.9%	9
Renfrew, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	3.7%	7	2.7%	9	125,925	8	135.6%	10	15.1%	2	0.0%	2	23.9%	2	15.6%	8
Petawawa, Town of	East	LT	26.0%	1.7%	1	1.4%	4	153,200	6	199.9%	10	5.0%	7	0.0%	2	24.5%	2	35.7%	10
Laurentian Hills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	2.2%	8	159,945	6	120.9%	8	-15.3%	10	0.1%	4	33.0%	1	30.8%	10

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Head, Clara and Maria, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	0.0%	1	1.1%	3	271,807	2	217.2%	10	-66.8%	10	0.0%	2	72.5%	1	76.1%	10
Horton, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.9%	7	163,976	6	109.8%	7	1.1%	9	1.5%	7	14.7%	4	16.4%	8
McNab-Braeside, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.6%	3	1.6%	5	183,803	4	112.3%	7	-0.6%	9	1.1%	6	6.3%	8	7.5%	5
Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.6%	6	112,389	9	105.2%	5	4.3%	7	1.6%	7	3.0%	9	8.4%	6
North Altona-Wilberforce, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	2.2%	8	129,150	8	105.9%	5	18.6%	2	1.6%	7	5.3%	8	6.5%	4
Admaston-Bromley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.2%	2	1.7%	6	140,475	7	106.4%	6	7.1%	6	8.0%	9	13.0%	5	15.2%	8
Laurentian Valley, Township of	East	LT	82.5%	2.4%	2	1.8%	6	166,612	5	119.5%	8	12.0%	3	1.1%	6	19.4%	3	15.2%	8
Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.1%	9	2.4%	9	121,143	8	103.6%	4	5.8%	6	0.6%	5	3.6%	9	5.0%	3
Madawaska Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.0%	8	2.1%	7	132,489	7	107.0%	6	4.8%	7	0.2%	4	5.5%	8	4.4%	2
Bonnechere Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	2.5%	9	104,798	9	105.7%	5	6.1%	6	1.6%	7	5.1%	8	4.3%	2
Whitewater Region, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.5%	3	2.1%	7	127,996	8	114.4%	7	6.9%	6	4.3%	9	10.3%	6	9.0%	6
Greater Madawaska, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	1.4%	4	151,382	7	150.1%	10	-10.7%	10	0.3%	5	1.7%	10	6.3%	4
Simcoe, County of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Barrie, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	4.6%	10	1.6%	5	242,477	2	109.0%	6	31.4%	1	0.0%	2	17.5%	3	4.8%	3
Orillia, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	4.2%	9	2.2%	8	193,704	4	124.2%	3	11.9%	3	0.0%	1	19.1%	3	8.3%	6
Collingwood, Town of	Central	LT	2.7%	6.5%	10	1.3%	4	188,579	4	105.9%	5	18.5%	2	0.0%	2	14.5%	4	6.3%	4
Midland, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	4.7%	10	1.7%	6	186,383	4	109.4%	6	7.8%	5	0.0%	3	21.7%	2	11.0%	7
Penetanguishene, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	5.0%	10	1.7%	6	180,560	5	106.2%	5	8.4%	5	0.0%	3	8.3%	6	6.1%	4
Wasaga Beach, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.3%	10	1.0%	2	220,065	3	101.4%	3	25.6%	1	0.0%	2	4.5%	9	6.2%	4
Innisfil, Town of	Central	LT	18.0%	3.8%	8	1.1%	3	269,853	2	103.6%	4	9.4%	4	1.2%	6	6.8%	7	6.9%	5
Bradford West Gwillimbury, Town of	Central	LT	23.6%	3.8%	8	1.3%	3	277,843	2	104.5%	5	19.6%	2	1.9%	7	10.5%	5	5.6%	3
New Tecumseth, Town of	Central	LT	29.9%	3.1%	5	1.1%	2	278,572	1	106.3%	6	17.4%	2	1.4%	7	13.9%	4	9.4%	6
Essa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.2%	2	0.7%	1	239,620	2	130.4%	9	18.9%	2	2.6%	8	12.2%	5	20.4%	9
Tiny, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	0.7%	1	258,466	2	101.9%	3	8.8%	5	0.6%	5	1.3%	10	2.1%	1
Adjala-Tosoronto, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.2%	2	0.6%	1	298,587	1	123.3%	8	13.5%	3	3.2%	8	5.9%	8	5.5%	3
Clearview, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.1%	2	244,255	2	105.4%	5	11.5%	3	3.0%	8	5.8%	8	6.0%	4
Oro-Medonte, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	0.8%	1	251,417	2	102.5%	4	20.0%	1	1.1%	6	5.0%	8	7.6%	5
Ramara, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.6%	7	0.9%	2	173,152	5	102.1%	3	7.5%	6	1.1%	6	4.1%	9	3.7%	2
Severn, Township of	Central	LT	90.4%	3.2%	5	0.8%	1	239,712	2	103.9%	4	8.8%	5	0.5%	5	7.3%	7	6.6%	4
Springwater, Township of	Central	LT	60.5%	3.0%	5	0.9%	2	281,993	1	105.0%	5	14.0%	2	2.1%	7	5.8%	8	3.3%	1
Tay, Township of	Central	LT	42.2%	3.7%	7	1.3%	3	155,034	6	102.2%	3	4.3%	7	0.6%	5	3.9%	9	4.4%	2
Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, United Counties of	East	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cornwall, City of	East	ST	0.0%	4.0%	8	3.5%	10	104,914	9	135.9%	10	-15.1%	10	0.0%	3	23.5%	2	12.0%	7
North Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.1%	5	2.2%	8	163,465	6	112.0%	7	2.3%	8	7.5%	9	13.9%	4	10.3%	7
South Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.7%	8	2.3%	8	150,669	7	117.3%	8	-2.4%	9	4.2%	9	17.7%	3	12.1%	7
North Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.2%	5	2.1%	7	116,905	8	110.6%	7	4.1%	7	4.5%	9	11.6%	5	5.3%	3
South Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.5%	7	2.0%	7	164,612	6	105.5%	5	2.4%	8	5.4%	9	10.8%	5	7.0%	5
North Stormont, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.9%	7	138,694	7	104.6%	5	8.7%	5	11.4%	10	5.2%	8	3.3%	1
South Stormont, Township of	East	LT	77.8%	2.9%	4	2.1%	7	153,745	6	122.7%	8	-1.2%	9	1.5%	7	12.5%	5	9.0%	6
Kawartha Lakes, City of	Central	ST	74.3%	3.6%	7	1.4%	4	199,246	4	104.3%	5	7.8%	5	1.6%	7	6.6%	7	2.3%	1
Wellington, County of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Guelph, City of	Central	ST	0.4%	3.7%	7	2.2%	8	220,706	3	128.1%	9	17.6%	2	0.0%	2	15.9%	4	5.7%	3

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%					
				Weight in Overall Composite Indicator		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health			
				PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE															
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties					
Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile				
Erin, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.9%	8	1.7%	6	309,690	1	105.0%	5	10.4%	4	2.8%	8	5.1%	8	3.1%	1				
Minto, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	2.2%	8	155,676	6	110.6%	7	20.0%	1	7.1%	9	11.9%	5	9.8%	6				
Puslinch, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.4%	9	1.7%	6	410,072	1	113.5%	7	21.7%	1	1.9%	7	12.4%	5	9.6%	6				
Centre Wellington, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	1.7%	6	226,912	3	108.4%	6	18.5%	2	2.7%	8	8.2%	6	5.7%	4				
Guelph-Eramosa, Township of	Central	LT	64.4%	4.1%	9	1.6%	5	316,366	1	104.9%	5	18.4%	2	4.2%	9	6.5%	8	4.2%	2				
Mapleton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.5%	7	2.0%	7	220,529	3	105.9%	5	18.3%	2	14.9%	10	6.7%	7	7.1%	5				
Wellington North, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.8%	8	2.1%	7	171,057	5	111.9%	7	11.3%	4	7.7%	9	12.8%	5	7.9%	5				
<b>Algoma, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>					
Sault Ste Marie, City of	North	ST	9.6%	3.6%	7	3.6%	10	107,198	9	125.8%	9	-4.3%	10	0.0%	2	22.5%	2	11.1%	7				
Elliot Lake, City of	North	ST	1.0%	5.7%	10	7.4%	10	42,632	10	117.1%	8	-4.0%	9	0.0%	2	12.3%	5	14.0%	8				
Blind River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.4%	6	2.2%	8	73,850	10	103.0%	4	-0.5%	9	0.0%	2	18.7%	3	14.4%	8				
Bruce Mines, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	4.6%	10	2.9%	9	89,590	10	104.9%	5	-0.7%	9	0.0%	1	15.1%	4	18.0%	9				
Thessalon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.4%	2	2.4%	9	73,825	10	113.2%	7	8.0%	5	0.0%	2	17.5%	3	14.3%	8				
Spanish, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.1%	5	2.5%	9	54,992	10	101.0%	2	1.4%	8	0.0%	3	10.1%	6	16.5%	8				
Hilton Beach, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	5.6%	10	2.3%	8	88,218	10	101.5%	3	-1.5%	9	0.0%	1	6.6%	8	24.9%	9				
Hilton, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5%	2	1.3%	4	126,670	8	100.4%	2	1.8%	8	0.1%	4	1.9%	10	11.6%	7				
Jocelyn, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.4%	4	128,629	8	101.8%	3	4.3%	7	0.3%	5	2.9%	9	10.8%	7				
Johnson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0%	9	2.7%	9	91,896	9	100.1%	1	4.2%	7	1.9%	7	5.0%	8	11.5%	7				
Laird, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3%	2	1.1%	3	116,814	8	100.3%	2	5.9%	6	1.6%	7	3.6%	9	10.7%	7				
Macdonald, Meredith and Aberdeen Add'l, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.1%	5	1.8%	6	95,618	9	100.0%	1	7.1%	6	0.9%	6	9.4%	6	10.9%	7				
Wawa, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0%	5	4.5%	10	73,262	10	198.7%	10	-70.2%	10	0.3%	5	22.7%	2	11.3%	7				
Plummer Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.3%	9	2.1%	7	93,640	9	100.0%	1	-0.8%	9	3.1%	8	5.3%	8	12.4%	7				
Prince, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.2%	3	138,373	7	102.6%	4	3.4%	8	0.1%	3	2.3%	10	9.3%	6				
St Joseph, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.2%	3	130,971	7	100.5%	2	7.6%	6	0.7%	5	3.0%	9	6.7%	5				
Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.4%	2	2.3%	8	107,884	9	101.0%	2	11.4%	3	0.8%	6	1.4%	10	12.0%	7				
Hornepayne, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	4.0%	10	63,050	10	106.9%	6	-0.2%	9	0.0%	1	19.6%	3	27.1%	9				
The North Shore, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5%	3	1.7%	6	91,982	9	115.1%	8	-4.2%	9	0.0%	1	14.6%	4	21.5%	9				
White River, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.2%	2	4.2%	10	73,545	10	125.4%	9	-1.3%	9	0.0%	1	35.0%	1	37.7%	10				
Dubreuilville, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.1%	2	5.4%	10	87,827	10	130.4%	9	21.3%	1	0.0%	1	25.0%	2	28.4%	9				
Huron Shores, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.9%	7	90,477	9	101.3%	3	-3.8%	9	1.4%	7	10.7%	5	12.5%	7				
<b>Cochrane, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>					
Timmins, City of	North	ST	12.2%	3.6%	7	3.9%	10	104,151	9	126.5%	9	3.6%	8	0.1%	3	22.7%	2	12.0%	7				
Hearst, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.2%	2	1.6%	6	117,782	8	108.0%	6	3.0%	8	0.1%	3	29.1%	1	17.5%	9				
Iroquois Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.1%	2	5.3%	10	84,420	10	160.6%	10	-9.2%	10	0.1%	3	42.1%	1	39.8%	10				
Kapuskaing, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8%	4	4.1%	10	85,790	10	123.6%	9	-5.5%	10	0.0%	3	34.2%	1	25.9%	9				
Smooth Rock Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	1.5%	1	3.5%	10	102,740	9	130.7%	9	-28.4%	10	0.0%	1	57.8%	1	57.0%	10				
Cochrane, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3%	2	2.1%	7	84,375	10	115.3%	8	-15.5%	10	0.2%	5	25.8%	2	18.5%	9				
Moosonee, Town of	North	ST																					
Black River Matheson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.5%	1	2.3%	8	112,877	9	115.5%	8	-18.5%	10	0.8%	6	52.6%	1	51.3%	10				
Moonbeam, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.4%	2	1.7%	6	82,893	10	93.3%	1	-15.6%	10	0.2%	4	28.8%	1	32.8%	10				
Fauquier-Strickland, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.2%	1	1.5%	5	99,819	9	147.2%	10	-64.4%	10	0.0%	1	66.1%	1	73.4%	10				
Val Rita-Harty, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8%	1	1.8%	6	127,035	8	83.5%	1	-27.6%	10	0.1%	3	62.4%	1	64.2%	10				



**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Mattice-Val Cote, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.4%	1	3.0%	9	167,412	5	132.5%	10	6.7%	6	0.0%	1	69.5%	1	71.1%	10
Opasatika, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3%	2	2.5%	9	271,913	2	82.9%	1	-38.5%	10	0.2%	4	86.8%	1	88.6%	10
<b>Kenora, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Dryden, City of	North	ST	100.0%	2.4%	2	2.5%	9	174,202	5	139.3%	10	7.3%	6	0.0%	2	33.4%	1	22.7%	9
Kenora, City of	North	ST	25.5%	2.6%	3	2.8%	9	148,942	7	135.9%	10	8.6%	5	0.0%	2	25.7%	2	14.0%	8
Sioux Lookout, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5%	6	2.6%	9	149,571	7	117.2%	8	7.6%	5	0.0%	1	18.5%	3	9.4%	6
Red Lake, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8%	4	3.8%	10	107,653	9	132.4%	10	3.6%	8	0.0%	2	28.7%	1	20.2%	9
Ignace, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8%	4	3.1%	10	77,749	10	108.4%	6	-5.0%	10	0.0%	2	31.0%	1	26.3%	9
Machin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0%	1	1.5%	5	162,794	6	116.3%	8	0.9%	9	0.2%	4	36.9%	1	37.2%	10
Ear Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0%	5	5.0%	10	91,252	9	144.2%	10	1.5%	8	0.0%	1	30.2%	1	31.5%	10
Pickle Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5%	7	4.5%	10	75,665	10	124.8%	9	23.3%	1	0.0%	1	52.2%	1	51.6%	10
Sioux Narrows - Nestor Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.6%	10	0.8%	1	189,685	4	101.1%	2	7.9%	5	0.0%	1	6.4%	8	6.2%	4
<b>Manitoulin, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Gore Bay, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.2%	3	110,737	9	97.8%	1	4.4%	7	0.2%	4	22.0%	2	20.9%	9
Northeastern Manitoulin and The Islands, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3%	6	1.7%	6	128,487	8	107.3%	6	7.5%	6	1.1%	6	10.1%	6	5.6%	3
Assiginack, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0%	8	1.4%	4	114,061	8	99.7%	1	4.7%	7	2.6%	8	6.0%	8	9.1%	6
Barrie Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.0%	2	128,676	8	100.1%	1	3.0%	8	8.6%	10	0.5%	10	24.5%	9
Billings, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.0%	2	117,413	8	100.9%	2	7.3%	6	1.8%	7	3.0%	9	7.1%	5
Burpee and Mills, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3%	2	1.1%	3	120,448	8	101.0%	2	3.5%	8	4.7%	9	7.3%	7	12.1%	7
Cockburn Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	-	10	98.4%	1	2.3%	8	0.0%	3	0.0%	10	36.8%	10
Gordon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.6%	1	0.9%	1	111,507	9	100.2%	1	10.7%	4	3.3%	8	6.4%	8	10.4%	7
Tehkummah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.0%	10	1.4%	4	110,826	9	103.1%	4	3.1%	8	3.8%	8	10.3%	6	13.4%	8
Central Manitoulin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.6%	10	1.4%	4	119,688	8	100.3%	2	4.5%	7	2.7%	8	6.0%	8	5.9%	4
<b>Nipissing, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
North Bay, City of	North	ST	4.4%	3.9%	8	2.8%	9	137,767	7	126.2%	9	3.4%	8	0.0%	2	20.0%	3	8.9%	6
Mattawa, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.9%	8	2.9%	9	71,216	10	113.2%	7	-3.3%	9	0.0%	1	17.1%	3	14.8%	8
Temagami, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.2%	3	204,534	3	94.1%	1	-15.1%	10	0.0%	1	38.9%	1	38.4%	10
West Nipissing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	3.6%	7	2.2%	8	101,426	9	113.8%	7	5.6%	6	0.9%	6	9.2%	6	5.0%	3
South Algonquin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.1%	1	1.7%	6	121,427	8	109.1%	6	6.1%	6	0.1%	4	8.1%	7	10.6%	7
Bonfield, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.1%	2	140,902	7	95.2%	1	-5.9%	10	0.6%	5	19.0%	3	20.8%	9
Calvin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.6%	3	2.3%	8	206,676	3	172.6%	10	-30.7%	10	0.9%	6	46.8%	1	51.7%	10
Chisholm, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0%	8	1.3%	4	117,470	8	100.1%	1	10.8%	4	1.7%	7	1.2%	10	8.1%	5
East Ferris, Township of	North	ST	97.6%	2.5%	3	0.8%	1	173,746	5	100.5%	2	5.1%	7	0.0%	3	4.5%	9	5.8%	4
Mattawan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	6.3%	10	1.6%	5	162,728	6	134.6%	10	-27.2%	10	0.0%	1	7.5%	7	33.3%	10
Papineau-Cameron, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5%	3	1.5%	5	198,936	4	92.7%	1	-21.4%	10	0.2%	4	49.0%	1	51.0%	10
<b>Parry Sound, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Kearney, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	4.5%	10	0.7%	1	192,557	4	99.7%	1	11.0%	4	0.1%	4	1.5%	10	4.9%	3
Parry Sound, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3%	6	1.6%	6	173,889	5	118.1%	8	7.0%	6	0.0%	2	26.4%	2	11.1%	7
Powassan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.6%	3	1.3%	4	130,748	7	106.0%	5	-3.5%	9	0.9%	6	16.9%	3	13.3%	8
Burk's Falls, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	3.9%	8	1.5%	5	97,591	9	106.2%	5	-0.8%	9	0.0%	1	20.1%	2	19.4%	9
South River, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0%	8	1.7%	6	84,309	10	102.4%	4	3.3%	8	0.0%	1	14.7%	4	13.6%	8
Sundridge, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	3.9%	8	1.3%	4	154,518	6	101.0%	2	2.1%	8	0.0%	1	19.6%	3	14.2%	8

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Armour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.4%	6	0.8%	1	183,508	4	97.8%	1	2.6%	8	0.2%	4	8.1%	7	9.9%	6
Carling, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5%	3	0.6%	1	367,892	1	101.1%	2	4.9%	7	0.1%	3	3.6%	9	6.5%	4
Whitestone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.1%	1	0.5%	1	195,295	4	99.9%	1	4.6%	7	0.1%	4	1.0%	10	3.5%	1
Callander, Municipality of	North	ST	57.9%	3.2%	6	1.1%	2	186,668	4	101.0%	2	18.0%	2	0.1%	3	5.3%	8	6.7%	4
Joly, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.6%	10	1.6%	5	118,453	8	100.3%	2	14.9%	2	1.0%	6	0.5%	10	17.1%	9
Machar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.1%	5	0.7%	1	173,961	5	98.9%	1	-0.3%	9	0.2%	4	5.7%	8	9.5%	6
McDougall, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	0.8%	1	262,509	2	101.9%	3	5.3%	7	0.2%	4	1.6%	10	7.0%	5
McKellar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.1%	5	0.8%	1	276,860	2	101.2%	2	9.7%	4	0.1%	3	2.0%	10	7.8%	5
McMurrich/Monteith, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	0.7%	1	178,796	5	99.7%	1	2.1%	8	0.2%	4	1.8%	10	7.7%	5
Nipissing, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	0.6%	1	173,436	5	99.8%	1	9.7%	4	0.5%	5	2.6%	10	5.6%	3
Perry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5%	2	0.5%	1	173,077	5	98.7%	1	5.4%	7	0.1%	3	5.4%	8	8.5%	6
Ryerson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.5%	9	0.9%	2	183,709	4	100.1%	1	5.6%	6	0.7%	6	0.8%	10	9.6%	6
Strong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.7%	7	1.0%	2	183,998	4	99.6%	1	1.4%	9	0.2%	4	15.3%	4	18.5%	9
The Archipelago, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	6.0%	10	0.4%	1	397,180	1	100.2%	1	1.3%	9	0.2%	4	7.2%	7	8.7%	6
Magnetawan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	3.2%	5	0.7%	1	230,636	3	100.3%	1	8.2%	5	0.2%	4	1.8%	10	3.9%	2
Seguin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8%	4	0.5%	1	487,944	1	100.5%	2	10.9%	4	0.2%	4	2.1%	10	5.4%	3
<b>Rainy River, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Fort Frances, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0%	5	4.0%	10	115,011	8	150.1%	10	2.7%	8	0.0%	1	23.6%	2	15.1%	8
Rainy River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0%	1	2.2%	8	64,862	10	123.7%	9	-1.5%	9	0.0%	2	17.8%	3	16.4%	8
Albion, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.7%	1	1.0%	2	167,708	5	111.6%	7	11.7%	3	0.9%	6	16.3%	3	18.1%	9
Atikokan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8%	4	7.6%	10	86,693	10	254.0%	10	23.3%	1	0.0%	2	37.3%	1	32.5%	10
Chapple, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0%	1	1.1%	3	154,046	6	111.8%	7	2.7%	8	4.1%	8	39.3%	1	41.4%	10
Emo, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0%	5	2.2%	8	107,850	9	114.9%	8	8.3%	5	1.9%	7	13.1%	5	12.6%	7
La Vallee, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.6%	1	1.3%	4	116,703	8	111.2%	7	7.9%	5	2.6%	8	4.3%	9	10.7%	7
Morley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.2%	2	1.4%	4	106,119	9	124.5%	9	19.7%	1	7.4%	9	7.5%	7	19.1%	9
Dawson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.3%	1	1.2%	3	111,833	9	142.1%	10	4.7%	7	5.9%	9	8.1%	7	16.4%	8
Lake of the Woods, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8%	1	1.0%	2	113,950	8	107.1%	6	6.9%	6	0.4%	5	7.6%	7	14.3%	8
<b>Sudbury, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Espanola, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.7%	7	4.7%	10	101,597	9	148.9%	10	-17.5%	10	0.0%	2	27.6%	2	22.0%	9
French River, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	3.4%	6	1.6%	6	95,726	9	102.6%	4	4.0%	7	0.5%	5	6.0%	8	4.8%	3
Killarney, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5%	7	1.0%	2	153,611	6	102.9%	4	-0.6%	9	0.0%	1	38.3%	1	38.6%	10
Markstay-Warren, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	2.3%	8	75,881	10	118.6%	8	2.4%	8	1.0%	6	9.4%	6	9.2%	6
St. Charles, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.8%	6	87,581	10	104.7%	5	5.3%	7	0.8%	6	8.3%	6	11.4%	7
Baldwin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	1.8%	6	75,242	10	101.5%	3	0.6%	9	0.3%	5	18.1%	3	21.1%	9
Chapleau, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3%	2	2.8%	9	59,342	10	104.9%	5	-0.2%	9	0.0%	1	22.9%	2	16.6%	8
Naim and Hyman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.9%	1	3.0%	9	96,866	9	141.1%	10	-24.2%	10	0.1%	3	31.7%	1	33.1%	10
Sables Spanish Rivers, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.6%	3	1.5%	5	80,216	10	106.0%	5	-2.4%	9	1.3%	7	9.4%	6	7.7%	5
<b>Thunder Bay, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Thunder Bay, City of	North	ST	5.3%	3.6%	7	3.4%	10	128,367	8	132.9%	10	3.3%	8	0.0%	2	21.0%	2	7.4%	5
Marathon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	1.9%	1	4.6%	10	68,781	10	163.5%	10	-0.3%	9	0.0%	1	30.9%	1	26.2%	9
Greenstone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.6%	3	2.8%	9	177,155	5	98.1%	1	43.3%	1	0.0%	2	66.4%	1	53.7%	10
Conmee, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.1%	2	2.5%	9	122,635	8	102.2%	3	8.2%	5	0.3%	5	2.0%	10	12.1%	7

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background Data**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas the tenth decile signifies relatively poor fiscal health.
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used. The group assigned a weighting for each indicator that is intended to reflect its relative importance in terms of evaluating municipal fiscal health.
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population residing in rural areas or small communities, as classified by Statistics Canada.
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government enterprises, less amounts to be recovered in future years.

				12.50%		4.17%		1.67%		1.7%		5.00%		1.67%		1.67%		5.00%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAX				ASSESSMENT BASE											
				Total residential property taxes (municipal) compared to median household income		Average Commercial/Industrial tax rate		Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment per Household (\$)		Weighted Assessment compared to Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Real Compounded Weighted Assessment Growth (2001 to 2007)		Discounted, Unweighted Farmland and Managed Forest Assessment as a proportion of Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment (%)		Discounted, Unweighted C/I/P Assessment compared to Total Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		% of Unweighted Assessment generated by the top 20 assessed properties	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Dorion, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	3.6%	10	117,700	8	128.2%	9	-17.8%	10	1.1%	6	21.0%	2	30.7%	10
Gillies, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8%	1	1.6%	5	90,289	9	101.3%	3	9.9%	4	1.9%	7	1.7%	10	17.4%	9
Neebing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0%	1	1.0%	2	147,721	7	101.8%	3	12.2%	3	0.6%	5	5.0%	9	6.2%	4
Nipigon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	4.0%	10	84,884	10	117.4%	8	-4.6%	10	0.0%	2	21.1%	2	15.6%	8
O'Connor, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.9%	1	1.1%	2	120,194	8	100.2%	1	9.4%	4	1.1%	6	3.7%	9	15.1%	8
Schreiber, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.9%	4	7.7%	10	47,341	10	118.4%	8	-4.0%	9	0.0%	1	15.5%	4	12.7%	7
Shuniah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3%	2	1.5%	5	155,492	6	105.9%	5	6.0%	6	0.0%	3	6.4%	8	14.1%	8
Terrace Bay, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.9%	1	5.6%	10	99,615	9	167.2%	10	-3.9%	9	0.0%	1	41.1%	1	41.4%	10
Manitouwadge, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0%	1	6.2%	10	29,324	10	134.4%	10	-6.4%	10	0.0%	1	20.8%	2	16.0%	8
Red Rock, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.1%	2	6.6%	10	110,071	9	186.4%	10	-12.5%	10	0.0%	1	39.6%	1	41.7%	10
Oliver Paipoonge, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0%	1	1.6%	5	166,100	6	107.7%	6	9.2%	4	2.3%	8	10.4%	6	6.3%	4
<b>Timiskaming, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	
Temiskaming Shores, City of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	4	2.1%	7	111,657	9	114.2%	7	4.0%	7	0.6%	5	25.4%	2	13.2%	8
Cobalt, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.2%	2	4.0%	10	31,974	10	108.7%	6	-5.5%	10	0.0%	1	6.1%	8	15.9%	8
Englehart, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.2%	2	2.1%	7	80,551	10	112.2%	7	-1.2%	9	0.0%	1	34.5%	1	33.0%	10
Kirkland Lake, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3%	6	7.4%	10	40,070	10	139.3%	10	-2.6%	9	0.0%	1	26.2%	2	18.0%	9
Latchford, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	3	1.5%	5	228,687	3	78.8%	1	223.1%	1	0.0%	1	71.9%	1	75.6%	10
Thornloe, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	2.7%	4	2.2%	8	62,829	10	104.7%	5	7.4%	6	8.9%	10	12.4%	5	62.5%	10
Armstrong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.7%	1	1.4%	4	115,335	8	100.5%	2	-9.6%	10	5.7%	9	37.4%	1	35.0%	10
Brethour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	0.6%	1	0.0%	1	87,087	10	134.1%	10	-16.7%	10	21.8%	10	6.6%	7	43.9%	10
Casey, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.5%	1	0.9%	1	93,541	9	100.1%	1	-5.0%	10	17.7%	10	2.7%	10	24.5%	9
Chamberlain, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.2%	1	0.8%	1	167,789	5	134.0%	10	-36.9%	10	2.1%	7	61.2%	1	68.1%	10
Coleman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.7%	1	1.8%	7	152,070	6	133.6%	10	-29.8%	10	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	52.9%	10
Evanturel, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.3%	1	0.8%	1	155,847	6	106.2%	5	-21.7%	10	3.6%	8	47.4%	1	51.7%	10
Harley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.9%	1	0.8%	1	119,636	8	103.8%	4	8.3%	5	6.7%	9	12.2%	5	22.3%	9
Harris, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.4%	1	0.6%	1	140,919	7	99.7%	1	5.5%	6	2.5%	8	1.7%	10	19.7%	9
Hilliard, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8%	1	1.3%	4	103,833	9	109.7%	6	-5.5%	10	19.6%	10	4.4%	9	33.3%	10
Hudson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.6%	1	0.7%	1	126,163	8	97.3%	1	8.3%	5	3.0%	8	6.7%	7	19.8%	9
James, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5%	3	3.8%	10	75,039	10	133.3%	10	34.2%	1	0.6%	5	31.6%	1	44.6%	10
Kerns, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.1%	1	0.4%	1	193,996	4	94.9%	1	-24.7%	10	11.0%	10	51.4%	1	62.1%	10
Larder Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8%	4	3.4%	10	38,986	10	103.2%	4	4.0%	7	0.0%	1	12.0%	5	18.5%	9
McGarry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.7%	10	4.3%	10	24,552	10	101.6%	3	-1.5%	9	0.0%	1	9.9%	6	16.7%	8
Gauthier, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.7%	7	1.7%	6	62,558	10	105.4%	5	0.3%	9	0.6%	5	10.8%	5	42.7%	10
Matachewan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.2%	2	3.0%	10	28,189	10	117.5%	8	-9.1%	10	0.0%	1	9.8%	6	20.9%	9
Charlton and Dack, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.2%	2	1.5%	5	83,765	10	100.5%	2	-14.0%	10	4.6%	9	21.9%	2	29.5%	9

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health.  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used.  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population that is rural.  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government.

				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%													
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health													
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)																								DEMOGRAPHICS									
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM													
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile										
Toronto, City of	GTA	ST	0.00%	609	10	0.2%	6	1.3%	8	1,154	10	0.4%	6	2.5%	9	23.4%	4	18.8%	3	0.9%	6	7.4%	4	0.0%		1											
Durham, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA												
Oshawa, City of	GTA	LT	1.8%	307	5	0.2%	4	0.6%	3	899	9	0.5%	7	1.8%	7	24.8%	6	18.0%	3	1.8%	6	18.3%	2	1.8%		1											
Pickering, City of	GTA	LT	5.2%	477	8	0.1%	3	0.6%	3	1,172	10	0.4%	6	1.6%	6	27.0%	7	12.4%	1	0.8%	6	18.3%	2	5.2%		1											
Ajax, Town of	GTA	LT	1.7%	448	8	0.1%	4	0.7%	4	1,115	10	0.4%	6	1.9%	7	30.3%	9	11.3%	1	22.3%	1	18.3%	2	1.7%		1											
Clarington, Municipality of	GTA	LT	23.4%	358	6	0.1%	4	0.6%	3	857	8	0.3%	5	1.5%	5	32.4%	10	15.0%	2	11.4%	2	18.3%	2	23.4%		3											
Whitby, Town of	GTA	LT	3.1%	434	7	0.1%	4	0.7%	4	995	10	0.3%	5	1.7%	6	30.4%	9	12.8%	1	27.2%	1	18.3%	2	3.1%		1											
Brock, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	291	4	0.1%	3	0.7%	3	648	7	0.3%	5	1.5%	5	27.9%	8	24.7%	6	-1.1%	8	18.3%	2	100.0%		10											
Scugog, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	385	6	0.1%	3	0.7%	4	768	8	0.3%	4	1.4%	5	25.1%	6	21.4%	5	6.3%	3	18.3%	2	100.0%		10											
Uxbridge, Township of	GTA	LT	50.9%	484	8	0.1%	3	0.8%	5	965	9	0.3%	4	1.6%	6	29.5%	9	19.0%	4	10.3%	2	18.3%	2	50.9%		6											
Haldimand, County of	Central	ST	100.0%	258	3	0.1%	3	0.6%	2	576	5	0.3%	5	1.3%	4	28.4%	8	19.1%	4	3.4%	5	5.8%	6	100.0%		10											
Norfolk, County of	SW	ST	76.7%	299	5	0.2%	5	0.8%	4	603	6	0.4%	6	1.5%	5	24.8%	6	25.4%	6	2.8%	5	5.8%	6	76.7%		8											
Halton, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA												
Burlington, City of	GTA	LT	2.5%	413	7	0.1%	3	0.7%	3	774	8	0.2%	3	1.3%	3	25.9%	6	21.0%	5	9.0%	2	25.6%	1	2.5%		1											
Halton Hills, Town of	GTA	LT	18.5%	396	7	0.1%	3	0.6%	3	634	6	0.2%	2	1.0%	2	32.5%	10	13.2%	1	14.7%	1	25.6%	1	18.5%		2											
Milton, Town of	GTA	LT	29.4%	496	8	0.1%	3	1.2%	7	871	9	0.2%	3	2.0%	7	21.9%	3	16.0%	2	71.4%	1	25.6%	1	29.4%		3											
Oakville, Town of	GTA	LT	0.8%	557	9	0.1%	3	0.8%	4	971	9	0.2%	2	1.4%	4	29.0%	8	15.7%	2	14.4%	1	25.6%	1	0.8%		1											
Hamilton, City of	Central	ST	7.3%	616	10	0.3%	8	1.4%	8	913	9	0.5%	8	2.1%	7	25.3%	6	20.7%	4	2.9%	5	8.9%	3	7.3%		1											
Niagara, Region of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA												
Niagara Falls, City of	Central	LT	3.1%	544	9	0.2%	7	1.3%	8	1,143	10	0.5%	8	2.7%	9	24.0%	5	24.5%	6	4.3%	4	4.1%	6	3.1%		1											
Port Colborne, City of	Central	LT	16.2%	313	5	0.2%	7	1.0%	6	642	7	0.5%	8	2.1%	7	24.3%	5	31.2%	9	0.8%	6	4.1%	6	16.2%		2											
St. Catharines, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	426	7	0.2%	7	1.0%	7	888	9	0.5%	8	2.2%	8	22.9%	3	27.7%	7	2.2%	6	4.1%	6	0.0%		1											
Welland, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	334	6	0.2%	7	0.8%	5	723	7	0.5%	8	1.8%	6	23.5%	4	25.1%	6	4.0%	4	4.1%	6	0.0%		1											
Thorold, City of	Central	LT	7.4%	447	8	0.3%	7	1.0%	6	899	9	0.5%	8	2.0%	7	24.2%	5	19.3%	4	1.0%	6	4.1%	6	7.4%		1											
Fort Erie, Town of	Central	LT	22.6%	425	7	0.2%	7	1.2%	7	735	7	0.4%	7	1.2%	8	25.1%	6	25.2%	6	6.3%	3	4.1%	6	22.6%		3											
Grimsby, Town of	Central	LT	8.9%	567	9	0.2%	6	1.0%	6	861	9	0.4%	6	1.5%	5	26.0%	7	21.3%	5	12.4%	1	4.1%	6	8.9%		1											
Lincoln, Town of	Central	LT	44.3%	556	9	0.2%	7	1.0%	7	897	9	0.4%	6	1.7%	6	31.7%	10	24.6%	6	5.4%	4	4.1%	6	44.3%		5											
Niagara-on-the-Lake, Town of	Central	LT	62.9%	859	10	0.2%	7	2.0%	9	1,310	10	0.4%	6	3.0%	9	20.3%	2	37.5%	10	5.4%	4	4.1%	6	62.9%		7											
Pelham, Town of	Central	LT	20.5%	538	9	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	889	9	0.4%	6	1.5%	5	26.3%	7	24.4%	6	5.8%	3	4.1%	6	20.5%		3											
Wainfleet, Township of	Central	LT	94.6%	402	7	0.2%	6	1.1%	7	658	7	0.4%	6	1.8%	6	28.0%	8	19.2%	4	5.5%	4	4.1%	6	94.6%		10											
West Lincoln, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	473	8	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	742	7	0.4%	6	1.4%	5	33.2%	10	13.1%	1	7.3%	3	4.1%	6	100.0%		10											
Ottawa, City of	East	ST	8.0%	563	9	0.2%	6	1.0%	6	939	9	0.3%	6	1.7%	6	24.7%	6	16.9%	3	4.9%	4	11.0%	2	8.0%		1											
Peel, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA												
Brampton, City of	GTA	LT	2.8%	491	8	0.1%	4	0.9%	6	939	9	0.3%	4	1.7%	6	31.2%	10	10.7%	1	33.3%	1	25.6%	1	2.8%		1											
Mississauga, City of	GTA	LT	0.1%	571	9	0.2%	4	1.0%	6	1,033	10	0.3%	4	1.7%	6	27.7%	8	12.9%	1	9.1%	2	25.6%	1	0.1%		1											
Caledon, Town of	GTA	LT	46.5%	580	9	0.1%	3	0.8%	5	992	10	0.2%	3	1.4%	4	33.7%	10	11.1%	1	12.7%	1	25.6%	1	46.5%		5											
Greater Sudbury, City of	North	ST	13.5%	675	10	0.6%	10	1.7%	9	863	9	0.7%	9	2.2%	8	23.7%	4	20.8%	4	1.7%	6	-1.1%	8	13.5%		2											
Waterloo, Region of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA												
Cambridge, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	441	7	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	912	9	0.4%	7	1.8%	7	27.7%	8	15.8%	2	9.1%	2	13.2%	2	0.0%		1											
Kitchener, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	370	6	0.2%	6	0.8%	5	778	8	0.4%	7	1.7%	6	25.6%	6	15.7%	2	7.5%	2	13.2%	2	0.0%		1											
Waterloo, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	459	8	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	835	8	0.3%	6	1.6%	6	25.4%	6	15.6%	2	12.6%	1	13.2%	2	0.0%		1											
North Dumfries, Township of	Central	LT	58.5%	651	10	0.2%	5	0.9%	6	1,013	10	0.3%	4	1.5%	5	34.5%	10	12.6%	1	3.4%	5	13.2%	2	58.5%		1											

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health.  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used.  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population that is in the rural and small community measure.  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government.

Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)												DEMOGRAPHICS									
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Wellesley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	443	7	0.2%	5	0.8%	4	758	8	0.3%	4	1.3%	4	48.3%	10	12.6%	1	4.5%	4	13.2%	2	100.0%	10
Wilmot, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	437	7	0.2%	5	0.8%	5	694	7	0.3%	4	1.3%	4	27.0%	7	24.7%	6	15.0%	1	13.2%	2	100.0%	10
Woolwich, Township of	Central	LT	48.4%	538	9	0.2%	5	1.0%	6	814	8	0.3%	4	1.4%	5	32.1%	10	22.5%	5	8.0%	2	13.2%	2	48.4%	5
York, Region of	GTA	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Vaughan, City of	GTA	LT	2.3%	724	10	0.1%	3	1.2%	7	1,216	10	0.2%	2	2.0%	7	29.4%	9	13.5%	1	31.2%	1	30.6%	1	2.3%	1
Aurora, Town of	GTA	LT	4.0%	487	8	0.1%	3	0.7%	4	846	8	0.2%	2	1.2%	3	31.6%	10	13.1%	1	18.6%	1	30.6%	1	4.0%	1
Markham, Town of	GTA	LT	2.0%	586	9	0.1%	3	1.0%	6	957	9	0.2%	2	1.6%	6	23.9%	4	15.1%	2	25.4%	1	30.6%	1	2.0%	1
Newmarket, Town of	GTA	LT	0.0%	437	7	0.1%	3	0.7%	3	910	9	0.3%	4	1.4%	4	30.7%	9	12.4%	1	12.9%	1	30.6%	1	0.0%	1
Richmond Hill, Town of	GTA	LT	1.0%	560	9	0.1%	3	1.0%	6	925	9	0.2%	2	1.6%	6	24.6%	5	13.3%	1	23.2%	1	30.6%	1	1.0%	1
Whitchurch-Stouffville, Town of	GTA	LT	49.7%	612	10	0.1%	3	0.9%	5	926	9	0.2%	2	1.4%	4	28.4%	8	19.8%	4	10.8%	2	30.6%	1	49.7%	5
East Gwillimbury, Town of	GTA	LT	32.0%	462	8	0.1%	3	0.7%	3	739	7	0.2%	2	1.1%	2	25.9%	6	14.1%	2	2.5%	5	30.6%	1	32.0%	4
Georgina, Town of	GTA	LT	29.7%	289	4	0.1%	3	0.6%	3	567	5	0.2%	3	1.3%	3	28.3%	8	15.2%	2	7.9%	2	30.6%	1	29.7%	3
King, Township of	GTA	LT	48.1%	603	9	0.1%	3	0.8%	5	940	9	0.2%	2	1.3%	4	27.7%	8	18.7%	3	5.1%	4	30.6%	1	48.1%	5
Muskoka, District of	Central	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Bracebridge, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	136	1	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	270	1	0.1%	1	0.8%	1	23.3%	4	26.3%	7	13.8%	1	10.1%	2	100.0%	10
Gravenhurst, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	146	1	0.1%	1	0.7%	4	249	1	0.1%	1	1.2%	3	19.1%	2	32.9%	9	1.3%	6	10.1%	2	100.0%	10
Huntsville, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	144	1	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	300	1	0.1%	1	0.9%	1	24.6%	5	26.4%	7	5.4%	4	10.1%	2	100.0%	10
Georgian Bay, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	174	1	0.1%	1	3.2%	10	351	2	0.1%	1	6.3%	10	18.0%	1	37.9%	10	17.5%	1	10.1%	2	100.0%	10
Lake of Bays, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	223	2	0.1%	1	2.0%	9	405	3	0.1%	1	3.6%	10	16.7%	1	37.1%	10	23.1%	1	10.1%	2	100.0%	10
Muskoka Lakes, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	351	6	0.1%	1	3.2%	10	621	6	0.1%	1	5.6%	10	27.5%	8	30.0%	8	7.0%	3	10.1%	2	100.0%	10
Oxford, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Woodstock, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	282	4	0.2%	5	0.7%	3	887	9	0.5%	8	2.1%	8	26.2%	7	22.7%	6	6.6%	3	6.4%	4	0.0%	1
Ingersoll, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	311	5	0.2%	5	0.7%	3	652	7	0.4%	6	1.4%	5	29.0%	8	20.5%	4	7.1%	3	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
Tillsonburg, Town of	SW	LT	0.0%	290	4	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	562	5	0.3%	5	1.4%	4	25.3%	6	35.0%	9	5.5%	4	6.4%	4	0.0%	1
Blandford Blenheim, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	358	6	0.2%	4	0.6%	3	749	8	0.3%	5	1.3%	4	33.3%	10	15.0%	2	-3.7%	9	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
East Zorra-Tavistock, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	338	6	0.2%	4	0.6%	3	808	8	0.4%	6	1.5%	5	29.3%	9	26.4%	7	1.5%	6	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
Norwich, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	297	4	0.1%	4	0.6%	2	691	7	0.3%	6	1.3%	4	34.9%	10	17.9%	3	0.0%	7	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
South-West Oxford, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	309	5	0.2%	4	0.6%	3	571	5	0.3%	4	1.2%	3	34.2%	10	14.0%	2	-2.5%	8	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
Zorra, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	399	7	0.2%	4	0.8%	4	506	4	0.2%	2	1.0%	1	26.3%	7	19.4%	4	0.9%	6	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
Brantford, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	621	10	0.4%	9	1.5%	8	914	9	0.6%	8	2.3%	8	26.6%	7	20.5%	4	4.4%	4	10.8%	2	0.0%	1
Brant, County of	Central	ST	100.0%	258	3	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	551	5	0.2%	3	1.1%	2	28.7%	8	20.6%	4	8.7%	2	10.8%	2	100.0%	10
Bruce, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
South Bruce Peninsula, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	196	2	0.1%	3	0.9%	6	451	3	0.3%	4	2.2%	8	20.7%	2	36.3%	10	4.0%	4	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
Saugeen Shores, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	236	3	0.1%	3	0.6%	3	529	5	0.3%	4	1.4%	4	17.4%	1	30.3%	8	2.9%	5	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
Arran-Elderslie, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	157	1	0.1%	3	0.4%	1	561	5	0.4%	7	1.5%	5	28.2%	8	21.4%	5	2.6%	5	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
Brockton, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	170	1	0.1%	3	0.5%	1	653	7	0.5%	7	1.7%	6	24.5%	5	22.1%	5	-0.2%	7	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
Northern Bruce Peninsula, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	227	2	0.1%	2	1.8%	9	351	2	0.2%	1	2.8%	9	17.9%	1	41.7%	10	7.0%	3	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
Huron-Kinloss, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	229	2	0.1%	3	0.8%	5	373	2	0.2%	2	1.4%	4	30.4%	9	25.5%	6	4.7%	4	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
Kincardine, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	275	4	0.1%	3	0.7%	3	526	5	0.2%	3	1.3%	4	22.0%	3	25.5%	6	1.3%	6	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
South Bruce, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	171	1	0.1%	3	0.4%	1	505	4	0.3%	6	1.2%	3	32.9%	10	17.5%	3	-2.0%	8	5.5%	6	100.0%	10
Dufferin, County of	Central	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Orangeville, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	244	3	0.1%	2	0.4%	1	857	8	0.4%	6	1.6%	5	30.4%	9	13.2%	1	6.6%	3	19.5%	1	0.0%	1

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

Note:  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality in the  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government

				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%		
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health				
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)												DEMOGRAPHICS										
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM		
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value
Shelburne, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	219	2	0.1%	2	0.6%	2	830	8	0.4%	7	2.1%	8	23.0%	8	28.0%	8	22.2%	1	19.5%	1	100.0%	10	
Mond, Town of	Central	LT	70.6%	374	6	0.1%	1	0.5%	2	754	8	0.2%	2	1.1%	2	26.4%	7	16.8%	3	2.3%	5	19.5%	1	70.6%	8	
Amaranth, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	264	4	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	507	4	0.2%	2	0.7%	1	28.4%	8	13.1%	1	2.9%	5	19.5%	1	100.0%	10	
East Garafraxa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	324	5	0.1%	1	0.5%	2	481	4	0.1%	1	0.7%	1	35.8%	10	13.9%	2	7.9%	2	19.5%	1	100.0%	10	
Melancthon, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	235	3	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	521	4	0.2%	3	1.2%	3	27.6%	8	12.2%	1	5.7%	3	19.5%	1	100.0%	10	
Mulmur, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	297	4	0.1%	1	0.6%	3	533	5	0.2%	1	1.1%	3	26.5%	7	17.7%	3	7.1%	3	19.5%	1	100.0%	10	
East Luther Grand Valley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	140	1	0.1%	1	0.3%	1	308	1	0.2%	2	0.8%	1	30.2%	9	10.7%	1	0.1%	7	19.5%	1	100.0%	10	
Elgin, County of	SW	UT		NA			NA		NA	NA			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA			
St Thomas, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	521	9	0.4%	9	1.3%	8	987	10	0.7%	9	2.5%	8	26.3%	7	20.3%	4	8.4%	2	8.2%	3	0.0%	1	
Aylmer, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	212	2	0.2%	4	0.5%	2	787	8	0.6%	8	1.9%	7	31.2%	10	23.3%	6	-1.2%	8	8.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Southwold, Township of	SW	LT	87.8%	425	7	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	627	6	0.3%	3	1.1%	2	26.8%	7	16.9%	3	5.3%	4	8.2%	3	87.8%	9	
Bayham, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	207	2	0.1%	3	0.6%	2	487	4	0.3%	5	1.3%	4	36.2%	10	16.4%	2	5.5%	4	8.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Central Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	48.0%	276	4	0.1%	3	0.5%	2	614	6	0.3%	5	1.2%	3	24.9%	6	19.4%	4	3.5%	5	8.2%	3	48.0%	5	
Dutton/Dunwich, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	232	2	0.1%	3	0.5%	2	451	3	0.3%	4	1.0%	2	33.2%	10	26.4%	7	3.4%	5	8.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Malahide, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	261	3	0.1%	3	0.5%	2	576	5	0.3%	4	1.2%	3	37.1%	10	14.9%	2	0.6%	7	8.2%	3	100.0%	10	
West Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	200	2	0.1%	3	0.5%	2	456	3	0.3%	5	1.2%	3	25.2%	6	22.3%	5	-2.1%	8	8.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Essex, County of	SW	UT		NA			NA		NA	NA			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA			
Windsor, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	490	8	0.3%	7	1.2%	7	1,169	10	0.7%	9	2.8%	9	25.9%	6	19.9%	4	3.5%	5	9.1%	3	0.0%	1	
LaSalle, Town of	SW	LT	19.3%	362	6	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	754	8	0.3%	5	1.1%	2	30.9%	9	12.4%	1	9.4%	2	9.1%	3	19.3%	2	
Amherstburg, Town of	SW	LT	46.7%	305	5	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	705	7	0.3%	5	1.2%	3	29.2%	9	17.8%	3	6.9%	3	9.1%	3	46.7%	5	
Essex, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	252	3	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	649	7	0.4%	6	1.3%	4	27.0%	7	18.7%	3	-0.3%	7	9.1%	3	100.0%	10	
Kingsville, Town of	SW	LT	48.6%	299	5	0.1%	4	0.6%	2	553	5	0.3%	4	1.1%	2	23.5%	4	19.6%	4	6.6%	3	9.1%	3	48.6%	5	
Lakeshore, Town of	SW	LT	46.3%	395	7	0.2%	4	0.7%	3	523	4	0.2%	2	0.9%	1	30.1%	9	14.0%	2	15.7%	1	9.1%	3	46.3%	5	
Leamington, Municipality of	SW	LT	31.0%	271	4	0.2%	4	0.6%	3	715	7	0.4%	7	1.7%	6	27.2%	7	22.2%	5	6.2%	3	9.1%	3	31.0%	4	
Tecumseh, Town of	SW	LT	19.2%	444	7	0.2%	4	0.6%	2	601	6	0.2%	2	0.8%	1	27.1%	7	14.9%	2	-0.3%	7	9.1%	3	19.2%	2	
Pelee, Township of	SW	ST	100.0%	10	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	279	1	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	18.3%	1	25.0%	6	12.1%	2	9.1%	3	100.0%	10	
Frontenac, County of	East	UT		NA			NA		NA	NA			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA			
Kingston, City of	East	ST	11.1%	587	9	0.3%	8	1.4%	8	858	8	0.5%	8	2.1%	8	22.0%	3	22.0%	5	2.6%	5	9.2%	3	11.1%	2	
Central Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	174	1	0.1%	3	1.0%	6	544	5	0.4%	7	3.1%	10	23.9%	4	34.5%	9	2.4%	5	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Frontenac Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	288	4	0.1%	3	0.9%	6	325	1	0.2%	1	1.0%	2	15.1%	1	28.5%	8	13.7%	1	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
North Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	183	1	0.1%	3	2.5%	10	280	1	0.2%	2	3.8%	10	17.5%	1	45.7%	10	5.7%	3	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
South Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	248	3	0.1%	3	0.7%	4	381	2	0.2%	2	1.1%	2	26.6%	7	16.1%	2	11.0%	2	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Grey, County of	SW	UT		NA			NA		NA	NA			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA			
Owen Sound, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	320	5	0.2%	6	0.9%	6	1,078	10	0.7%	9	3.2%	10	23.9%	4	30.8%	8	1.4%	6	7.3%	4	0.0%	1	
Hanover, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	241	3	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	889	9	0.6%	9	2.5%	9	21.5%	3	35.6%	9	4.0%	4	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
The Blue Mountains, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	594	9	0.2%	4	2.9%	10	619	6	0.2%	1	3.0%	9	19.2%	2	41.8%	10	11.6%	2	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Meaford, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	312	5	0.2%	4	0.9%	5	496	4	0.2%	3	1.4%	4	19.5%	2	30.3%	8	5.5%	4	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Chatsworth, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	253	3	0.2%	4	0.7%	4	355	2	0.2%	3	1.0%	2	28.1%	8	23.5%	6	1.8%	6	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Southgate, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	264	4	0.2%	4	0.7%	4	419	3	0.3%	3	1.1%	2	31.1%	9	19.0%	4	3.8%	5	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Georgian Bluffs, Township of	SW	LT	92.8%	337	6	0.2%	5	0.8%	4	437	3	0.2%	2	1.0%	2	21.9%	3	21.4%	5	3.7%	5	7.3%	4	92.8%	10	
Grey Highlands, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	326	5	0.2%	5	1.0%	7	383	2	0.2%	2	1.2%	3	24.5%	5	27.2%	7	3.1%	5	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
West Grey, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	259	3	0.2%	5	0.7%	3	624	6	0.4%	6	1.6%	6	23.9%	5	24.9%	6	3.8%	5	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

Note:  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fisc  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%		
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health				
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)												DEMOGRAPHICS										
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM		
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value
Halliburton, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Dysart et al, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	177	1	0.1%	1	1.7%	9	243	1	0.1%	1	2.3%	8	18.8%	2	43.4%	10	12.2%	2	4.9%	6	100.0%	10	
Minden Hills, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	152	1	0.1%	1	1.2%	7	253	1	0.1%	1	1.9%	7	19.9%	2	39.8%	10	4.6%	4	4.9%	6	100.0%	10	
Highlands East, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	109	1	0.1%	1	1.2%	7	300	1	0.2%	2	3.3%	10	18.6%	2	37.2%	10	2.2%	6	4.9%	6	100.0%	10	
Algonquin Highlands, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	160	1	0.1%	1	2.1%	9	228	1	0.1%	1	3.0%	9	17.0%	1	40.9%	10	8.2%	2	4.9%	6	100.0%	10	
Hastings, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Belleville, City of	East	ST	16.7%	655	10	0.4%	9	1.7%	9	1,010	10	0.7%	9	2.7%	9	23.0%	4	26.7%	7	6.1%	3	6.4%	4	16.7%	2	
Quinte West, City of	East	ST	37.0%	493	8	0.3%	8	1.2%	7	627	6	0.4%	7	5	27.1%	7	21.5%	5	3.2%	5	6.4%	4	37.0%	4		
Deseronto, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	296	4	0.3%	8	1.0%	6	826	8	0.9%	10	2.7%	9	31.1%	9	17.8%	3	1.6%	6	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Bancroft, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	462	8	0.3%	8	1.8%	9	723	7	0.5%	8	2.7%	9	25.1%	6	34.7%	9	-6.1%	9	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Faraday, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	475	8	0.3%	8	2.4%	10	340	2	0.2%	3	1.7%	6	12.1%	1	29.7%	8	-0.2%	7	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Limerick, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	408	7	0.3%	8	5.2%	10	351	2	0.3%	4	4.5%	10	19.6%	2	31.9%	9	0.6%	7	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Madoc, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	424	7	0.3%	8	1.3%	8	640	6	0.5%	8	1.9%	7	29.8%	9	19.9%	4	1.2%	6	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Tudor and Cashel, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	342	6	0.3%	8	3.3%	10	318	1	0.3%	5	3.1%	10	15.1%	1	27.9%	7	2.6%	5	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Tyendinaga, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	493	8	0.3%	8	1.2%	7	393	2	0.3%	4	1.9%	1	31.5%	10	14.7%	2	8.0%	2	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Wollaston, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	421	7	0.3%	8	3.9%	10	325	1	0.3%	3	3.0%	9	20.9%	2	33.9%	9	7.5%	2	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Centre Hastings, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	426	7	0.3%	8	1.2%	7	483	4	0.4%	6	1.4%	4	26.8%	7	27.4%	7	3.8%	5	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Stirling-Rawdon, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	415	7	0.3%	8	1.0%	7	616	6	0.5%	8	1.5%	5	26.0%	6	22.5%	5	0.4%	7	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Tweed, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	373	6	0.3%	8	1.3%	7	405	3	0.4%	6	1.4%	4	26.2%	7	24.7%	6	0.0%	7	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Hastings Highlands, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	529	9	0.3%	8	3.6%	10	337	2	0.2%	2	2.8%	8	25.1%	6	26.3%	7	1.0%	6	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Carlton/Mayo, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	366	6	0.3%	8	2.3%	10	195	1	0.2%	2	1.2%	3	20.2%	2	37.7%	10	14.0%	1	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Marmorata and Lake, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	418	7	0.3%	8	2.1%	9	424	3	0.3%	5	2.2%	8	26.1%	7	34.5%	9	-1.8%	8	6.4%	4	100.0%	10	
Huron, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Goderich, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	235	3	0.1%	4	0.6%	3	681	7	0.4%	7	1.7%	6	23.9%	4	31.5%	9	-0.5%	7	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
Bluewater, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	298	5	0.1%	4	1.1%	7	396	2	0.2%	2	1.4%	4	24.9%	6	28.3%	8	2.9%	5	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
South Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	261	3	0.1%	3	0.6%	3	570	5	0.3%	5	1.4%	5	23.7%	4	30.6%	8	-0.4%	7	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
Huron East, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	244	3	0.1%	4	0.6%	3	581	6	0.3%	6	1.4%	5	31.1%	9	23.3%	6	-3.8%	9	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
Howick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	216	2	0.1%	4	0.6%	2	365	2	0.2%	3	2.7%	1	41.5%	10	19.5%	4	2.7%	5	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
Central Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	231	2	0.1%	3	0.7%	3	459	3	0.3%	4	1.3%	4	24.4%	5	26.7%	7	-2.1%	8	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	274	4	0.1%	4	0.9%	6	316	1	0.2%	1	1.1%	2	29.9%	9	27.7%	7	0.0%	7	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
Morris-Turnberry, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	254	3	0.1%	4	0.6%	2	442	3	0.3%	3	1.0%	1	30.4%	9	25.6%	7	-2.7%	8	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
North Huron, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	189	2	0.1%	4	0.5%	1	593	6	0.5%	8	1.4%	5	27.4%	7	26.3%	7	0.6%	7	3.4%	6	100.0%	10	
Chatham-Kent, City of	SW	ST	46.7%	507	8	0.4%	8	1.2%	7	788	8	0.6%	9	7	26.5%	7	22.7%	6	0.8%	7	-1.6%	8	46.7%	5		
Lambton, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Sarnia, City of	SW	LT	4.3%	307	5	0.2%	6	0.7%	4	992	10	0.7%	9	2.3%	8	23.1%	4	25.9%	7	0.8%	7	0.5%	8	4.3%	1	
Lambton Shores, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	317	5	0.2%	5	1.1%	7	528	5	0.3%	4	1.8%	7	19.4%	2	36.6%	10	5.5%	4	0.5%	8	100.0%	10	
Petrolia, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	256	3	0.2%	5	0.6%	3	499	4	0.4%	6	1.2%	3	26.2%	7	23.2%	6	7.7%	2	0.5%	8	100.0%	10	
Plympton-Wyoming, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	344	6	0.2%	5	0.7%	3	508	4	0.2%	3	1.0%	2	26.3%	7	18.5%	3	2.0%	6	0.5%	8	100.0%	10	
Oil Springs, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	161	1	0.2%	5	0.3%	1	496	4	0.5%	8	1.0%	2	22.9%	4	20.9%	5	-5.4%	9	0.5%	8	100.0%	10	
Point Edward, Village of	SW	LT	0.0%	446	7	0.2%	5	0.9%	6	1,375	10	0.5%	8	2.9%	9	20.3%	2	30.6%	8	-3.9%	9	0.5%	8	0.0%	1	
Enniskillen, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	358	6	0.2%	5	0.6%	3	710	7	0.3%	5	1.3%	3	31.0%	9	23.3%	6	-4.2%	9	0.5%	8	100.0%	10	
Dawn-Euphemia, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	528	9	0.2%	6	1.3%	8	725	7	0.3%	4	1.7%	6	29.1%	8	21.9%	5	-7.6%	10	0.5%	8	100.0%	10	

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

Note:  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health.  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used.  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population that is rural.  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government.

Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health			
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)												DEMOGRAPHICS									
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Warwick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	331	5	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	735	7	0.4%	7	1.6%	5	29.6%	9	19.0%	4	-2.0%	8	0.5%	8	100.0%	10
Brooke-Alvinston, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	344	6	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	871	9	0.5%	7	1.9%	7	32.4%	10	18.1%	3	-4.5%	9	0.5%	8	100.0%	10
St. Clair, Township of	SW	LT	45.8%	456	8	0.2%	6	0.8%	5	577	6	0.3%	4	1.1%	2	26.0%	7	17.1%	3	-0.1%	7	0.5%	8	45.8%	5
Lanark, County of	East	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Smiths Falls, Separated Town of	East	ST	100.0%	907	10	0.8%	10	2.5%	10	1,030	10	0.9%	10	2.8%	9	24.6%	5	26.7%	7	-4.0%	9	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Carleton Place, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	298	4	0.2%	5	0.7%	3	752	8	0.4%	7	1.7%	6	25.8%	6	18.6%	3	4.1%	4	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Perth, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	298	4	0.2%	6	0.8%	5	983	10	0.6%	9	2.7%	9	17.4%	1	39.9%	10	-1.6%	8	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Mississippi Mills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	327	5	0.2%	5	0.6%	3	447	3	0.2%	3	0.8%	1	23.9%	4	19.0%	4	0.7%	7	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Beckwith, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	320	5	0.2%	5	0.6%	3	366	2	0.2%	2	0.7%	1	27.1%	7	11.7%	1	5.6%	3	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Montague, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	265	4	0.2%	5	0.7%	3	541	5	1.4%	4	1.4%	4	29.5%	9	15.7%	2	-2.1%	8	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Lanark Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	229	2	0.2%	5	0.9%	6	437	3	0.3%	5	1.8%	6	18.1%	1	21.1%	5	8.0%	2	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Drummond-North Elmsley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	305	5	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	393	2	0.2%	2	1.0%	1	24.7%	5	19.3%	4	6.7%	3	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Tay Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	332	6	0.2%	5	1.3%	7	344	2	0.2%	2	1.3%	4	23.9%	4	27.3%	7	3.6%	5	9.6%	2	100.0%	10
Leeds and Grenville, United Counties of	East	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Brockville, City of	East	ST	0.0%	459	8	0.3%	8	1.2%	7	1,145	10	0.8%	9	3.1%	10	21.8%	3	31.3%	9	2.7%	5	4.4%	6	0.0%	1
Ganoque, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	390	6	0.3%	7	1.0%	6	1,155	10	0.7%	9	2.9%	9	24.3%	5	34.1%	9	2.3%	5	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Prescott, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	453	8	0.4%	9	1.5%	8	820	8	0.7%	9	2.7%	9	29.6%	9	34.7%	9	-1.1%	8	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Westport, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	251	3	0.2%	4	0.8%	4	484	4	0.3%	5	1.5%	5	18.9%	2	47.2%	10	-0.3%	7	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Merrickville-Wolford, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	259	3	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	635	6	0.4%	6	1.3%	4	24.2%	5	26.2%	7	2.0%	6	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Augusta, Township of	East	LT	90.6%	286	4	0.2%	4	0.5%	2	380	2	0.2%	2	0.7%	1	23.9%	4	18.9%	4	-1.6%	8	4.4%	6	90.6%	10
Front of Yonge, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	239	3	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	435	3	0.3%	4	0.9%	1	24.2%	5	13.7%	2	6.2%	3	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
North Grenville, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	301	5	0.1%	4	0.6%	2	583	6	0.3%	4	1.1%	3	26.8%	7	15.5%	2	4.5%	4	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Rideau Lakes, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	271	4	0.1%	4	1.1%	7	380	2	0.2%	2	1.5%	3	21.5%	3	30.0%	8	6.8%	3	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Athens and Rear of Yonge and Escott, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	223	2	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	326	1	0.2%	2	0.8%	1	31.3%	10	22.2%	5	1.1%	6	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Edwardsburgh/Cardinal, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	239	3	0.2%	4	0.5%	2	514	4	0.3%	5	1.2%	3	26.0%	7	21.0%	5	0.2%	7	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Leeds and the Thousand Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	314	5	0.1%	3	1.0%	6	449	3	0.2%	2	1.4%	5	22.0%	3	21.8%	5	4.0%	4	4.4%	6	100.0%	10
Elizabethtown - Kitley, Township of	East	LT	90.8%	272	4	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	549	5	0.3%	5	1.1%	2	23.9%	5	25.2%	6	1.6%	6	4.4%	6	90.8%	10
Lennox and Addington, County of	East	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Greater Napanee, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	413	7	0.3%	7	1.1%	7	668	7	0.4%	7	1.8%	7	22.3%	3	27.2%	7	1.8%	6	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
Addington Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	227	2	0.2%	6	2.3%	10	432	3	0.4%	7	4.3%	10	19.8%	2	31.9%	9	4.6%	4	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
Loyalist, Township of	East	LT	54.5%	428	7	0.2%	6	0.9%	6	590	6	0.3%	5	1.3%	4	24.2%	5	20.6%	4	3.2%	5	6.4%	4	54.5%	6
Stone Mills, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	325	5	0.2%	6	0.8%	5	447	3	0.3%	5	1.2%	3	24.6%	5	15.0%	2	3.1%	5	6.4%	4	100.0%	10
Middlesex, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
London, City of	SW	ST	1.0%	492	8	0.3%	7	1.2%	7	801	8	0.5%	8	2.0%	7	24.0%	5	18.9%	4	4.7%	4	8.6%	3	1.0%	1
Newbury, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	100	1	0.1%	2	0.4%	1	886	9	0.9%	10	3.2%	10	26.0%	7	29.6%	8	4.0%	4	8.6%	3	100.0%	10
Middlesex Centre, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	294	4	0.1%	2	0.5%	1	515	4	0.2%	2	0.8%	1	31.4%	10	21.0%	5	9.5%	2	8.6%	3	100.0%	10
Lucan Biddulph, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	187	1	0.1%	2	0.3%	1	464	4	0.3%	3	0.9%	1	32.9%	10	13.8%	2	-0.3%	7	8.6%	3	100.0%	10
Adelaide Metcalfe, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	266	4	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	522	4	0.2%	2	1.1%	2	35.6%	10	22.1%	5	0.3%	7	8.6%	3	100.0%	10
North Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	200	2	0.1%	2	0.4%	1	492	4	0.2%	3	1.0%	2	31.9%	10	18.6%	3	-2.3%	8	8.6%	3	100.0%	10
Southwest Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	157	1	0.1%	2	0.3%	1	414	3	0.3%	4	0.9%	1	28.6%	8	22.0%	5	-4.1%	9	8.6%	3	100.0%	10
Strathroy - Caradoc, Township of	SW	LT	33.0%	187	1	0.1%	2	0.4%	1	718	7	0.4%	7	1.5%	5	30.3%	9	21.2%	5	4.3%	4	8.6%	3	33.0%	4
Thames Centre, Municipality of	SW	LT	65.9%	259	3	0.1%	2	0.4%	1	435	3	0.2%	1	0.7%	1	29.7%	9	17.0%	3	4.9%	4	8.6%	3	65.9%	7



**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality in  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government

Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%		
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health				
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)										DEMOGRAPHICS												
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM		
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value
Northumberland, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Cobourg, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	370	6	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	959	9	0.5%	8	2.2%	8	24.2%	5	34.2%	9	6.0%	3	9.8%	2	0.0%	1	
Brighton, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	293	4	0.2%	5	0.8%	5	469	4	0.3%	4	1.3%	4	21.8%	3	37.2%	10	8.5%	2	9.8%	2	100.0%	10	
Trent Hills, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	237	3	0.2%	5	0.8%	5	581	6	0.4%	7	2.0%	7	20.9%	2	35.2%	9	-2.6%	8	9.8%	2	100.0%	10	
Port Hope, Municipality of	Central	LT	24.9%	358	6	0.2%	5	0.8%	4	890	9	0.5%	8	1.9%	7	24.6%	5	22.4%	5	5.0%	4	9.8%	2	24.9%	3	
Hamilton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	327	5	0.2%	5	0.7%	3	528	5	0.3%	4	1.1%	2	24.4%	5	16.7%	3	1.7%	6	9.8%	2	100.0%	10	
Alnwick/Haldimand, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	335	6	0.2%	5	0.9%	5	537	5	0.3%	4	1.4%	5	26.1%	7	20.9%	5	10.1%	2	9.8%	2	100.0%	10	
Cramahe, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	294	4	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	565	5	0.3%	5	1.4%	5	28.0%	8	21.9%	5	4.1%	4	9.8%	2	100.0%	10	
Perth, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Stratford, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	381	6	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	983	10	0.5%	8	2.2%	8	25.0%	6	22.2%	5	2.3%	5	6.0%	5	0.0%	1	
St. Marys, Town of	SW	ST	100.0%	198	2	0.1%	2	0.4%	1	613	6	0.3%	5	1.3%	4	27.9%	8	30.2%	8	5.1%	4	6.0%	5	100.0%	10	
North Perth, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	175	1	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	680	7	0.4%	6	1.5%	5	29.7%	9	22.7%	6	1.7%	6	6.0%	5	100.0%	10	
Perth East, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	200	2	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	674	7	0.3%	5	1.3%	3	35.5%	10	17.7%	3	-0.6%	8	6.0%	5	100.0%	10	
Perth South, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	232	3	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	762	8	0.3%	4	1.3%	4	30.9%	9	13.9%	2	-3.9%	9	6.0%	5	100.0%	10	
West Perth, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	195	2	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	598	6	0.3%	4	1.2%	3	29.8%	9	19.5%	4	-3.2%	8	6.0%	5	100.0%	10	
Peterborough, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Peterborough, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	596	9	0.3%	8	1.6%	8	922	9	0.5%	8	2.5%	9	22.9%	4	29.0%	8	4.8%	4	7.3%	4	0.0%	1	
Asphodel-Norwood, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	158	1	0.1%	2	0.4%	1	562	5	0.4%	6	1.5%	5	24.3%	5	26.9%	7	6.6%	3	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
North Kawartha, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	242	3	0.1%	2	3.1%	10	345	2	0.1%	1	4.4%	10	18.0%	1	32.9%	9	9.2%	2	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	244	3	0.1%	2	0.5%	1	585	6	0.2%	3	1.1%	2	25.9%	6	14.9%	2	4.4%	4	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Douro-Dummer, Township of	Central	LT	82.2%	253	3	0.1%	2	0.8%	4	344	2	0.1%	1	1.0%	2	25.4%	6	20.2%	4	4.5%	4	7.3%	4	82.2%	9	
Galway-Cavendish-Harvey, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	241	3	0.1%	2	1.8%	9	347	2	0.1%	1	2.6%	9	15.8%	1	32.2%	9	20.9%	1	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	178	1	0.1%	2	1.1%	7	309	1	0.2%	2	1.9%	7	18.5%	2	32.3%	9	3.5%	5	7.3%	4	100.0%	10	
Otonabee-South Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	95.5%	191	2	0.1%	2	0.5%	1	472	4	0.3%	3	1.1%	3	23.4%	4	20.7%	4	4.0%	4	7.3%	4	95.5%	10	
Smith-Ennismore-Lakefield, Township of	Central	LT	67.2%	249	3	0.1%	2	0.6%	3	442	3	0.2%	2	1.1%	2	22.4%	3	25.6%	6	6.1%	3	7.3%	4	67.2%	7	
Prescott and Russell, United Counties of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Clarence-Rockland, City of	East	LT	51.3%	508	8	0.3%	7	0.9%	6	573	5	0.3%	5	1.1%	2	25.9%	6	13.4%	1	6.0%	3	9.2%	3	51.3%	6	
Hawkesbury, Town of	East	LT	0.0%	363	6	0.3%	8	1.3%	8	971	9	0.9%	10	3.4%	10	21.6%	3	28.1%	8	5.3%	4	9.2%	3	0.0%	1	
Casselton, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	523	9	0.3%	7	1.2%	7	733	7	0.4%	7	1.7%	6	25.0%	6	12.5%	1	13.2%	1	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
East Hawkesbury, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	393	7	0.3%	7	0.9%	6	566	5	0.4%	7	1.3%	4	25.7%	6	16.1%	2	-1.4%	8	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Russell, Township of	East	LT	31.3%	612	10	0.3%	7	1.0%	6	609	6	0.3%	4	1.0%	2	30.3%	9	11.8%	1	11.9%	2	9.2%	3	31.3%	4	
Alfred and Plantagenet, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	366	6	0.3%	7	0.9%	6	593	6	0.5%	8	1.5%	5	24.7%	5	19.6%	4	0.7%	7	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
ChAMPLAIN, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	411	7	0.3%	7	1.0%	6	474	4	0.3%	6	1.1%	3	23.0%	4	21.2%	5	1.1%	6	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
the Nation, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	445	7	0.3%	7	0.9%	6	586	6	0.4%	6	1.2%	3	28.2%	8	12.1%	1	0.4%	7	9.2%	3	100.0%	10	
Prince Edward, County of	East	ST	100.0%	366	6	0.2%	6	1.0%	6	509	4	0.3%	4	1.4%	5	21.7%	3	32.2%	9	2.4%	5	6.3%	5	100.0%	10	
Renfrew, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Pembroke, City of	East	ST	0.0%	693	10	0.6%	10	2.2%	10	1,074	10	1.0%	10	3.5%	10	23.4%	4	35.3%	9	3.3%	5	2.7%	7	0.0%	1	
Arnprior, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	356	6	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	783	8	0.5%	8	2.0%	7	22.3%	3	29.5%	8	-0.5%	7	2.7%	7	100.0%	10	
Deep River, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	222	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	1	1,065	10	0.8%	9	1.9%	7	23.8%	4	38.0%	10	2.0%	6	2.7%	7	100.0%	10	
Renfrew, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	284	4	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	754	8	0.6%	9	2.4%	8	24.8%	6	35.6%	9	-1.2%	8	2.7%	7	100.0%	10	
Petawawa, Town of	East	LT	26.0%	212	2	0.1%	3	0.5%	1	373	2	0.2%	3	0.8%	1	32.7%	10	9.9%	1	1.8%	6	2.7%	7	26.0%	3	
Laurentian Hills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	293	4	0.2%	5	0.8%	4	762	8	0.5%	8	2.0%	7	22.7%	3	20.2%	4	1.4%	6	2.7%	7	100.0%	10	

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health.  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used.  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population in the Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) tier.  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government.

MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Weight in Overall Composite Indicator																							
				2.78% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		2.8% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		2.8% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		2.78% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		2.8% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		2.8% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		4.17% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		4.17% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		3.33% High Value=Better Fiscal Health		0.83% High Value=Better Fiscal Health		4.17% Low Value=Better Fiscal Health			
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)																							
				Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM			
Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile				
Head, Clara and Maria, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	634	10	0.2%	6	0.0%	1	495	4	0.2%	2	0.0%	1	12.3%	1	41.0%	10	0.0%	7	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Horton, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	323	5	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	424	3	0.3%	4	1.1%	3	24.6%	5	15.4%	2	9.2%	2	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
McNab-Braeside, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	349	6	0.2%	5	0.7%	4	403	3	0.2%	3	0.9%	7	16.8%	3	5.5%	3	2.7%	7	100.0%	10				
Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	207	2	0.2%	5	1.1%	7	337	2	0.3%	5	1.8%	7	21.3%	2	28.9%	8	-4.3%	9	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
North Altona-Wilberforce, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	249	3	0.2%	6	0.9%	6	426	3	0.3%	5	1.6%	6	24.3%	5	21.6%	5	4.1%	4	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Admaston-Bromley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	271	4	0.2%	6	0.7%	4	583	6	0.4%	7	1.6%	6	27.8%	8	18.6%	3	-3.8%	9	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Laurentian Valley, Township of	East	LT	82.5%	352	6	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	502	4	0.3%	5	1.2%	3	25.7%	6	19.0%	4	6.1%	3	2.7%	7	82.5%	9		
Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	222	2	0.2%	5	1.1%	7	402	2	0.3%	5	2.3%	7	24.8%	6	25.5%	6	2.3%	5	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Madawaska Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	252	3	0.2%	6	1.3%	8	341	2	0.3%	4	1.7%	6	26.6%	7	34.4%	9	-0.6%	7	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Bonnechere Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	200	2	0.2%	6	0.9%	6	387	2	0.4%	6	1.8%	7	20.2%	2	28.0%	8	2.1%	6	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Whitewater Region, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	256	3	0.2%	6	0.8%	5	439	3	0.3%	5	1.4%	4	25.9%	6	26.8%	7	1.7%	6	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Greater Madawaska, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	277	4	0.2%	5	1.8%	9	339	2	0.2%	3	2.2%	8	14.9%	1	36.7%	10	20.1%	1	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
Simcoe, County of	Central	UT		NA			NA		NA			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA					
Barrie, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	403	7	0.2%	5	0.9%	5	992	10	0.4%	7	2.2%	8	29.7%	9	14.9%	2	23.8%	1	21.1%	1	0.0%	1		
Orillia, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	581	9	0.3%	8	1.5%	8	685	7	0.4%	6	1.8%	6	23.6%	4	27.9%	7	3.9%	4	21.1%	1	0.0%	1		
Collingwood, Town of	Central	LT	2.7%	211	2	0.1%	2	0.9%	6	560	5	0.3%	5	2.4%	8	22.8%	3	32.5%	9	7.8%	2	21.1%	1	2.7%	1		
Midland, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	215	2	0.1%	3	0.6%	2	851	8	0.5%	8	2.3%	8	23.8%	4	31.7%	9	0.5%	7	21.1%	1	0.0%	1		
Penetanguishene, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	200	2	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	694	7	0.4%	6	1.8%	7	24.7%	5	29.1%	8	12.5%	1	21.1%	1	0.0%	1		
Wasaga Beach, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	230	2	0.1%	2	1.0%	7	487	4	0.2%	3	2.2%	8	23.7%	4	38.2%	10	21.0%	1	21.1%	1	100.0%	10		
Innisfil, Town of	Central	LT	18.0%	293	4	0.1%	2	0.6%	3	767	8	0.3%	4	1.7%	6	28.0%	4	19.1%	4	8.8%	2	21.1%	1	18.0%	2		
Bradford West Gwillimbury, Town of	Central	LT	23.6%	309	5	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	830	8	0.3%	5	1.4%	5	27.5%	8	11.6%	1	8.1%	2	21.1%	1	23.6%	3		
New Tecumseth, Town of	Central	LT	29.9%	314	5	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	572	5	0.2%	2	1.0%	1	28.8%	8	21.1%	5	6.0%	3	21.1%	1	29.9%	3		
Essa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	218	2	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	434	3	0.2%	2	0.8%	1	29.1%	8	10.9%	1	0.6%	7	21.1%	1	100.0%	10		
Tiny, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	275	4	0.1%	2	1.4%	8	338	2	0.1%	1	1.8%	6	19.0%	2	28.5%	8	19.4%	1	21.1%	1	100.0%	10		
Adjala-Tosorontio, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	209	5	0.1%	2	0.6%	2	423	3	0.1%	1	0.8%	1	27.0%	7	13.5%	1	6.1%	3	21.1%	1	100.0%	10		
Clearview, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	264	3	0.1%	2	0.6%	2	553	5	0.2%	3	1.2%	3	26.9%	7	21.3%	5	2.1%	6	21.1%	1	100.0%	10		
Oro-Medonte, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	272	4	0.1%	2	0.7%	4	328	1	0.1%	1	0.9%	1	25.6%	6	19.3%	4	9.4%	2	21.1%	1	100.0%	10		
Ramara, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	185	1	0.1%	2	0.9%	5	238	1	0.1%	1	1.1%	3	24.2%	5	28.2%	8	9.4%	2	21.1%	1	100.0%	10		
Severn, Township of	Central	LT	90.4%	259	3	0.1%	2	0.8%	5	327	1	0.1%	1	1.1%	2	23.9%	5	27.1%	7	8.0%	2	21.1%	1	90.4%	10		
Springwater, Township of	Central	LT	60.5%	305	5	0.1%	2	0.6%	2	634	6	0.2%	3	1.2%	3	30.3%	9	16.8%	3	8.4%	2	21.1%	1	60.5%	7		
Tay, Township of	Central	LT	42.2%	167	1	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	444	3	0.3%	4	1.4%	4	25.8%	6	22.4%	5	6.4%	3	21.1%	1	42.2%	5		
Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, United Counties of	East	UT		NA			NA		NA			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA					
Cornwall, City of	East	ST	0.0%	803	10	0.8%	10	2.6%	10	1,027	10	1.0%	10	3.3%	10	24.1%	5	26.4%	7	0.7%	7	2.7%	7	0.0%	1		
North Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	379	6	0.2%	6	0.8%	4	650	7	0.4%	7	1.4%	4	26.0%	7	20.1%	4	0.7%	7	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
South Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	348	6	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	537	5	0.4%	6	1.4%	4	26.0%	7	23.5%	6	-2.3%	8	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
North Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	268	4	0.2%	6	0.8%	4	493	4	0.4%	7	1.4%	5	24.2%	5	28.4%	8	0.4%	7	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
South Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	364	6	0.2%	6	0.8%	5	745	7	0.5%	7	1.7%	6	22.7%	3	23.1%	6	1.4%	6	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
North Stormont, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	303	5	0.2%	6	0.7%	4	528	5	0.4%	6	1.2%	3	26.9%	7	15.7%	2	-1.3%	8	2.7%	7	100.0%	10		
South Stormont, Township of	East	LT	77.8%	349	6	0.2%	6	0.7%	4	617	6	0.4%	7	1.3%	3	28.9%	8	20.9%	4	4.8%	4	2.7%	7	77.8%	8		
Kawartha Lakes, City of	Central	ST	74.3%	303	5	0.2%	4	0.9%	5	465	4	0.2%	3	1.4%	4	23.7%	4	28.6%	8	7.8%	2	6.5%	4	74.3%	8		
Wellington, County of	Central	UT		NA			NA		NA			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA					
Guelph, City of	Central	ST	0.4%	436	7	0.2%	6	0.9%	5	873	9	0.4%	7	1.8%	7	24.9%	6	17.5%	3	8.3%	2	12.5%	2	0.4%	1		

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population in the RSCM  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government

Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health			
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)												DEMOGRAPHICS									
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Erin, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	283	4	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	640	6	0.2%	2	1.0%	2	27.8%	8	14.3%	2	0.9%	6	12.5%	2	100.0%	10
Minto, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	149	1	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	560	5	0.4%	6	1.4%	4	32.1%	10	26.0%	7	4.2%	4	12.5%	2	100.0%	10
Puslinch, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	397	7	0.1%	1	0.6%	3	982	10	0.2%	3	1.6%	6	26.3%	7	20.7%	4	13.7%	1	12.5%	2	100.0%	10
Centre Wellington, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	212	2	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	469	4	0.2%	2	0.9%	1	27.8%	8	20.7%	4	7.4%	2	12.5%	2	100.0%	10
Guelph-Eramosa, Township of	Central	LT	64.4%	290	4	0.1%	1	0.5%	1	705	7	0.2%	3	1.1%	2	31.0%	9	18.5%	3	8.0%	2	12.5%	2	64.4%	7
Mapleton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	205	2	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	500	4	0.2%	3	1.0%	2	43.7%	10	12.2%	1	5.9%	3	12.5%	2	100.0%	10
Wellington North, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	166	1	0.1%	1	0.4%	1	412	3	0.2%	3	1.1%	2	30.2%	9	26.9%	7	-1.1%	8	12.5%	2	100.0%	10
Algoma, District of	North	D		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Sault Ste Marie, City of	North	ST	9.6%	656	10	0.6%	10	1.7%	8	913	9	0.9%	9	2.3%	8	22.2%	3	26.0%	7	0.5%	7	-5.4%	9	9.6%	1
Elliot Lake, City of	North	ST	1.0%	292	4	0.7%	10	1.1%	7	640	7	1.5%	10	2.4%	8	17.7%	1	56.8%	10	-3.4%	8	-5.4%	9	1.0%	1
Blind River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	413	7	0.6%	10	1.7%	9	606	6	0.8%	9	2.5%	9	21.4%	3	22.4%	5	-4.8%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Bruce Mines, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	517	9	0.6%	10	1.4%	9	788	8	0.9%	10	2.7%	9	26.4%	7	35.8%	10	-6.9%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Thessalon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	456	8	0.6%	10	1.4%	8	848	8	1.1%	10	2.6%	9	18.4%	2	40.2%	10	-5.3%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Spanish, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	319	5	0.6%	10	1.3%	8	760	8	1.4%	10	3.2%	10	25.0%	6	30.2%	8	-10.8%	10	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Hilton Beach, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	461	8	0.5%	9	2.6%	10	606	6	0.7%	9	3.4%	8	21.5%	3	46.2%	10	-1.1%	8	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Hilton, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	645	10	0.5%	9	4.6%	10	590	6	0.5%	8	4.3%	10	10.4%	1	38.0%	10	-5.8%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Jocelyn, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	651	10	0.5%	9	4.0%	10	424	3	0.3%	5	2.6%	9	14.7%	1	41.2%	10	-7.0%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Johnson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	485	8	0.5%	9	2.9%	10	623	6	0.7%	9	3.7%	10	21.9%	3	37.1%	10	6.5%	3	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Laird, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	616	10	0.5%	9	1.7%	9	508	4	0.4%	7	1.4%	5	19.6%	2	18.7%	3	5.6%	3	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Macdonald, Meredith and Aberdeen Add'l, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	514	9	0.5%	10	1.8%	9	518	4	0.5%	8	1.8%	7	23.6%	4	14.7%	2	6.7%	3	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Wawa, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	829	10	1.1%	10	2.1%	9	1,270	10	1.7%	10	3.2%	10	24.5%	5	16.5%	2	-12.6%	10	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Plummer Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	493	8	0.5%	9	3.2%	10	358	2	0.4%	6	2.3%	8	25.1%	6	38.2%	10	-6.9%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Prince, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	816	10	0.6%	10	1.9%	9	558	5	0.4%	7	1.3%	4	20.1%	2	17.9%	3	-3.9%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
St Joseph, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	671	10	0.5%	9	2.7%	10	425	3	0.3%	5	1.7%	6	31.6%	10	34.0%	9	-6.0%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	545	9	0.5%	9	2.1%	9	483	4	0.4%	7	1.9%	7	23.9%	4	28.5%	8	-16.7%	10	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Hornepayne, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	398	7	0.6%	10	0.8%	4	780	8	1.2%	10	1.5%	5	37.0%	10	13.7%	2	-11.2%	10	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
The North Shore, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	561	9	0.6%	10	1.7%	9	894	9	1.0%	10	2.8%	9	7.8%	1	40.9%	10	0.9%	6	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
White River, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	519	9	0.7%	10	1.1%	7	867	9	1.2%	10	1.8%	7	22.8%	3	10.3%	1	-15.3%	10	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Dubreuilville, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	654	10	0.7%	10	1.0%	6	801	8	0.9%	10	1.2%	3	30.3%	9	7.3%	1	-20.1%	10	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Huron Shores, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	477	8	0.5%	9	2.0%	9	521	4	0.6%	9	2.2%	8	23.5%	4	27.2%	7	-5.5%	9	-5.4%	9	100.0%	10
Cochrane, District of	North	D		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Timmins, City of	North	ST	12.2%	554	9	0.5%	10	1.4%	8	939	9	0.9%	10	2.3%	8	24.9%	6	17.4%	3	-1.6%	8	-8.5%	10	12.2%	2
Hearst, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	611	10	0.5%	9	1.3%	8	859	9	0.7%	9	1.8%	7	19.8%	2	16.6%	3	-3.5%	9	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Iroquois Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	480	8	0.6%	10	1.2%	7	780	8	0.9%	10	2.0%	7	23.5%	4	26.9%	7	-9.4%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Kapuskasing, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	468	8	0.5%	10	1.1%	7	588	6	0.7%	9	1.4%	5	22.4%	3	21.9%	5	-7.9%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Smooth Rock Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	610	10	0.6%	10	1.2%	7	591	6	0.6%	9	1.1%	3	22.4%	3	26.6%	7	-19.5%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Cochrane, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	488	8	0.6%	10	1.3%	8	531	5	0.6%	9	1.4%	5	22.8%	3	19.1%	4	-3.6%	9	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Moosonee, Town of	North	ST		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Black River Matheson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	600	9	0.5%	10	1.9%	9	554	5	0.5%	8	1.7%	6	29.0%	8	24.0%	6	-9.3%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Moonbeam, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	425	7	0.5%	9	1.8%	9	339	2	0.4%	7	1.4%	5	21.0%	2	24.4%	6	8.1%	2	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Fauquier-Strickland, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	748	10	0.7%	10	2.4%	10	363	2	0.4%	6	1.1%	3	16.9%	1	31.2%	9	-16.2%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Val Rita-Harty, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	673	10	0.5%	10	1.6%	8	531	5	0.4%	7	1.2%	3	28.7%	8	17.5%	3	-8.1%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health.  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used.  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population in the RSCM.  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government.

				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%	
<b>Weight in Overall Composite Indicator</b>				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				<b>MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)</b>										<b>DEMOGRAPHICS</b>											
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Mattice-Val Cote, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	848	10	0.5%	9	2.5%	10	650	7	0.4%	6	1.9%	7	20.0%	2	14.1%	2	-13.4%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
Opasatika, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1,354	10	0.5%	9	6.7%	10	1,061	10	0.4%	7	5.3%	10	19.0%	2	33.8%	9	-13.8%	10	-8.5%	10	100.0%	10
<b>Kenora, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>				<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>	
Dryden, City of	North	ST	100.0%	449	8	0.3%	7	0.9%	5	1,202	10	0.7%	9	2.3%	8	28.5%	8	18.4%	3	0.0%	7	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
Kenora, City of	North	ST	25.5%	391	6	0.3%	7	0.9%	5	1,199	10	0.8%	9	2.7%	9	25.3%	6	22.6%	5	-4.2%	9	-0.4%	8	25.5%	3
Sioux Lookout, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	389	6	0.3%	7	0.9%	5	1,548	10	1.0%	10	3.4%	10	31.7%	10	11.2%	1	-2.9%	8	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
Red Lake, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	295	4	0.3%	7	0.7%	3	983	10	0.9%	10	2.2%	8	25.2%	6	13.5%	2	6.9%	3	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
Ignace, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	238	3	0.3%	8	0.7%	3	731	7	0.9%	10	2.1%	7	27.8%	8	14.2%	2	-16.3%	10	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
Machin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	404	7	0.2%	7	1.2%	7	528	5	0.3%	5	1.6%	6	27.7%	8	21.2%	5	-14.4%	10	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
Ear Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	261	3	0.3%	7	0.6%	3	1,265	10	1.4%	10	3.0%	9	32.3%	10	14.5%	2	0.3%	7	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
Pickle Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	212	2	0.3%	7	1.0%	6	2,372	10	3.1%	10	10.7%	10	37.4%	10	11.1%	1	20.1%	1	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
Sioux Narrows - Nestor Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	414	7	0.2%	6	5.2%	10	428	3	0.2%	3	5.4%	10	14.7%	1	33.7%	9	16.5%	1	-0.4%	8	100.0%	10
<b>Manitoulin, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>				<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>	
Gore Bay, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	293	4	0.3%	7	0.8%	4	664	7	0.6%	9	1.8%	6	16.2%	1	36.5%	10	2.9%	5	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Northeastern Manitoulin and The Islands, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	327	5	0.3%	7	1.6%	8	654	7	0.5%	8	3.1%	10	18.8%	2	31.1%	8	7.1%	3	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Assignack, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	286	4	0.3%	7	1.6%	8	693	7	0.6%	9	3.9%	10	26.3%	7	24.8%	6	-1.8%	8	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Barrie Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	306	5	0.2%	7	3.1%	10	292	1	0.2%	3	2.9%	9	15.0%	1	100.0%	10	-6.0%	9	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Billings, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	277	4	0.2%	6	1.9%	9	555	5	0.5%	8	3.7%	10	19.5%	2	48.0%	10	-2.2%	8	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Burpee and Mills, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	299	5	0.2%	7	1.8%	9	449	3	0.4%	6	2.7%	9	22.5%	3	41.4%	10	-9.1%	10	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Cockburn Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	274	4	0.2%	6	0.0%	1	299	1	0.2%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	7	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Gordon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	265	4	0.2%	7	1.4%	8	361	2	0.3%	5	1.9%	7	24.0%	5	31.3%	9	-12.9%	10	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Tehkummah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	279	4	0.3%	7	2.4%	10	489	4	0.4%	7	4.3%	10	19.1%	2	49.1%	10	4.1%	4	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Central Manitoulin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	299	5	0.2%	7	1.7%	8	516	4	0.4%	7	2.9%	9	16.2%	1	36.6%	10	1.9%	6	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
<b>Nipissing, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>				<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>	
North Bay, City of	North	ST	4.4%	739	10	0.5%	10	1.9%	9	1,075	10	0.8%	9	2.8%	9	23.2%	4	22.6%	5	2.3%	5	1.7%	8	4.4%	1
Mattawa, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	396	7	0.6%	10	1.6%	8	612	6	0.9%	9	2.5%	8	25.9%	6	29.2%	8	-11.8%	10	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
Teragama, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	790	10	0.4%	9	7.3%	10	508	4	0.2%	3	4.7%	10	18.5%	2	28.2%	8	4.6%	4	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
West Nipissing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	508	8	0.5%	9	2.2%	10	564	5	0.6%	8	2.5%	8	22.2%	3	25.7%	7	2.3%	6	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
South Algouquin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	544	9	0.4%	9	3.0%	10	329	1	0.3%	4	1.8%	6	19.4%	2	30.4%	8	-2.0%	8	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
Bonfield, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	611	10	0.4%	9	1.9%	9	332	1	0.2%	3	1.0%	2	28.6%	8	16.9%	3	-2.7%	8	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
Calvin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1,385	10	0.7%	10	5.0%	10	921	9	0.4%	7	3.3%	10	23.4%	4	19.0%	4	0.8%	6	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
Chisholm, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	549	9	0.5%	9	2.0%	9	327	1	0.3%	4	1.2%	3	31.2%	9	15.9%	2	7.2%	3	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
East Ferris, Township of	North	ST	97.6%	790	10	0.5%	9	1.8%	9	243	1	0.1%	1	0.5%	1	23.4%	4	18.5%	3	-2.1%	8	1.7%	8	97.6%	10
Mattawan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	656	10	0.4%	9	3.9%	10	976	9	0.6%	9	5.7%	10	34.3%	10	34.3%	9	28.9%	1	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
Papineau-Cameron, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	781	10	0.4%	9	2.5%	10	671	7	0.3%	5	2.1%	8	23.3%	4	19.7%	4	6.1%	3	1.7%	8	100.0%	10
<b>Parry Sound, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>				<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>					<b>NA</b>				<b>NA</b>	
Kearney, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	173	1	0.1%	1	1.8%	9	314	1	0.2%	1	3.3%	10	12.6%	1	28.1%	8	3.2%	5	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Parry Sound, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	182	1	0.1%	2	0.5%	2	878	9	0.5%	8	2.5%	9	22.9%	4	30.1%	8	-5.0%	9	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Powassan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	194	2	0.1%	4	0.5%	2	343	2	0.3%	4	0.9%	1	22.3%	3	31.5%	9	1.8%	6	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Burk's Falls, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	110	1	0.1%	2	0.5%	1	666	7	0.7%	9	2.9%	8	27.7%	8	32.2%	9	-5.0%	9	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
South River, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	136	1	0.2%	5	0.6%	2	416	3	0.5%	8	1.7%	6	23.5%	4	35.5%	9	2.8%	5	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Sundridge, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	164	1	0.1%	2	0.5%	1	707	7	0.5%	8	2.0%	7	20.3%	2	43.5%	10	-4.2%	9	6.4%	5	100.0%	10

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health.  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used.  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population in the RSCM.  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government.

Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health			
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)												DEMOGRAPHICS									
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Armour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	176	1	0.1%	1	1.0%	7	271	1	0.1%	1	1.6%	6	14.1%	1	30.0%	8	-5.8%	9	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Carling, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	319	5	0.1%	1	2.6%	10	407	3	0.1%	1	3.3%	10	16.3%	1	33.7%	9	5.6%	3	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Whitestone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	173	1	0.1%	1	1.9%	9	197	1	0.1%	1	2.2%	8	19.6%	2	49.8%	10	20.8%	1	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Callander, Municipality of	North	ST	57.9%	220	2	0.1%	3	0.5%	2	457	3	0.2%	3	1.0%	2	21.1%	2	21.2%	5	2.3%	5	6.4%	5	57.9%	6
Joly, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	126	1	0.1%	2	0.7%	3	140	1	0.1%	1	12.7%	1	29.3%	1	29.3%	8	-3.4%	8	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Machar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	172	1	0.1%	1	1.0%	6	166	1	0.1%	1	1.0%	1	19.5%	2	26.4%	7	2.0%	6	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
McDougall, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	254	3	0.1%	1	0.9%	6	332	1	0.1%	1	1.2%	3	22.7%	3	25.0%	6	3.7%	5	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
McKellar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	246	3	0.1%	1	2.1%	9	255	1	0.1%	1	1.2%	8	14.3%	1	35.0%	9	15.8%	1	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
McMurrich/Monteith, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	168	1	0.1%	1	1.1%	7	374	2	0.2%	2	2.6%	9	14.5%	1	28.1%	8	3.3%	5	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Nipissing, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	187	1	0.1%	2	0.8%	4	234	1	0.1%	1	0.9%	1	21.9%	3	23.4%	3	6.4%	3	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Perry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	169	1	0.1%	1	0.7%	4	262	1	0.2%	1	1.1%	2	24.5%	5	22.7%	6	-10.7%	10	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Ryerson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	178	1	0.1%	1	1.3%	8	255	1	0.1%	1	1.9%	7	16.0%	1	38.3%	10	8.5%	2	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Strong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	181	1	0.1%	1	0.8%	5	241	1	0.1%	1	1.1%	3	35.9%	10	37.4%	10	-3.1%	8	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
The Archipelago, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	327	5	0.1%	1	13.1%	10	144	1	0.0%	1	5.8%	10	22.0%	3	56.7%	10	14.1%	1	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Magnetawan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	207	2	0.1%	1	1.9%	9	214	1	0.1%	1	2.0%	7	17.3%	1	33.8%	9	20.0%	1	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
Seguin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	412	7	0.1%	1	2.9%	10	357	2	0.1%	1	2.5%	8	22.3%	3	28.3%	8	15.6%	1	6.4%	5	100.0%	10
<b>Rainy River, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		
Fort Frances, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	390	6	0.3%	8	0.9%	6	1,118	10	1.0%	10	2.7%	9	24.7%	5	29.2%	8	-2.5%	8	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Rainy River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	228	2	0.4%	8	0.7%	4	823	8	1.3%	10	2.7%	9	29.4%	9	41.9%	10	-7.3%	9	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Albion, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	494	8	0.3%	7	0.7%	4	795	8	0.5%	8	1.2%	3	25.7%	6	14.6%	2	0.2%	7	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Atikokan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	398	7	0.5%	9	0.9%	5	1,260	10	1.5%	10	2.8%	9	24.3%	5	22.5%	5	-9.3%	10	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Chapple, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	626	10	0.4%	9	1.8%	9	958	9	0.6%	9	2.8%	9	30.2%	9	16.8%	3	-5.9%	9	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Emo, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	334	6	0.3%	8	0.8%	6	554	5	0.5%	8	1.5%	5	29.9%	9	27.9%	7	-2.0%	8	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
La Vallee, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	338	6	0.3%	7	0.6%	3	735	7	0.6%	9	1.4%	4	31.1%	9	15.4%	2	-0.6%	7	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Morley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	327	5	0.3%	8	1.2%	7	558	5	0.5%	8	2.1%	7	31.6%	10	22.0%	5	-6.5%	9	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Dawson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	331	5	0.3%	7	1.0%	6	454	3	0.4%	7	1.4%	4	37.3%	10	25.9%	7	1.1%	6	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
Lake of the Woods, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	251	3	0.2%	6	3.0%	10	401	2	0.4%	6	4.8%	10	23.4%	4	28.1%	8	-2.1%	8	-7.4%	9	100.0%	10
<b>Sudbury, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		
Espanola, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	393	6	0.4%	9	1.0%	6	1,007	10	1.0%	10	2.5%	9	22.5%	3	23.5%	6	-2.5%	8	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
French River, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	246	3	0.3%	7	1.3%	8	468	4	0.5%	8	2.5%	8	14.5%	1	29.6%	8	-5.4%	9	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
Killarney, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	366	6	0.2%	7	5.2%	10	461	3	0.3%	5	6.5%	10	13.0%	1	45.3%	10	6.1%	3	3.3%	7	100.0%	10
Markstay-Warren, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	259	3	0.3%	8	0.8%	5	694	7	0.9%	10	2.2%	8	17.8%	1	20.7%	4	-5.8%	9	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
St. Charles, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	244	3	0.3%	7	1.0%	6	621	6	0.7%	9	2.5%	8	20.4%	2	32.7%	9	-6.9%	9	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
Baldwin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	214	2	0.3%	7	0.7%	4	911	9	1.2%	10	3.2%	10	17.0%	1	27.4%	7	-11.2%	10	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
Chapleau, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	210	2	0.4%	8	0.5%	1	749	8	1.3%	10	1.7%	6	24.1%	5	18.0%	3	-16.9%	10	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
Naim and Hyman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	328	5	0.3%	8	1.0%	7	1,077	10	1.1%	10	3.4%	10	25.1%	6	16.7%	3	17.4%	1	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
Sables Spanish Rivers, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	227	2	0.3%	7	0.8%	5	619	6	0.8%	9	2.3%	8	24.6%	5	23.6%	6	-0.2%	7	-8.9%	10	100.0%	10
<b>Thunder Bay, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		
Thunder Bay, City of	North	ST	5.3%	573	9	0.4%	9	1.4%	8	1,083	10	0.8%	9	2.6%	9	23.5%	4	23.4%	6	0.1%	7	-4.8%	8	5.3%	1
Marathon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	324	5	0.5%	9	0.5%	2	665	7	1.0%	10	1.0%	2	23.2%	4	8.8%	1	-12.5%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Greenstone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	574	9	0.3%	8	1.5%	8	824	8	0.5%	8	2.1%	8	22.8%	3	17.9%	3	-13.4%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Conmee, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	452	8	0.4%	8	0.7%	4	552	5	0.5%	7	0.9%	1	34.7%	10	11.0%	1	-1.1%	8	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Municipal Cost and Demographic Indicators)**

**Note:**  
 -The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal health.  
 -The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used.  
 -RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality's population in the RSCM.  
 -ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier  
 -Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government.

				2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		2.78%		2.8%		2.8%		4.17%		4.17%		3.33%		0.83%		4.17%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)												DEMOGRAPHICS									
MUNICIPALITY	Region	Tier	RSCM (%)	Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) per Household		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Social Service Costs (Social Program + Public Health) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) per Household		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Discounted, Unweighted Assessment		Emergency Service Costs (Police, Fire and Land Ambulance) as a Proportion of Median Household Income		Youth Population compared to Working Age Population		Senior Population compared to Working Age Population		Five-Year Change in Population 2001-2006		Ten-Year Projected Change in Population 2006-2016		RSCM	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Dorion, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	529	9	0.4%	9	1.3%	8	958	9	0.8%	9	2.4%	8	22.0%	3	11.3%	1	-14.3%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Gillies, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	346	6	0.4%	9	0.8%	4	369	2	0.4%	7	0.8%	1	23.4%	4	17.0%	3	4.2%	4	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Neebing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	501	8	0.3%	8	1.3%	8	415	3	0.3%	4	1.1%	2	19.0%	2	11.4%	1	6.6%	3	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Nipigon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	365	6	0.4%	9	0.7%	4	788	8	0.9%	10	1.5%	5	24.1%	5	22.9%	6	-10.8%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
O'Connor, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	437	7	0.4%	8	0.7%	3	480	4	0.4%	7	0.7%	1	24.4%	5	12.0%	1	-0.6%	7	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Schreiber, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	220	2	0.5%	9	0.5%	1	460	3	1.0%	10	1.0%	2	22.7%	3	27.7%	7	-37.8%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Shuniah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	538	9	0.3%	8	2.0%	9	473	4	0.3%	5	1.8%	6	20.2%	2	25.2%	6	18.1%	1	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Terrace Bay, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	569	9	0.6%	10	0.9%	5	937	9	0.9%	10	1.4%	5	22.9%	3	18.9%	4	-16.7%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Manitouwadge, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	146	1	0.5%	9	0.2%	1	785	8	2.7%	10	1.3%	4	23.9%	4	10.5%	1	-22.0%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Red Rock, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	798	10	0.7%	10	1.4%	8	1,067	10	1.0%	10	1.9%	7	29.8%	9	16.6%	3	-13.8%	10	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Oliver Paipoonge, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	617	10	0.4%	9	1.0%	6	610	6	0.4%	6	1.0%	1	26.7%	7	16.6%	3	-1.8%	8	-4.8%	8	100.0%	10
Timiskaming, District of	North	D	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Temiskaming Shores, City of	North	ST	100.0%	554	9	0.5%	9	1.4%	8	827	8	0.7%	9	2.1%	8	24.1%	5	24.8%	6	1.0%	6	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Cobalt, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	484	8	1.5%	10	1.7%	9	495	4	1.5%	10	1.8%	6	24.6%	5	22.4%	5	0.0%	7	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Englehart, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	507	8	0.6%	10	1.4%	8	610	6	0.8%	9	1.7%	6	23.3%	4	33.3%	9	-6.3%	9	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Kirkland Lake, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	448	8	1.1%	10	1.9%	9	742	7	1.9%	10	3.1%	10	22.2%	3	26.5%	7	-4.3%	9	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Latchford, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	697	10	0.3%	8	3.3%	10	391	2	0.2%	1	1.9%	7	17.3%	1	34.2%	9	21.2%	1	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Thornloe, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	576	9	0.9%	10	1.9%	9	401	2	0.6%	9	1.3%	4	28.6%	8	11.9%	1	-12.5%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Armstrong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	555	9	0.5%	9	1.4%	8	500	4	0.4%	7	1.2%	3	27.3%	7	22.8%	6	-5.6%	9	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Brethour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	470	8	0.5%	10	1.2%	7	294	1	0.3%	5	0.7%	1	27.8%	8	23.7%	6	-25.5%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Casey, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	520	9	0.6%	10	1.2%	7	451	3	0.5%	8	1.1%	2	30.7%	9	12.7%	1	-8.6%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Chamberlain, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	615	10	0.4%	8	1.7%	9	429	3	0.3%	4	1.2%	3	26.3%	7	24.2%	6	-7.5%	9	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Coleman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	464	8	0.3%	8	1.8%	9	384	2	0.3%	3	1.5%	5	16.4%	1	28.0%	7	-21.6%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Evanturel, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	604	10	0.4%	9	1.4%	8	458	3	0.3%	4	1.1%	2	27.5%	8	21.9%	5	-6.5%	9	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Harley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	561	9	0.5%	9	1.5%	8	530	5	0.4%	7	1.4%	4	21.9%	3	14.4%	2	-1.1%	8	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Harris, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	522	9	0.4%	8	1.0%	7	312	1	0.2%	3	0.6%	1	23.2%	4	17.8%	3	-1.2%	8	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Hilliard, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	493	8	0.5%	9	1.2%	7	401	2	0.4%	6	1.0%	2	25.5%	6	27.3%	7	-7.9%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Hudson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	433	7	0.3%	8	1.4%	8	311	1	0.2%	3	1.0%	2	29.3%	9	30.2%	8	-37.8%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
James, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	406	7	0.5%	10	1.3%	8	565	5	0.8%	9	1.9%	7	18.9%	2	26.3%	7	-11.3%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Kerns, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	679	10	0.4%	8	1.6%	8	563	5	0.3%	4	1.3%	4	27.9%	8	26.5%	7	-9.7%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Larder Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	404	7	1.0%	10	1.8%	9	595	6	1.5%	10	2.6%	9	20.3%	2	27.4%	7	-7.0%	9	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
McGarry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	419	7	1.7%	10	3.0%	10	613	6	2.5%	10	4.4%	10	14.6%	1	28.5%	8	-14.4%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Gauthier, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	455	8	0.7%	10	2.8%	10	1,499	10	2.4%	10	3.9%	10	42.4%	10	33.3%	9	3.9%	5	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Matachewan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	311	5	1.1%	10	2.3%	10	373	2	1.3%	10	2.7%	9	12.8%	1	29.6%	8	21.8%	1	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10
Charlton and Dack, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	541	9	0.6%	10	1.7%	9	472	4	0.6%	8	1.5%	5	22.1%	3	20.6%	4	-12.7%	10	-8.5%	9	100.0%	10

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Toronto, City of	GTA	ST	0.00%	7,474	4	22.6%	10	60.8	6	(1,726)	9	(2,038)	10	3,113	10	1,037	3
Durham, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oshawa, City of	GTA	LT	1.8%	6,862	3	13.5%	8	63.0	5	(1,225)	8	(1,626)	10	2,335	9	835	3
Pickering, City of	GTA	LT	5.2%	6,862	3	6.9%	3	71.9	1	67	5	2,447	2	1,773	9	1,247	2
Ajax, Town of	GTA	LT	1.7%	6,862	3	8.2%	4	71.6	1	(321)	6	1,541	4	1,601	8	1,194	2
Clarington, Municipality of	GTA	LT	23.4%	6,862	3	5.6%	2	68.6	2	(1,561)	9	1,509	4	1,761	9	2,797	1
Whitby, Town of	GTA	LT	3.1%	6,862	3	6.0%	2	70.4	2	518	3	508	6	1,628	8	1,908	1
Brock, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	6,862	3	8.8%	5	65.5	4	93	5	1,399	4	878	6	1,408	2
Scugog, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	6,862	3	5.8%	2	66.0	3	(113)	6	427	7	1,576	8	1,659	2
Uxbridge, Township of	GTA	LT	50.9%	6,862	3	5.1%	2	69.1	2	(518)	7	562	6	1,341	7	1,221	2
Haldimand, County of	Central	ST	100.0%	8,029	6	7.8%	4	65.5	4	1,693	1	2,356	2	731	5	689	4
Norfolk, County of	SW	ST	76.7%	8,029	6	9.9%	6	61.8	5	(1,326)	9	734	6	1,435	8	515	4
Halton, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Burlington, City of	GTA	LT	2.5%	6,560	2	8.1%	4	68.0	3	90	5	2,075	3	1,224	7	2,257	1
Halton Hills, Town of	GTA	LT	18.5%	6,560	2	4.3%	1	72.6	1	372	4	2,691	2	1,053	7	1,760	1
Milton, Town of	GTA	LT	29.4%	6,560	2	3.9%	1	73.0	1	(1,651)	9	3,420	1	1,670	8	2,731	1
Oakville, Town of	GTA	LT	0.8%	6,560	2	7.8%	4	68.7	2	(332)	7	3,070	1	1,334	7	2,490	1
Hamilton, City of	Central	ST	7.3%	8,236	7	19.8%	10	59.6	6	(858)	8	722	6	1,693	8	551	4
Niagara, Region of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Niagara Falls, City of	Central	LT	3.1%	8,459	8	14.4%	8	60.6	6	(99)	6	1,119	5	1,483	8	1,547	2
Port Colborne, City of	Central	LT	16.2%	8,459	8	14.9%	9	53.8	8	(1,143)	8	(478)	8	1,524	8	922	3
St. Catharines, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	8,459	8	15.5%	9	58.2	7	(359)	7	1,350	4	1,677	8	1,637	2
Welland, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	8,459	8	14.9%	9	57.5	7	(835)	8	1,002	5	1,991	9	1,787	1
Thorold, City of	Central	LT	7.4%	8,459	8	13.2%	8	62.5	5	(200)	6	2,483	2	980	6	3,363	1
Fort Erie, Town of	Central	LT	22.6%	8,459	8	11.9%	7	58.1	7	(23)	5	532	6	1,403	7	1,359	2
Grimsby, Town of	Central	LT	8.9%	8,459	8	6.9%	3	67.8	3	(29)	5	3,082	1	1,940	9	1,910	1
Lincoln, Town of	Central	LT	44.3%	8,459	8	4.7%	1	65.4	4	733	2	2,188	2	1,525	8	1,738	1
Niagara-on-the-Lake, Town of	Central	LT	62.9%	8,459	8	4.3%	1	64.0	4	(813)	8	2,123	2	2,665	10	2,023	1
Pelham, Town of	Central	LT	20.5%	8,459	8	5.1%	2	62.6	5	(1,007)	8	(248)	8	2,208	9	1,254	2
Wainfleet, Township of	Central	LT	94.6%	8,459	8	4.9%	2	64.7	4	304	4	370	7	871	6	906	3
West Lincoln, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	8,459	8	5.7%	2	70.0	2	(193)	6	2,324	2	983	6	1,077	3
Ottawa, City of	East	ST	8.0%	6,354	1	15.0%	9	66.0	3	(2,424)	10	(1,001)	9	2,438	9	1,341	2
Peel, Region of	GTA	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Brampton, City of	GTA	LT	2.8%	7,012	3	10.8%	6	71.0	2	(345)	7	3,747	1	1,657	8	1,776	1
Mississauga, City of	GTA	LT	0.1%	7,012	3	12.7%	8	68.7	2	(632)	7	3,456	1	1,169	7	2,543	1
Caledon, Town of	GTA	LT	46.5%	7,012	3	4.6%	1	74.4	1	83	5	2,128	2	1,413	7	631	4
Greater Sudbury, City of	North	ST	13.5%	8,308	7	14.9%	9	56.3	7	(193)	6	1,603	3	733	5	921	3
Waterloo, Region of	Central	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cambridge, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	6,862	3	10.1%	6	67.5	3	18	5	2,079	2	722	5	2,316	1
Kitchener, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	6,862	3	13.3%	8	67.0	3	258	4	2,394	2	1,114	7	1,335	2
Waterloo, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	6,862	3	10.2%	6	68.4	2	958	2	728	6	2,638	10	1,199	2
North Dumfries, Township of	Central	LT	58.5%	6,862	3	4.1%	1	74.9	1	(2,401)	10	1,317	4	1,066	7	1,579	2

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fis
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Wellesley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,862	3	8.2%	4	72.6	1	1,346	1	4,622	1	934	6	1,006	3
Wilmot, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,862	3	4.1%	1	69.5	2	513	3	3,300	1	1,189	7	1,963	1
Woolwich, Township of	Central	LT	48.4%	6,862	3	5.7%	2	71.9	1	3,537	1	4,817	1	981	6	1,993	1
York, Region of	GTA	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Vaughan, City of	GTA	LT	2.3%	7,067	3	8.2%	4	69.3	2	(818)	8	4,586	1	4,011	10	2,004	1
Aurora, Town of	GTA	LT	4.0%	7,067	3	6.1%	2	73.4	1	(576)	7	2,267	2	3,508	10	3,694	1
Markham, Town of	GTA	LT	2.0%	7,067	3	12.6%	7	64.5	4	(21)	5	3,983	1	2,992	10	2,583	1
Newmarket, Town of	GTA	LT	0.0%	7,067	3	8.6%	5	73.3	1	(1,278)	8	955	5	3,712	10	2,218	1
Richmond Hill, Town of	GTA	LT	1.0%	7,067	3	12.6%	7	66.4	3	(469)	7	5,354	1	2,844	10	5,397	1
Whitchurch-Stouffville, Town of	GTA	LT	49.7%	7,067	3	3.4%	1	70.6	2	(65)	6	1,530	4	3,047	10	1,793	1
East Gwillimbury, Town of	GTA	LT	32.0%	7,067	3	6.1%	3	75.0	1	132	5	309	7	2,649	10	1,270	2
Georgina, Town of	GTA	LT	29.7%	7,067	3	10.3%	6	68.0	3	(1,010)	8	(725)	9	1,779	9	797	3
King, Township of	GTA	LT	48.1%	7,067	3	4.9%	2	69.8	2	(1,410)	9	(1,016)	9	3,350	10	1,966	1
Muskoka, District of	Central	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Bracebridge, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	4,623	1	8.6%	5	64.0	4	821	2	1,560	3	1,576	8	294	6
Gravenhurst, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	4,623	1	11.3%	7	55.1	8	(1,682)	9	(894)	9	2,533	10	1,986	1
Huntsville, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	4,623	1	8.7%	5	62.2	5	204	4	400	7	1,420	8	329	5
Georgian Bay, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4,623	1	11.8%	7	47.3	9	(16)	5	256	7	1,348	7	378	5
Lake of Bays, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4,623	1	13.1%	8	51.8	9	312	4	358	7	1,531	8	480	4
Muskoka Lakes, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4,623	1	7.5%	4	57.9	7	339	4	1,447	4	2,395	9	1,092	3
Oxford, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Woodstock, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	8,256	7	11.9%	7	61.6	5	969	2	2,794	2	925	6	1,126	2
Ingersoll, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,256	7	8.6%	5	63.5	5	42	5	2,279	2	680	5	509	4
Tillsonburg, Town of	SW	LT	0.0%	8,256	7	10.1%	6	55.3	8	(1,356)	9	(933)	9	2,413	9	417	5
Blandford Blenheim, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,256	7	2.8%	1	73.8	1	440	3	1,938	3	605	5	498	4
East Zorra-Tavistock, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,256	7	4.7%	1	70.7	2	293	4	1,121	5	783	6	499	4
Norwich, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,256	7	7.5%	4	67.4	3	(403)	7	(0)	8	691	5	431	5
South-West Oxford, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,256	7	6.9%	3	71.1	2	504	3	1,094	5	583	5	439	5
Zorra, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,256	7	5.7%	2	69.5	2	(494)	7	1,123	5	1,452	8	712	3
Brantford, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	8,663	8	15.2%	9	61.1	6	583	3	2,794	2	766	5	1,099	3
Brant, County of	Central	ST	100.0%	8,663	8	6.0%	2	68.2	3	368	4	1,474	4	169	2	426	5
Bruce, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
South Bruce Peninsula, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	10.9%	6	53.7	8	(132)	6	692	6	1,035	7	406	5
Saugeen Shores, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	7.1%	3	60.7	6	(1,108)	8	1,119	5	1,773	9	248	6
Arran Elderslie, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	12.8%	8	63.7	5	702	2	3,117	1	723	5	232	6
Brockton, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	10.4%	6	67.0	3	(1,292)	9	(131)	8	2,345	9	1,679	2
Northern Bruce Peninsula, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	8.5%	5	51.1	9	(974)	8	887	5	1,017	6	290	6
Huron-Kinloss, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	4.8%	2	61.5	6	401	3	1,664	3	1,103	7	647	4
Kincardine, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	9.7%	5	61.5	6	2,575	1	12,965	1	1,814	9	4,615	1
South Bruce, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,469	2	8.8%	5	72.7	1	1,662	1	2,287	2	858	6	310	5
Dufferin, County of	Central	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Orangeville, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	6,108	1	6.6%	3	71.1	2	(4,926)	10	(2,165)	10	1,494	8	109	7



**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fisc
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Shelburne, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,108	1	15.0%	9	64.9	4	(193)	6	(975)	9	1,617	8	134	7
Mond, Town of	Central	LT	70.6%	6,108	1	4.9%	2	72.4	1	329	4	1,211	4	1,026	7	181	6
Amaranth, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,108	1	3.5%	1	73.2	1	(574)	7	155	7	794	6	124	7
East Garafraxa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,108	1	1.6%	1	73.3	1	614	3	1,768	3	991	6	272	6
Melancthon, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,108	1	9.0%	5	68.9	2	117	5	852	5	1,043	7	590	4
Mulmur, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,108	1	6.6%	3	72.5	1	(226)	6	390	7	986	6	185	6
East Luther Grand Valley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,108	1	9.0%	5	72.6	1	203	4	140	7	404	4	165	6
Elgin, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
St Thomas, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	8,368	7	15.2%	9	59.7	6	(98)	6	995	5	772	5	96	7
Aylmer, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,368	7	12.6%	7	56.6	7	(905)	8	637	6	1,501	8	328	5
Southwold, Township of	SW	LT	87.8%	8,368	7	5.9%	2	70.5	2	883	2	(530)	8	1,870	9	7	10
Bayham, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,368	7	9.9%	6	61.7	5	1,023	2	677	6	685	5	208	6
Central Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	48.0%	8,368	7	5.4%	2	66.9	3	(1,808)	9	(904)	9	1,814	9	127	7
Dutton/Dunwich, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,368	7	6.1%	2	66.5	3	177	4	(2,646)	10	1,877	9	3	10
Malahide, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,368	7	5.5%	2	67.9	3	(845)	8	(487)	8	1,425	8	4	10
West Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,368	7	13.5%	8	61.6	5	1,821	1	2,504	2	553	5	455	5
Essex, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Windsor, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	7,583	5	16.8%	9	58.7	6	(764)	7	(2,661)	10	1,785	9	579	4
LaSalle, Town of	SW	LT	19.3%	7,583	5	3.6%	1	69.5	2	486	3	875	5	1,025	7	1,725	1
Amherstburg, Town of	SW	LT	46.7%	7,583	5	7.4%	4	65.9	3	(1,210)	8	(2,825)	10	1,707	9	34	9
Essex, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,583	5	6.5%	3	64.5	4	26	5	(961)	9	3,316	10	1,007	3
Kingsville, Town of	SW	LT	48.6%	7,583	5	5.7%	2	68.2	3	2,194	1	1,197	4	919	6	39	9
Lakeshore, Town of	SW	LT	46.3%	7,583	5	7.1%	3	67.3	3	(32)	6	774	5	1,198	7	373	5
Leamington, Municipality of	SW	LT	31.0%	7,583	5	11.4%	7	63.6	5	322	4	(2,150)	10	4,776	10	342	5
Tecumseh, Town of	SW	LT	19.2%	7,583	5	4.9%	2	68.7	2	(1,669)	9	179	7	1,463	8	935	3
Pelee, Township of	SW	ST	100.0%	7,583	5	2.1%	1	-	10	(3,233)	10	(3,339)	10	1,135	7	18	9
Frontenac, County of	East	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Kingston, City of	East	ST	11.1%	6,758	2	17.1%	9	59.7	6	(308)	6	(139)	8	1,404	7	1,618	2
Central Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6,758	2	13.1%	8	48.7	9	380	3	1,699	3	389	4	337	5
Frontenac Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6,758	2	2.5%	1	67.9	3	(1,143)	8	1,994	3	454	4	1,030	3
North Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6,758	2	18.4%	10	36.7	10	(1,665)	9	725	6	281	3	529	4
South Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6,758	2	8.1%	4	65.0	4	321	4	1,311	4	383	4	391	5
Grey, County of	SW	UT		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Owen Sound, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	7,534	5	17.5%	9	54.8	8	(1,245)	8	112	7	1,615	8	2,534	1
Hanover, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,534	5	11.2%	7	61.7	5	(1,152)	8	1,330	4	1,108	7	1,101	3
The Blue Mountains, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,534	5	8.6%	5	56.4	7	(2,773)	10	623	6	1,196	7	2,120	1
Meaford, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,534	5	9.2%	5	60.0	6	(1,815)	9	(1,095)	9	286	3	186	6
Chatsworth, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,534	5	11.0%	7	63.0	5	(315)	6	390	7	157	2	15	9
Southgate, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,534	5	13.9%	8	64.9	4	(1,745)	9	(296)	8	1,415	8	142	7
Georgian Bluffs, Township of	SW	LT	92.8%	7,534	5	3.5%	1	64.8	4	291	4	723	6	210	3	58	8
Grey Highlands, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,534	5	9.8%	5	60.0	6	(180)	6	233	7	304	3	96	7
West Grey, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,534	5	7.8%	4	65.8	4	(481)	7	13	8	313	3	121	7

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fisc
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Haliburton, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Dysart et al, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3,408	1	12.3%	7	46.6	10	(488)	7	(556)	9	285	3	275	6
Minden Hills, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3,408	1	13.6%	8	50.7	9	177	4	1,233	4	28	1	10	9
Highlands East, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	3,408	1	16.7%	9	44.0	10	(829)	8	(1,492)	10	106	2	5	10
Algonquin Highlands, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3,408	1	8.4%	4	51.2	9	202	4	1,869	3	29	1	7	10
Hastings, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Belleville, City of	East	ST	16.7%	8,110	7	17.1%	9	57.6	7	680	3	319	7	1,344	7	1,063	3
Quinte West, City of	East	ST	37.0%	8,110	7	12.4%	7	58.6	7	(706)	7	926	5	518	4	669	4
Deseronto, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	19.5%	10	54.9	8	90	5	(1,103)	9	3,701	10	57	8
Bancroft, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	17.0%	9	47.4	9	(1,101)	8	(672)	9	2,923	10	327	5
Faraday, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	10.5%	6	50.9	9	640	3	842	5	2,950	10	93	7
Limerick, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	21.6%	10	40.3	10	(438)	7	(56)	8	2,399	9	367	5
Madoc, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	19.8%	10	56.9	7	(143)	6	907	5	2,506	9	83	8
Tudor and Cashel, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	19.7%	10	48.3	9	430	3	985	5	2,069	9	67	8
Tyendinaga, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	6.8%	3	65.1	4	(264)	6	(102)	8	3,096	10	97	7
Wollaston, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	14.1%	8	39.6	10	(459)	7	1,249	4	2,703	10	175	6
Centre Hastings, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	12.0%	7	57.9	7	(585)	7	443	7	2,529	10	83	8
Stirling-Rawdon, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	9.4%	5	63.0	5	(394)	7	1,144	5	2,462	9	1,697	2
Tweed, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	11.3%	7	53.2	8	978	2	1,584	3	2,215	9	383	5
Hastings Highlands, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	13.4%	8	47.0	10	(26)	5	583	6	3,181	10	103	7
Carlton/Mayo, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	11.4%	7	48.5	9	(2,982)	10	(1,256)	9	2,172	9	72	8
Marmora and Lake, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	8,110	7	18.6%	10	44.4	10	(1,377)	9	(538)	9	2,946	10	81	8
Huron, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Goderich, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	11.6%	7	60.6	6	(2,346)	10	1,378	4	2,083	9	1,900	1
Bluewater, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	6.6%	3	64.1	4	422	3	1,105	5	972	6	1,035	3
South Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	7.5%	4	63.7	5	(2,633)	10	(1,075)	9	822	6	823	3
Huron East, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	9.8%	5	68.5	2	951	2	1,690	3	151	2	1,179	2
Howick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	10.0%	6	69.1	2	(287)	6	(36)	8	168	2	361	5
Central Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	9.9%	6	63.8	5	555	3	1,201	4	169	2	473	5
Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	7.8%	4	65.9	3	1,320	1	1,318	4	232	3	558	4
Morris-Tumberry, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	7.9%	4	74.1	1	319	4	399	7	186	2	424	5
North Huron, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	6,815	2	9.0%	5	65.6	4	450	3	1,896	3	840	6	321	5
Chatham-Kent, City of	SW	ST	46.7%	8,661	8	12.6%	7	60.5	6	(2,992)	10	(2,651)	10	3,607	10	35	9
Lambton, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Sarnia, City of	SW	LT	4.3%	8,109	6	14.7%	8	57.4	7	127	5	(1,206)	9	3,123	10	310	6
Lambton Shores, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	6.3%	3	58.3	7	(1,274)	8	(1,759)	10	1,829	9	630	4
Petrolia, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	9.4%	5	60.0	6	(4,511)	10	(1,255)	9	4,774	10	58	8
Plympton-Wyoming, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	4.7%	1	64.4	4	(254)	6	250	7	1,021	7	77	8
Oil Springs, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	6.7%	3	69.2	2	911	2	2,164	2	487	4	334	5
Point Edward, Village of	SW	LT	0.0%	8,109	6	9.8%	5	51.0	9	1,392	1	3,612	1	1,406	7	98	7
Enniskillen, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	9.4%	5	72.3	1	1,170	1	4,027	1	932	6	78	8
Dawn-Euphermia, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	8.9%	5	66.7	3	49	5	9,586	1	869	6	116	7

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fisc
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Warwick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	7.1%	3	72.2	1	952	2	2,963	1	1,055	7	73	8
Brooke-Alvinston, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8,109	6	10.6%	6	68.0	3	441	3	98	7	2,000	9	243	6
St. Clair, Township of	SW	LT	45.8%	8,109	6	7.4%	4	64.6	4	978	2	1,082	5	1,673	8	101	7
Lanark, County of	East	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Smiths Falls, Separated Town of	East	ST	100.0%	7,095	4	18.4%	10	54.0	8	(785)	8	(585)	9	1,094	7	5	10
Carleton Place, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	9.4%	5	64.6	4	842	2	1,938	3	788	6	895	3
Perth, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	14.6%	8	48.4	9	(780)	7	531	6	341	3	16	9
Mississippi Mills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	5.3%	2	67.1	3	(661)	7	701	6	526	4	3	10
Beckwith, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	4.2%	1	70.6	2	239	4	365	7	176	2	3	10
Montague, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	10.7%	6	65.3	4	324	4	1,561	3	83	2	9	9
Lanark Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	10.6%	6	58.6	7	(1,290)	9	(416)	8	819	6	128	7
Drummond-North Elmsley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	4.5%	1	63.9	5	(345)	7	491	6	339	3	6	10
Tay Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,095	4	7.0%	3	63.2	5	1,117	1	1,749	3	104	2	6	10
Leeds and Grenville, United Counties of	East	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Brockville, City of	East	ST	0.0%	7,853	6	14.2%	8	52.7	8	(2,152)	9	(1,450)	10	2,804	10	1,284	2
Ganoque, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	7,853	6	14.9%	8	57.3	7	(2,801)	10	(2,336)	10	2,017	9	533	4
Prescott, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	7,853	6	22.3%	10	48.2	9	(2,530)	10	(2,360)	10	3,623	10	0	10
Westport, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	18.6%	10	55.0	8	(2,431)	10	(2,217)	10	1,644	8	43	9
Merrickville-Wolford, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	6.6%	3	64.9	4	(1,616)	9	(1,346)	9	549	4	59	8
Augusta, Township of	East	LT	90.6%	7,853	6	5.0%	2	64.3	4	374	4	641	6	550	5	156	7
Front of Yonge, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	8.6%	5	64.0	4	(331)	6	374	7	438	4	319	5
North Grenville, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	8.0%	4	66.2	3	(3,128)	10	(2,445)	10	3,168	10	679	4
Rideau Lakes, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	10.1%	6	57.1	7	(391)	7	(207)	8	616	5	67	8
Athens and Rear of Yonge and Escott, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	6.3%	3	63.9	5	164	4	459	6	525	4	30	9
Edwardsburgh/Cardinal, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	10.7%	6	58.5	7	2,029	1	3,534	1	740	5	309	6
Leeds and the Thousand Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,853	6	6.5%	3	60.1	6	561	3	994	5	683	5	29	9
Elizabethtown - Kitley, Township of	East	LT	90.8%	7,853	6	4.3%	1	66.3	3	27	5	569	6	522	4	25	9
Lennox and Addington, County of	East	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greater Napanee, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,559	5	14.1%	8	56.9	7	(1,908)	9	(325)	8	2,703	10	773	3
Addington Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,559	5	20.4%	10	39.8	10	733	2	(1,706)	10	323	3	52	8
Loyalist, Township of	East	LT	54.5%	7,559	5	10.1%	6	64.4	4	(6)	5	(285)	8	949	6	677	4
Stone Mills, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,559	5	8.4%	4	65.4	4	399	3	1,648	3	377	4	258	6
Middlesex, County of	SW	UT		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
London, City of	SW	ST	1.0%	7,211	4	16.8%	9	62.1	5	(781)	8	(706)	9	2,658	10	1,027	3
Newbury, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,211	4	8.8%	5	59.0	6	1,847	1	2,693	2	1,202	7	1,771	1
Middlesex Centre, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,211	4	4.0%	1	71.3	2	(898)	8	(169)	8	1,021	7	1,699	2
Lucan Biddulph, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,211	4	9.9%	6	73.6	1	611	3	1,513	4	721	5	708	4
Adelaide Metcalfe, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,211	4	9.9%	6	72.9	1	(1,819)	9	(2,198)	10	434	4	514	4
North Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,211	4	8.9%	5	70.6	2	(1,112)	8	(1,655)	10	1,134	7	801	3
Southwest Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,211	4	8.2%	4	68.5	2	(154)	6	1,925	3	506	4	1,069	3
Strathroy - Caradoc, Township of	SW	LT	33.0%	7,211	4	8.2%	4	66.4	3	454	3	(95)	8	949	6	502	4
Thames Centre, Municipality of	SW	LT	65.9%	7,211	4	4.3%	1	71.0	2	(342)	7	692	6	823	6	558	4

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
				Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Northumberland, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Cobourg, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	8,482	8	11.1%	7	54.9	8	(1,467)	9	764	5	3,084	10	-	10
Brighton, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	8,482	8	9.9%	6	53.6	8	(1,049)	8	486	6	106	2	726	3
Trent Hills, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	8,482	8	12.4%	7	51.5	9	(1,712)	9	317	7	54	1	297	6
Port Hope, Municipality of	Central	LT	24.9%	8,482	8	7.4%	4	61.6	5	(1,071)	8	(6)	8	118	2	999	3
Hamilton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	8,482	8	5.5%	2	64.9	4	306	4	439	7	463	4	220	6
Alnwick/Haldimand, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	8,482	8	7.0%	3	64.6	4	355	4	477	6	64	1	5	10
Cramahe, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	8,482	8	9.3%	5	59.5	6	748	2	162	7	885	6	0	10
Perth, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Stratford, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	7,425	4	8.8%	5	66.9	3	(3,012)	10	(931)	9	1,072	7	230	6
St. Marys, Town of	SW	ST	100.0%	7,425	4	7.8%	4	65.7	4	(3,184)	10	(1,547)	10	790	6	1,707	2
North Perth, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,425	4	7.1%	3	69.5	2	(1,645)	9	(1,312)	9	2,189	9	1,420	2
Perth East, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,425	4	5.5%	2	75.4	1	23	5	1,480	4	354	4	1,241	2
Perth South, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,425	4	4.6%	1	77.9	1	2,413	1	2,906	2	129	2	58	8
West Perth, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	7,425	4	7.6%	4	73.1	1	494	3	2,079	3	862	6	437	5
Peterborough, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Peterborough, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	7,373	4	17.6%	10	55.9	7	(488)	7	1,665	3	1,965	9	848	3
Asphodel-Norwood, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7,373	4	10.3%	6	60.4	6	(2,249)	9	(238)	8	155	2	105	7
North Kawartha, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7,373	4	13.7%	8	48.6	9	1,054	2	867	5	220	3	60	8
Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7,373	4	5.8%	2	66.6	3	(499)	7	687	6	216	3	-	10
Douro-Dummer, Township of	Central	LT	82.2%	7,373	4	8.9%	5	61.6	5	364	4	1,325	4	221	3	7	10
Galway-Cavendish-Harvey, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7,373	4	9.6%	5	48.9	9	926	2	1,726	3	210	3	5	10
Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7,373	4	12.0%	7	42.7	10	793	2	1,170	5	203	2	61	8
Otonabee-South Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	95.5%	7,373	4	7.7%	4	64.8	4	(1,693)	9	(632)	9	855	6	327	5
Smith-Ennismore-Lakefield, Township of	Central	LT	67.2%	7,373	4	6.6%	3	58.9	6	(92)	6	577	6	219	3	79	8
Prescott and Russell, United Counties of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Clarence-Rockland, City of	East	LT	51.3%	7,819	6	7.1%	3	72.5	1	(493)	7	(1,452)	10	1,631	8	452	5
Hawkesbury, Town of	East	LT	0.0%	7,819	6	23.4%	10	51.4	9	(1,159)	8	(1,516)	10	2,989	10	72	8
Casselton, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	7,819	6	7.3%	4	70.1	2	(3,584)	10	(2,305)	10	3,415	10	1,037	3
East Hawkesbury, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,819	6	10.7%	6	61.7	5	681	3	59	7	532	4	71	8
Russell, Township of	East	LT	31.3%	7,819	6	6.2%	3	74.8	1	(719)	7	(540)	9	1,305	7	63	8
Alfred and Plantagenet, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,819	6	10.1%	6	62.1	5	339	4	838	5	482	4	389	5
Champlain, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,819	6	11.0%	7	63.4	5	(750)	7	(210)	8	1,067	7	647	4
the Nation, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	7,819	6	7.9%	4	73.7	1	(18)	5	(2,626)	10	1,899	9	248	6
Prince Edward, County of	East	ST	100.0%	9,009	9	10.3%	6	54.9	8	(1,100)	8	(263)	8	969	6	407	5
Renfrew, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Pembroke, City of	East	ST	0.0%	7,513	5	21.4%	10	48.4	9	(1,802)	9	(547)	9	701	5	670	4
Arnprior, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	14.2%	8	56.5	7	(1,843)	9	(706)	9	2,908	10	2,355	1
Deep River, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	6.7%	3	51.2	9	(2,387)	10	(2,454)	10	862	6	1,390	2
Renfrew, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	17.5%	10	51.0	9	(527)	7	1,559	3	1,455	8	43	9
Petawawa, Town of	East	LT	26.0%	7,513	5	7.2%	3	67.1	3	784	2	464	6	963	6	276	6
Laurentian Hills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	9.8%	5	60.1	6	(99)	6	672	6	1,121	7	639	4

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fis
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Weight in Overall Composite Indicator													
				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC				FINANCIAL									
Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)					
Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile				
Head, Clara and Maria, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	11.1%	7	54.5	8	(204)	6	2,607	2	1,036	7	95	7
Horton, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	8.4%	4	73.7	1	339	4	401	7	566	5	48	8
McNab-Braeside, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	3.6%	1	65.7	4	114	5	808	5	573	5	53	8
Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	13.4%	8	43.5	10	386	3	513	6	337	3	41	9
North Algona-Wilberforce, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	8.1%	4	60.0	6	497	3	973	5	408	4	41	9
Admaston-Bromley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	6.5%	3	70.4	2	(167)	6	423	7	520	4	40	9
Laurentian Valley, Township of	East	LT	82.5%	7,513	5	8.1%	4	60.8	6	784	2	392	7	1,104	7	104	7
Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	16.1%	9	52.9	8	1,635	1	1,622	3	412	4	46	9
Madawaska Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	12.6%	7	50.6	9	(734)	7	(428)	8	999	6	38	9
Bonnechere Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	16.5%	9	53.2	8	(1,819)	9	(571)	9	586	5	30	9
Whitewater Region, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	10.8%	6	63.2	5	68	5	(108)	8	481	4	45	9
Greater Madawaska, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7,513	5	9.3%	5	56.2	7	(2,338)	10	(1,342)	9	452	4	42	9
Simcoe, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Barrie, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	6,833	3	11.2%	7	68.2	3	(262)	6	2,976	1	406	4	299	6
Orillia, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	6,833	3	13.3%	8	58.5	7	59	5	4,013	1	193	2	487	4
Collingwood, Town of	Central	LT	2.7%	6,833	3	14.2%	8	58.8	6	(930)	8	(1,481)	10	2,299	9	37	9
Midland, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	6,833	3	14.8%	8	53.7	8	(18)	5	689	6	1,447	8	36	9
Penetanguishene, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	6,833	3	15.0%	9	58.8	6	575	3	1,511	4	958	6	2,199	1
Wasaga Beach, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,833	3	10.1%	6	50.9	9	(29)	5	1,194	4	2,144	9	35	9
Innisfil, Town of	Central	LT	18.0%	6,833	3	8.0%	4	65.5	4	432	3	1,651	3	757	5	405	5
Bradford West Gwillimbury, Town of	Central	LT	23.6%	6,833	3	5.3%	2	73.7	1	(3,875)	10	(1,777)	10	612	5	1,684	2
New Tecumseth, Town of	Central	LT	29.9%	6,833	3	6.0%	2	67.1	3	492	3	646	6	666	5	825	3
Essa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,833	3	6.5%	3	71.5	2	(2,470)	10	(1,356)	10	724	5	49	8
Tiny, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,833	3	7.8%	4	57.3	7	712	2	1,247	4	123	2	54	8
Adjala-Tosoronto, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,833	3	5.4%	2	71.8	1	351	4	2,144	2	133	2	99	7
Clearview, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,833	3	5.4%	2	67.7	3	(1,070)	8	(753)	9	1,546	8	189	6
Oro-Medonte, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,833	3	5.4%	2	66.3	3	(220)	6	643	6	118	2	36	9
Ramara, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,833	3	7.6%	4	55.3	8	(535)	7	257	7	112	2	67	8
Severn, Township of	Central	LT	90.4%	6,833	3	7.2%	3	60.6	6	(1,333)	9	(124)	8	133	2	310	6
Springwater, Township of	Central	LT	60.5%	6,833	3	6.0%	2	65.6	4	(174)	6	856	5	246	3	249	6
Tay, Township of	Central	LT	42.2%	6,833	3	12.0%	7	55.7	8	(999)	8	(39)	8	889	6	35	9
Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, United Counties of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Cornwall, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	9,065	9	23.6%	10	52.7	8	674	3	2,129	2	326	3	1,642	2
North Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	9,065	9	8.0%	4	68.2	3	683	2	2,024	3	110	2	1,086	3
South Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	9,065	9	11.0%	7	58.6	7	(1,382)	9	(324)	8	140	2	724	3
North Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	9,065	9	13.7%	8	57.5	7	(214)	6	99	7	806	6	315	5
South Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	9,065	9	7.9%	4	63.5	5	1,131	1	663	6	306	3	-	10
North Stormont, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	9,065	9	9.2%	5	67.8	3	978	2	636	6	346	4	134	7
South Stormont, Township of	East	LT	77.8%	9,065	9	4.1%	1	64.0	4	(1,361)	9	(1,283)	9	148	2	213	6
Kawartha Lakes, City of	Central	ST	74.3%	7,999	6	9.9%	6	56.1	7	(93)	6	(1,354)	10	1,531	8	63	8
Wellington, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Guelph, City of	Central	ST	0.4%	6,814	2	10.3%	6	68.2	3	1,899	1	464	6	1,973	9	208	6

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fisc
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
				Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Erin, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,814	2	4.3%	1	73.6	1	(182)	6	414	7	1,560	8	524	4
Minto, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,814	2	10.5%	6	63.5	5	(2,355)	10	420	7	2,119	9	2,018	1
Puslinch, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,814	2	4.1%	1	67.6	3	(328)	6	480	6	1,554	8	625	4
Centre Wellington, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,814	2	6.2%	3	68.4	2	558	3	1,558	4	2,594	10	437	5
Guelph-Eramosa, Township of	Central	LT	64.4%	6,814	2	2.7%	1	72.0	1	1,788	1	1,813	3	1,584	8	1,309	2
Mapleton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,814	2	3.5%	1	76.0	1	(1,370)	9	(195)	8	1,270	7	506	4
Wellington North, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6,814	2	10.2%	6	64.2	4	933	2	2,578	2	1,539	8	454	5
<b>Algoma, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>
Sault Ste Marie, City of	North	ST	9.6%	9,709	10	16.7%	9	53.8	8	(957)	8	1,153	5	860	6	499	4
Elliot Lake, City of	North	ST	1.0%	9,709	10	23.4%	10	33.0	10	561	3	1,595	3	268	3	1,255	2
Blind River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	21.5%	10	51.5	9	(2,374)	10	(3,175)	10	592	5	-	10
Bruce Mines, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	13.9%	8	48.5	9	123	5	(322)	8	2,229	9	265	6
Thessalon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	17.2%	9	50.5	9	(659)	7	773	5	1,276	7	370	5
Spanish, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	21.8%	10	27.9	10	(1,063)	8	1,455	4	-	1	1,141	2
Hilton Beach, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	15.0%	9	62.1	5	(2,381)	10	(6,495)	10	2,786	10	154	7
Hilton, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	5.8%	2	46.7	10	1,328	1	3,942	1	-	1	344	5
Jocelyn, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	6.7%	3	51.0	9	864	2	2,213	2	-	1	132	7
Johnson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	18.0%	10	38.7	10	1,898	1	2,121	2	76	1	195	6
Laird, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	7.4%	4	55.2	8	1,978	1	2,710	2	-	1	1,154	2
Macdonald, Meredith and Aberdeen Add'l, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	12.8%	8	54.0	8	3,424	1	4,126	1	716	5	103	7
Wawa, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	12.0%	7	64.4	4	(1,879)	9	(3,859)	10	1,851	9	1,162	2
Plummer Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	19.4%	10	51.7	9	2,919	1	3,179	1	30	1	6	10
Prince, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	10.4%	6	62.9	5	364	4	1,189	4	79	1	174	6
St Joseph, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	6.2%	3	57.3	7	1,218	1	1,750	3	103	2	33	9
Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	3.2%	1	66.2	3	1,240	1	1,835	3	-	1	562	4
Hornepayne, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	10.8%	6	67.3	3	(1,609)	9	(77)	8	1,054	7	36	9
The North Shore, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	7.2%	3	47.5	9	1,026	2	2,664	2	-	1	1,140	2
White River, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	5.0%	2	63.9	5	(3,695)	10	(4,253)	10	4,831	10	611	4
Dubreuilville, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	4.7%	1	75.0	1	(1,282)	9	(809)	9	-	1	9	9
Huron Shores, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	9,709	10	10.1%	6	51.2	9	715	2	2,111	2	2	1	36	9
<b>Cochrane, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>
Timmins, City of	North	ST	12.2%	9,063	9	16.1%	9	56.7	7	(691)	7	(555)	9	32	1	170	6
Hearst, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	11.7%	7	64.3	4	84	5	1,923	3	78	1	-	10
Iroquois Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	12.2%	7	49.2	9	(134)	6	399	7	1,683	8	191	6
Kapuskasung, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	13.6%	8	54.3	8	(874)	8	229	7	223	3	-	10
Smooth Rock Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	8.3%	4	55.0	8	105	5	26	7	30	1	100	7
Cochrane, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	13.3%	8	56.9	7	(4,523)	10	(332)	8	1,469	8	52	8
Moosonee, Town of	North	ST			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>
Black River Matheson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	14.5%	8	47.5	9	367	4	2,583	2	23	1	76	8
Moonbeam, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	11.0%	7	44.6	10	1,228	1	1,430	4	256	3	-	10
Fauquier-Strickland, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	2.2%	1	34.2	10	955	2	(1,054)	9	3,446	10	-	10
Val Rita-Harty, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	16.2%	9	54.9	8	1,083	1	560	6	379	4	395	5

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fiscal
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators used
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a municipality
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business government

MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Weight in Overall Composite Indicator													
				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC				FINANCIAL									
Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)					
Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile				
Mattice-Val Cote, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	16.9%	9	46.5	10	(812)	8	537	6	-	1	-	10
Opasatika, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,063	9	43.8%	10	45.5	10	811	2	2,399	2	-	1	834	3
<b>Kenora, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>
Dryden, City of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	9.1%	5	62.9	5	(3,442)	10	988	5	1,453	8	-	10
Kenora, City of	North	ST	25.5%	10,945	10	9.6%	5	60.9	6	(227)	6	7,471	1	3,156	10	582	4
Sioux Lookout, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	11.4%	7	68.4	2	759	2	(5,011)	10	7,921	10	753	3
Red Lake, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	7.8%	4	69.1	2	(1,945)	9	(357)	8	1,906	9	818	3
Ignace, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	8.2%	4	52.4	8	90	5	1,447	4	-	1	270	6
Machin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	7.5%	4	63.8	5	(1,785)	9	(1,068)	9	80	1	-	10
Ear Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	14.5%	8	65.2	4	(1,118)	8	996	5	-	1	161	7
Pickle Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	12.3%	7	81.1	1	(2,583)	10	413	7	213	3	260	6
Sioux Narrows - Nestor Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	10,945	10	5.4%	2	60.8	6	155	5	4,225	1	769	5	1,104	3
<b>Manitoulin, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>
Gore Bay, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	8.9%	5	56.0	7	(3,900)	10	(1,708)	10	-	1	2,073	1
Northeastern Manitoulin and The Islands, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	22.5%	10	54.8	8	1,100	1	2,007	3	802	6	921	3
Assignack, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	9.7%	5	52.3	8	(2,319)	10	(485)	8	133	2	-	10
Barrie Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	15.1%	9	-	10	(4,496)	10	6,496	1	-	1	57	8
Billings, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	4.8%	2	57.6	7	1,431	1	1,327	4	-	1	18	9
Burpee and Mills, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	4.1%	1	64.9	4	2,372	1	4,616	1	161	2	-	10
Cockburn Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	15.1%	9	-	10	668	3	56,892	1	-	1	4	10
Gordon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	6.4%	3	67.1	3	(437)	7	3,745	1	50	1	1,466	2
Tehkummah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	12.3%	7	73.8	1	154	5	636	6	-	1	-	10
Central Manitoulin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	16.8%	9	47.9	9	(1,006)	8	(1,404)	10	92	2	115	7
<b>Nipissing, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>
North Bay, City of	North	ST	4.4%	8,597	8	18.2%	10	56.3	7	762	2	1,245	4	1,419	8	713	3
Mattawa, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	26.6%	10	42.5	10	813	2	865	5	230	3	-	10
Temagami, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	17.8%	10	59.9	6	(675)	7	(944)	9	663	5	70	8
West Nipissing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	21.2%	10	45.4	10	612	3	(1,390)	10	1,575	8	42	9
South Algonquin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	13.0%	8	48.1	9	206	4	366	7	120	2	3	10
Bonfield, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	10.2%	6	56.5	7	(7)	5	261	7	2	1	119	7
Calvin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	17.4%	9	70.2	2	34	5	1,371	4	103	2	230	6
Chisholm, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	6.1%	3	55.4	8	703	2	639	6	367	4	16	9
East Ferris, Township of	North	ST	97.6%	8,597	8	6.6%	3	64.9	4	322	4	1,192	4	2	1	61	8
Mattawan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	12.7%	8	78.9	1	1,164	1	4,716	1	1	1	49	8
Papineau-Cameron, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,597	8	19.8%	10	52.8	8	107	5	1,455	4	2	1	71	8
<b>Parry Sound, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>			<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>
Kearney, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	13.0%	8	40.0	10	(2,615)	10	(95)	8	452	4	317	5
Parry Sound, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	18.7%	10	56.4	7	(769)	7	3,445	1	1,544	8	463	5
Powassan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	9.4%	5	59.8	6	150	5	1,084	5	401	4	388	5
Burk's Falls, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	21.8%	10	52.6	8	656	3	2,535	2	265	3	43	9
South River, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	34.0%	10	33.9	10	(697)	7	1,193	4	105	2	-	10
Sundridge, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	11.3%	7	46.1	10	858	2	3,276	1	360	4	10	9

**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fisc
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
				ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Armour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	11.9%	7	52.0	9	508	3	598	6	438	4	27	9
Carling, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	4.1%	1	43.3	10	1,027	2	2,385	2	469	4	-	10
Whitestone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	13.7%	8	53.6	8	(3,311)	10	(169)	8	396	4	8	9
Callander, Municipality of	North	ST	57.9%	5,794	1	10.6%	6	63.5	5	1,022	2	589	6	1,570	8	57	8
Joly, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	10.5%	6	60.8	6	222	4	1,275	4	495	4	-	10
Machar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	6.7%	3	46.3	10	1,055	1	1,675	3	348	4	-	10
McDougall, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	4.6%	1	61.3	6	(3,475)	10	(263)	8	205	2	702	4
McKellar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	5.0%	2	57.0	7	(102)	6	2,357	2	182	2	22	9
McMurrich/Monteith, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	24.0%	10	55.7	8	227	4	1,162	5	128	2	40	9
Nipissing, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	8.3%	4	61.3	6	607	3	818	5	450	4	-	10
Perry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	11.3%	7	55.9	7	234	4	1,540	4	330	3	250	6
Ryerson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	20.5%	10	46.6	10	(1,713)	9	(427)	8	793	6	33	9
Strong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	13.9%	8	49.5	9	353	4	910	5	609	5	-	10
The Archipelago, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	4.1%	1	43.4	10	4,717	1	1,772	3	2,016	9	154	7
Magnetawan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	19.3%	10	45.0	10	515	3	1,244	4	254	3	45	9
Seguin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5,794	1	6.5%	3	61.9	5	(3,031)	10	(951)	9	1,372	7	164	6
<b>Rainy River, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Fort Frances, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	13.7%	8	58.0	7	185	4	2,625	2	1,870	9	1,753	1
Rainy River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	11.0%	7	42.2	10	725	2	1,261	4	262	3	1,280	2
Albion, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	3.1%	1	71.2	2	638	3	1,437	4	396	4	493	4
Atikokan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	11.1%	7	54.4	8	1,473	1	2,986	1	294	3	247	6
Chapple, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	9.4%	5	69.0	2	2,543	1	3,338	1	558	5	1,121	2
Emo, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	15.4%	9	55.9	7	154	5	3,587	1	260	3	1,276	2
La Vallée, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	4.7%	1	61.8	5	1,190	1	1,677	3	244	3	608	4
Morley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	4.5%	1	61.9	5	(713)	7	3,007	1	236	3	1,752	1
Dawson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	5.7%	2	53.9	8	472	3	3,676	1	266	3	1,798	1
Lake of the Woods, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,951	9	10.8%	6	50.9	9	2,661	1	4,134	1	233	3	689	4
<b>Sudbury, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Espanola, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	18.2%	10	53.6	8	(505)	7	(552)	9	2,356	9	-	10
French River, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	12.5%	7	45.7	10	427	3	824	5	269	3	-	10
Killarney, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	7,413	4	10.4%	6	48.8	9	(3,208)	10	(421)	8	135	2	497	4
Markstay-Warren, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	17.0%	9	43.8	10	(986)	8	(231)	8	580	5	537	4
St. Charles, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	13.3%	8	46.6	10	(1,247)	8	(1,392)	10	689	5	1,033	3
Baldwin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	16.0%	9	53.8	8	145	5	1,485	4	-	1	1,259	2
Chapleau, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	12.1%	7	61.6	5	(60)	6	1,653	3	1,193	7	1,400	2
Naim and Hyman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	7.1%	3	59.7	6	932	2	1,404	4	-	1	65	8
Sables Spanish Rivers, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,023	9	16.6%	9	45.5	10	1,012	2	1,608	3	104	2	1	10
<b>Thunder Bay, District of</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>D</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
Thunder Bay, City of	North	ST	5.3%	8,353	7	15.1%	9	57.6	7	(3,004)	10	(1,414)	10	4,116	10	1,723	1
Marathon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	8.6%	5	69.2	2	(1,399)	9	135	7	383	4	920	3
Greenstone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	11.8%	7	59.7	6	(1,773)	9	(1,833)	10	1,285	7	510	4
Conmee, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	2.7%	1	78.1	1	165	4	981	5	479	4	684	4



**PMFSDR Municipal Fiscal Health - Indicator Background | Municipal Fiscal Health Indicators (Economic, Financial and Composite Indicators)**

**Note:**

- The "decile" is defined on a range from 1 to 10. The first "decile" signifies relatively good fisc
- The overall composite indicator reflects the weighted average "decile" of all the indicators us
- RSCM - The Rural and Small Community Measure (RSCM) represents the proportion of a n
- ST = single tier, LT = lower tier, UT = upper tier
- Municipal position is defined as total fund balances, including equity in business governmen

				4.17%		8.33%		4.17%		4.17%		5.83%		3.33%		3.33%	
Weight in Overall Composite Indicator				Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health		Low value=Better Fiscal Health		High Value=Better Fiscal Health	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	ECONOMIC						FINANCIAL							
				Average government transfer (SA, EI, GIS, OAS etc.) expenditure per household		Low Income population as a percent of Total population		2001 Employment Rate		Change in municipal position per household (2001-2006)		Municipal position per household (2006)		Average Debt per Household (2006)		Average Discretionary Reserves per Household (2006)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Dorion, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	5.7%	2	47.9	9	485	3	1,801	3	781	5	2,483	1
Gillies, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	6.7%	3	48.1	9	(14)	5	147	7	381	4	807	3
Neebing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	5.6%	2	64.9	4	898	2	1,705	3	596	5	455	5
Nipigon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	5.2%	2	60.4	6	96	5	1,742	3	590	5	1,831	1
O'Connor, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	7.6%	4	66.1	3	(674)	7	(323)	8	943	6	224	6
Schreiber, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	5.2%	2	61.0	6	896	2	2,187	2	476	4	1,245	2
Shuniah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	6.5%	3	61.0	6	(2,948)	10	(54)	8	641	5	1,259	2
Terrace Bay, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	7.3%	4	64.9	4	242	4	3,039	1	3,279	10	2,158	1
Manitouowadge, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	10.4%	6	58.2	7	(1,220)	8	1,613	3	290	3	1,063	3
Red Rock, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	9.8%	5	55.5	8	1,586	1	8,011	1	953	6	4,203	1
Oliver Paipoonge, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	8,353	7	4.4%	1	64.4	4	295	4	865	5	770	5	483	4
Timiskaming, District of	North	D		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Timiskaming Shores, City of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	14.8%	8	60.2	6	(224)	6	154	7	154	2	246	6
Cobalt, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	24.6%	10	40.0	10	(691)	7	(606)	9	248	3	82	8
Englehart, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	16.6%	9	49.2	9	(500)	7	628	6	83	1	329	5
Kirkland Lake, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	21.9%	10	48.5	9	(2,312)	10	(1,911)	10	1,646	8	447	5
Latchford, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	29.2%	10	45.2	10	(3,122)	10	(1,062)	9	63	1	70	8
Thornloe, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	16.4%	9	38.9	10	208	4	1,191	4	470	4	99	7
Armstrong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	11.1%	7	63.0	5	(3,706)	10	(619)	9	94	2	105	7
Brethour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	16.4%	9	66.7	3	(10,742)	10	(3,505)	10	1,042	7	84	7
Casey, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	14.1%	8	60.9	6	(102)	6	2,470	2	217	3	94	7
Chamberlain, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	14.3%	8	69.6	2	(269)	6	1,892	3	768	5	120	7
Coleman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	9.1%	5	56.7	7	2,121	1	3,929	1	85	2	95	7
Evanturel, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	8.9%	5	60.7	6	1,729	1	3,532	1	221	3	117	7
Harley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	15.2%	9	70.8	2	(125)	6	2,180	2	216	3	106	7
Harris, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	6.7%	3	63.6	5	327	4	1,089	5	89	2	108	7
Hilliard, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	16.4%	9	62.2	5	(1,818)	9	176	7	656	5	89	7
Hudson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	10.2%	6	75.9	1	1,334	1	2,473	2	177	2	85	7
James, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	29.8%	10	56.0	7	384	3	2,738	2	66	1	73	8
Kerns, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	2.8%	1	72.2	1	305	4	2,112	2	705	5	133	7
Larder Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	16.5%	9	38.8	10	(1,864)	9	(867)	9	64	1	95	7
McGarry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	37.3%	10	34.4	10	15	5	1,756	3	324	3	1,117	3
Gauthier, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	16.4%	9	58.3	7	1,379	1	2,122	2	74	1	82	8
Matatchewan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	29.5%	10	29.1	10	(72)	6	1,153	5	50	1	56	8
Charlton and Dack, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	9,251	10	15.1%	9	53.2	8	(941)	8	69	7	874	6	260	6