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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	ATOR CATE	GORY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL	ROGRAM, RE, PUBLIC I, LAND	DEMOGR	APHICS	ECONO	оміс	FINAM	NCIAL	Fisca (1-Good	icator of Municipa al Health fiscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Toronto, City of	GTA	ST	0.00%	4.8	5	4.2	3	8.2	9	3.4	1	7.5	8	8.4	10	6.1	7
Durham, Region of	GTA	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Oshawa, City of	GTA	LT	1.8%	8.8	10	4.4	3	5.8	6	3.8	1	6.0	6	7.9	9	6.1	5
Pickering, City of	GTA	LT	5.2%	7.5	8	4.3	3	6.0	6	3.6	1	2.5	1	4.2	3	4.7	:
Ajax, Town of	GTA	LT	1.7%	9.0	10	2.4	1	6.5	7	3.1	1	3.0	2	4.9	5	4.8	3
Clarington, Municipality of	GTA	LT	23.4%	8.5	9	3.7	2	5.2	5	4.3	2	2.3	1	5.7	6	4.9	3
Whitby, Town of	GTA	LT	3.1%	9.0	10	2.6	1	6.0	6	3.1	1	2.3	1	4.7	4	4.6	2
Brock, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	9.3	10	4.9	5	4.5	4	7.7	9	4.3	4	4.3	4	5.8	e
Scugog, Township of	GTA	LT	100.0%	8.3	9	3.3	1	5.0	5	6.0	4	2.5	1	6.0	6	5.2	4
Uxbridge, Township of	GTA	LT	50.9%	9.0	10	3.7	2	5.8	6	5.3	3	2.3	1	5.7	6	5.3	ŧ
Haldimand, County of	Central	ST	100.0%	6.5	7	5.1	5	3.7	3	6.8	7	4.5	4	2.8	1	4.9	3
Norfolk, County of	SW	ST	76.7%	7.0	7	4.4	3	5.2	5	6.3	6	5.8	6	6.8	8	5.9	7
Halton, Region of	GTA	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Burlington, City of	GTA	LT	2.5%	5.5	6	2.7	1	4.5	4	3.5	1	3.3	2	3.9	3	3.9	1
Halton Hills, Town of	GTA	LT	18.5%	5.5	6	2.8	1	3.8	3	3.5	1	1.3	1	3.3	2	3.4	
Milton, Town of	GTA	LT	29.4%	7.5	8	3.3	1	6.2	7	2.3	1	1.3	1	4.4	4	4.1	
Oakville, Town of	GTA	LT	0.8%	6.8	7	2.0	1	5.2	5	3.0	1	3.0	2	3.7	2	3.9	
Hamilton, City of	Central	ST	7.3%	9.0	10	4.1	3	8.3	10	3.9	1	8.3	9	6.5	7	6.7	9
Niagara, Region of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		N/
Niagara Falls, City of	Central	LT	3.1%	8.8	10	5.6	6	8.5	10	4.1	2	7.5	8	5.3	5	6.6	9
Port Colborne, City of	Central	LT	16.2%	10.0	10	7.1	9	6.7	8	5.5	3	8.5	10	7.0	8	7.5	10
St. Catharines, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	9.8	10	5.4	6	7.7	9	4.3	2	8.3	9	5.2	5	6.7	9
Welland, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	9.0	10	5.6	6	6.5	7	3.9	1	8.3	9	5.8	6	6.5	8
Thorold, City of	Central	LT	7.4%	9.0	10	6.4	7	7.5	9	4.0	1	7.3	8	3.6	2	6.3	8
Fort Erie, Town of	Central	LT	22.6%	8.8	10	5.4	6	7.2	8	4.7	2	7.3	8	5.2	5	6.4	8
Grimsby, Town of	Central	LT	8.9%	9.5	10	3.2	1	6.8	8	3.8	1	4.3	4	3.6	2	5.2	4
Lincoln, Town of	Central	LT	44.3%	8.8	10	3.8	2	7.3	8	6.4	6	3.5	3	3.0	2	5.5	
Niagara-on-the-Lake, Town of	Central	LT	62.9%	9.0	10	4.1	2	8.5	10	5.9	4	3.5	3	4.9	5	6.0	7
Pelham, Town of	Central	LT	20.5%	8.8	10	3.8	2	6.7	8	4.9	2	4.3	4	7.0	8	5.9	5
Wainfleet, Township of	Central	LT	94.6%	9.8	10	5.3	5	6.5	7	6.6	6	4.0	4	5.3	5	6.2	8
West Lincoln, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.3	8	4.4	3	6.2	7	6.2	5	3.5	3	4.0	3	5.2	4
Ottawa, City of	East	ST	8.0%	5.5	6	2.8	1	7.0	8	3.4	1	5.5	6	7.9	9	5.3	
Peel, Region of	GTA	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Brampton, City of	GTA	LT	2.8%	7.5	8	1.9	1	6.2	7	3.3	1	4.3	4	3.9	3	4.5	2

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	ATOR CATE	CORV						OSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI	L COSTS ROGRAM, E, PUBLIC , LAND	DEMOGR		ECON	оміс	FINAN	ICIAL	Composite Indi Fisca (1-Good f	cator of Municipal I Health iscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Mississauga, City of	GTA	LT	0.1%	5.0	5	2.3	1	6.5	7	3.0	1	5.3	5	3.7	2	4.3	1
Caledon, Town of	GTA	LT	46.5%	5.0	5	3.1	1	5.7	6	4.3	2	1.5	1	4.2	3	3.9	1
Greater Sudbury, City of	North	ST	13.5%	7.0	7	5.9	7	9.2	10	4.1	2	8.0	9	4.2	3	6.4	8
Waterloo, Region of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Cambridge, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	7.3	8	3.2	1	6.8	8	3.3	1	4.5	4	3.2	2	4.7	3
Kitchener, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	6.5	7	3.2	1	6.3	7	2.8	1	5.5	6	3.5	2	4.6	2
Waterloo, City of	Central	LT	0.0%	8.0	9	2.9	1	6.5	7	2.6	1	4.3	4	5.0	5	4.9	3
North Dumfries, Township of	Central	LT	58.5%	4.5	4	4.7	4	6.7	8	5.4	3	1.5	1	5.7	6	4.7	3
Wellesley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6.3	7	3.1	1	5.3	5	6.2	5	3.0	2	2.4	1	4.4	2
Wilmot, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.8	8	4.2	3	5.3	5	6.1	5	1.8	1	2.7	1	4.6	2
Woolwich, Township of	Central	LT	48.4%	5.3	5	3.8	2	6.2	7	5.5	3	2.0	1	2.0	1	4.1	1
York, Region of	GTA	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Vaughan, City of	GTA	LT	2.3%	8.0	9	2.1	1	6.5	7	3.0	1	3.3	2	4.6	4	4.6	2
Aurora, Town of	GTA	LT	4.0%	7.3	8	2.5	1	4.7	4	3.3	1	2.0	1	4.7	4	4.1	1
Markham, Town of	GTA	LT	2.0%	8.0	9	1.8	1	5.8	6	2.0	1	5.3	5	3.8	3	4.4	2
Newmarket, Town of	GTA	LT	0.0%	5.8	6	2.7	1	5.0	5	3.0	1	3.5	3	6.0	6	4.3	2
Richmond Hill, Town of	GTA	LT	1.0%	8.0	9	1.9	1	5.8	6	2.0	1	5.0	5	4.3	4	4.5	2
Whitchurch-Stouffville, Town of	GTA	LT	49.7%	7.3	8	3.2	1	5.5	6	4.7	2	1.8	1	5.1	5	4.6	2
East Gwillimbury, Town of	GTA	LT	32.0%	5.8	6	3.8	2	4.2	3	4.1	2	2.5	1	6.1	7	4.4	2
Georgina, Town of	GTA	LT	29.7%	8.5	9	2.9	1	3.5	2	3.7	1	4.5	4	7.6	9	5.1	4
King, Township of	GTA	LT	48.1%	8.0	9	4.1	2	5.3	5	4.9	2	2.3	1	7.6	9	5.4	5
Muskoka, District of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Bracebridge, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	6.5	7	3.0	1	1.0	1	5.6	4	3.8	3	4.4	4	4.0	1
Gravenhurst, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	3.7	2	1.8	1	6.6	6	5.8	6	7.6	9	5.6	5
Huntsville, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	6.5	7	2.9	1	1.0	1	6.4	6	4.0	4	6.1	7	4.5	2
Georgian Bay, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.8	9	3.6	2	4.2	3	5.6	4	6.0	6	6.1	7	5.5	5
Lake of Bays, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	6.3	7	3.4	2	4.3	4	5.6	4	6.5	7	5.9	6	5.3	5
Muskoka Lakes, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.0	7	3.4	2	5.7	6	7.2	8	4.0	4	4.8	4	5.3	5
Oxford, County of	sw	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Woodstock, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	9.3	10	4.3	3	6.2	7	4.3	2	6.5	7	2.8	1	5.6	5
Ingersoll, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	4.9	5	5.2	5	6.3	6	5.5	6	3.8	2	5.5	5
Tillsonburg, Town of	SW	LT	0.0%	8.3	9	4.9	5	4.5	4	5.0	3	6.8	7	8.2	10	6.3	8
Blandford Blenheim, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	7.8	10	5.0	5	7.5	9	2.5	1	3.6	2	5.1	4
East Zorra-Tavistock, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	6.3	7	5.3	5	7.9	10	2.8	2	4.8	4	5.2	4

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

			1					COMPOS		CATOR CATE	OPV						POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	NT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PF POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL/	L COSTS Rogram, E, PUBLIC , LAND	DEMOGR		ECON	оміс	FINAN	ICIAL	Composite Indi Fisca (1-Good f	cator of Municipal I Health "iscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Norwich, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.0	6	4.5	4	4.5	4	7.4	8	4.5	4	6.6	7	5.6	5
South-West Oxford, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.3	4	6.3	7	4.0	3	7.3	8	3.8	3	4.5	4	5.0	4
Zorra, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.0	5	6.2	7	3.7	3	6.7	6	3.3	2	5.7	6	5.1	4
Brantford, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	9.0	10	3.8	2	8.7	10	3.9	1	8.0	9	3.1	2	6.1	7
Brant, County of	Central	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	3.3	1	2.8	2	6.0	5	3.8	3	3.8	3	4.2	1
Bruce, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
South Bruce Peninsula, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.0	6	4.9	5	4.3	4	6.6	6	5.5	6	6.0	7	5.6	5
Saugeen Shores, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.5	4	4.1	2	3.7	3	6.1	5	3.5	3	6.8	8	4.8	3
Arran Elderslie, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.3	4	4.9	5	3.7	3	7.1	8	5.8	6	3.1	2	4.8	3
Brockton, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	5.6	6	4.2	3	6.7	7	4.3	4	7.3	8	5.6	6
Northern Bruce Peninsula, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	4.7	4	4.2	3	6.2	5	5.3	5	6.2	7	5.4	5
Huron-Kinloss, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.5	4	4.3	3	3.0	2	7.4	8	3.0	2	4.0	3	4.4	2
Kincardine, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3	3	5.1	5	3.7	3	6.3	5	4.5	4	2.6	1	4.2	1
South Bruce, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.5	3	5.5	6	3.0	2	7.7	9	3.3	2	3.2	2	4.3	2
Dufferin, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Orangeville, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	7.5	8	3.4	2	4.2	3	3.4	1	2.3	1	9.0	10	5.0	3
Shelburne, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	9.3	10	4.4	3	4.8	4	6.8	7	5.8	6	7.7	9	6.4	8
Mono, Town of	Central	LT	70.6%	7.5	8	3.6	2	3.5	2	5.6	3	1.5	1	5.0	5	4.4	2
Amaranth, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.5	3	3.9	2	2.2	1	5.8	4	1.0	1	6.8	8	3.9	1
East Garafraxa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	3.8	2	2.3	1	6.0	4	1.0	1	4.2	3	3.8	1
Melancthon, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	3.6	2	2.8	2	5.4	3	3.3	2	5.2	5	4.3	2
Mulmur, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	3.7	2	2.8	2	5.7	4	2.0	1	6.4	7	4.4	2
East Luther Grand Valley, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	5.4	6	1.2	1	6.5	6	3.0	2	5.5	6	4.5	2
Elgin, County of	sw	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
St Thomas, City of	sw	ST	0.0%	6.8	7	4.7	4	8.8	10	3.6	1	7.8	9	5.7	6	6.2	7
Aylmer, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	8.3	9	5.8	6	5.2	5	8.3	10	7.0	8	6.7	8	6.9	9
Southwold, Township of	SW	LT	87.8%	3.5	3	6.0	7	4.5	4	5.7	4	3.3	2	7.1	8	5.0	4
Bayham, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	7.3	8	5.3	5	3.3	2	6.5	6	6.0	6	4.8	4	5.5	5
Central Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	48.0%	8.8	10	4.4	3	3.8	3	4.9	2	3.5	3	8.6	10	5.7	6
Dutton/Dunwich, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.3	7	5.1	5	2.7	1	7.9	10	3.5	3	8.3	10	5.6	6
Malahide, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.3	7	6.1	7	3.3	2	7.1	8	3.5	3	8.4	10	5.8	6
West Elgin, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.5	7	6.3	7	3.0	2	7.0	7	7.0	8	3.0	1	5.5	5
Essex, County of	sw	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Windsor, City of	SW	ST	0.0%	9.3	10	4.8	4	8.3	10	3.9	1	7.3	8	7.9	9	6.9	9

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

			1					COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	ATOR CATE	SORY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI	L COSTS ROGRAM, RE, PUBLIC I, LAND	DEMOGR		ECON	ОМІС	FINA	NCIAL	Composite Indi Fisca (1-Good	icator of Municipal al Health fiscal health fiscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
LaSalle, Town of	SW	LT	19.3%	6.3	7	3.2	1	4.5	4	3.6	1	2.3	1	4.1	3	4.0	1
Amherstburg, Town of	SW	LT	46.7%	5.8	6	3.9	2	4.3	4	5.0	3	4.0	4	9.1	10	5.3	5
Essex, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.3	4	5.3	5	4.3	4	6.6	6	3.8	3	7.0	8	5.2	4
Kingsville, Town of	SW	LT	48.6%	3.8	3	3.6	2	3.7	3	4.0	2	3.0	2	4.7	4	3.8	1
Lakeshore, Town of	SW	LT	46.3%	4.8	5	3.4	2	3.5	2	4.4	2	3.5	3	5.7	6	4.2	1
Leamington, Municipality of	SW	LT	31.0%	7.5	8	5.1	5	5.2	5	4.8	2	6.0	6	7.5	9	6.0	7
Tecumseh, Town of	SW	LT	19.2%	2.5	2	4.2	3	3.7	3	4.3	2	2.8	2	6.9	8	4.1	1
Pelee, Township of	sw	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	4.8	4	1.0	1	4.8	2	2.3	1	9.2	10	4.4	2
Frontenac, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Kingston, City of	East	ST	11.1%	8.8	10	4.8	4	8.2	9	3.7	1	6.5	7	6.1	7	6.3	8
Central Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6.0	6	4.2	3	5.3	5	6.9	7	6.8	7	3.6	2	5.5	5
Frontenac Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	1.0	1	4.2	3	2.8	2	5.1	3	1.8	1	4.5	4	3.2	1
North Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	4.6	4	4.5	4	6.0	5	8.0	9	5.8	6	6.1	7
South Frontenac, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.3	3	3.3	1	2.7	1	5.3	3	3.5	3	4.2	3	3.7	1
Grey, County of	sw	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Owen Sound, City of	SW	LT	0.0%	8.5	9	6.9	8	7.7	9	4.7	2	7.8	9	6.3	7	7.0	9
Hanover, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	4.8	4	6.5	7	6.5	6	6.0	6	5.4	5	6.1	7
The Blue Mountains, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	2.8	1	6.5	7	6.1	5	5.5	6	6.2	7	5.9	6
Meaford, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	5.6	6	4.2	3	6.0	5	5.3	5	7.2	8	6.0	7
Chatsworth, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.0	2	4.2	3	3.0	2	7.4	8	6.0	6	6.2	7	5.0	3
Southgate, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	4.6	4	3.3	2	7.0	7	6.3	7	8.1	10	5.8	6
Georgian Bluffs, Township of	SW	LT	92.8%	3.8	3	4.8	4	3.7	3	5.7	4	2.8	2	5.3	5	4.3	2
Grey Highlands, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.8	3	3.9	2	4.0	3	6.7	7	5.3	5	6.0	6	4.9	3
West Grey, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.0	5	4.2	3	4.8	4	6.5	6	4.3	4	6.6	7	5.2	4
Haliburton, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Dysart et al, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	4.7	4	3.5	2	6.2	5	6.3	7	6.7	8	5.2	4
Minden Hills, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.5	2	4.0	2	3.0	2	6.6	6	6.5	7	4.4	4	4.5	2
Highlands East, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.3	4	4.6	4	3.7	3	7.0	7	7.3	8	7.9	9	5.8	6
Algonquin Highlands, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	3.3	3	4.9	5	3.7	3	6.0	4	4.5	4	4.3	4	4.4	2
Hastings, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Belleville, City of	East	ST	16.7%	8.3	9	5.6	6	9.3	10	4.1	2	8.0	9	5.2	5	6.7	9
Quinte West, City of	East	ST	37.0%	4.8	5	6.3	7	6.8	8	5.2	3	7.0	8	5.1	5	5.9	7
Deseronto, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7.8	8	7.0	8	7.5	9	6.9	7	8.8	10	8.0	10	7.7	10
Bancroft, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	8.8	10	6.3	7	8.2	9	8.3	10	8.5	10	8.2	10	8.0	10

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	ATOR CATE	GORY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	NT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL	Rogram, E, Public , Land	DEMOGR	APHICS	ECON	ЭМІС	FINAM	ICIAL	Fisca (1-Good f	cator of Municipal I Health iscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Faraday, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.3	5	5.2	5	6.2	7	6.4	6	7.0	8	5.9	6	6.0	7
Limerick, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	7.1	9	6.8	8	6.9	7	9.3	10	7.4	8	7.6	10
Madoc, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	5.2	5	7.3	8	7.2	8	8.5	10	6.7	8	6.7	9
Tudor and Cashel, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6.3	7	6.8	8	6.7	8	5.7	4	9.0	10	5.9	6	6.7	9
Tyendinaga, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	5.1	5	5.0	5	6.1	5	4.3	4	7.7	9	5.6	6
Wollaston, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8.5	9	6.3	7	6.3	7	5.9	4	8.3	9	6.4	7	6.9	9
Centre Hastings, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	7.3	8	4.8	4	6.0	6	7.2	8	7.0	8	7.8	9	6.7	9
Stirling-Rawdon, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.0	5	5.6	6	6.8	8	6.9	7	5.5	6	5.7	6	5.9	7
Tweed, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	4.6	4	5.7	6	7.4	8	7.3	8	4.4	4	5.8	6
Hastings Highlands, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	7.3	8	4.9	5	6.5	7	7.2	8	8.3	9	6.8	8	6.8	9
Carlow/Mayo, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7.8	9	6.5	7	5.0	5	5.9	4	7.5	8	9.1	10	7.0	9
Marmora and Lake, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	6.0	6	5.4	6	6.7	8	8.3	10	9.3	10	9.0	10	7.4	10
Huron, County of	SW	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Goderich, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	9.0	10	5.0	5	5.0	5	7.5	9	5.5	6	5.9	6	6.3	8
Bluewater, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.0	6	4.6	4	4.0	3	7.3	8	3.0	2	4.3	4	4.9	3
South Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.3	5	6.9	8	4.0	3	7.2	8	3.8	3	7.5	9	5.8	6
Huron East, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.8	3	4.5	4	4.5	4	8.4	10	3.5	3	2.4	1	4.5	2
Howick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.8	5	5.2	5	2.3	1	7.3	8	4.0	4	5.7	6	4.9	3
Central Huron, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	6.1	7	3.2	2	7.4	8	4.8	5	3.6	2	5.1	4
Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.8	3	5.8	6	3.0	2	8.2	10	3.3	2	3.1	2	4.5	2
Morris-Turnberry, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	6.5	7	2.7	1	8.4	10	2.8	2	4.9	4	4.9	3
North Huron, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	8.5	9	6.0	7	4.3	4	7.7	9	4.0	4	4.0	3	5.8	6
Chatham-Kent, City of	SW	ST	46.7%	7.0	7	5.2	5	7.8	9	6.3	6	7.0	8	9.8	10	7.2	10
Lambton, County of	sw	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Sarnia, City of	SW	LT	4.3%	8.3	9	6.2	7	7.0	8	4.8	2	7.3	8	7.6	9	6.9	9
Lambton Shores, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	5.2	5	5.5	6	6.7	7	4.8	5	8.1	10	6.3	8
Petrolia, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	6.5	7	4.9	5	4.0	3	6.6	6	5.5	6	9.3	10	6.1	7
Plympton-Wyoming, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.8	2	4.8	4	3.8	3	6.6	6	3.0	2	7.0	8	4.7	2
Oil Springs, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3	3	8.0	10	3.5	2	7.0	7	3.5	3	3.0	2	4.7	3
Point Edward, Village of	SW	LT	0.0%	5.3	5	7.3	9	7.5	9	5.0	2	6.3	7	3.4	2	5.8	6
Enniskillen, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.0	2	7.8	10	4.8	4	8.5	10	4.3	4	3.4	2	5.3	5
Dawn-Euphemia, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.8	2	8.1	10	6.7	8	8.2	10	4.8	5	4.2	3	5.8	6
Warwick, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.8	2	7.4	9	5.5	5	7.8	9	3.3	2	3.9	3	5.1	4
Brooke-Alvinston, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.5	3	8.0	10	6.3	7	8.0	10	5.3	5	6.2	7	6.2	7

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPO	SITE BY INDIC		CORV						POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL	L COSTS ROGRAM, E, PUBLIC , LAND	DEMOGR		ECON	оміс	FINAM	NCIAL	Composite Indi Fisca (1-Good f	cator of Municipal I Health 'iscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
St. Clair, Township of	SW	LT	45.8%	3.3	3	7.4	9	5.2	5	5.6	3	4.5	4	5.3	5	5.2	4
Lanark, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Smiths Falls, Separated Town of	East	ST	100.0%	7.8	8	6.9	8	9.8	10	7.4	8	8.0	9	8.6	10	8.1	10
Carleton Place, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7.8	8	3.9	2	5.5	6	5.7	4	4.5	4	3.4	2	5.1	4
Perth, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	9.0	10	5.5	6	7.2	8	7.0	7	7.3	8	6.3	7	7.0	10
Mississippi Mills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	4.2	3	3.3	2	6.0	5	2.8	2	6.7	7	4.5	2
Beckwith, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.3	1	3.4	2	3.0	2	5.2	3	2.0	1	5.9	6	3.6	1
Montague, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	4.5	4	4.3	4	7.0	7	5.0	5	4.3	4	5.1	4
Lanark Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7.8	8	4.2	3	4.5	4	4.5	2	5.8	6	7.7	9	5.7	6
Drummond-North Elmsley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	3.2	1	3.2	2	5.5	3	2.8	2	6.5	7	4.2	1
Tay Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	5.4	6	4.3	4	6.4	6	3.8	3	3.7	2	4.8	3
Leeds and Grenville, United Counties of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Brockville, City of	East	ST	0.0%	7.8	8	5.6	6	8.7	10	4.6	2	7.5	8	8.2	10	7.0	10
Gananoque, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	5.8	6	6.2	7	7.8	9	7.3	8	7.3	8	8.6	10	7.2	10
Prescott, Town of	East	ST	100.0%	7.5	8	6.6	8	8.5	10	8.9	10	8.8	10	10.0	10	8.4	10
Westport, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	8.3	9	6.7	8	4.2	3	7.2	8	8.5	10	9.4	10	7.4	10
Merrickville-Wolford, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	4.9	5	4.2	3	7.0	7	4.0	4	7.8	9	5.6	5
Augusta, Township of	East	LT	90.6%	4.0	4	6.9	8	2.5	1	6.4	6	3.5	3	5.5	6	4.8	3
Front of Yonge, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.3	1	7.2	9	2.8	2	5.2	3	5.0	5	5.8	6	4.7	3
North Grenville, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	3.6	2	4.0	3	5.9	4	4.3	4	8.8	10	5.3	5
Rideau Lakes, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.5	4	4.5	4	4.0	3	6.2	5	6.3	7	7.2	8	5.4	5
Athens and Rear of Yonge and Escott, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	2.3	1	5.5	6	2.0	1	7.8	9	4.3	4	5.7	6	4.6	2
Edwardsburgh/Cardinal, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.8	3	7.0	8	3.5	2	7.2	8	6.3	7	2.8	1	5.1	4
Leeds and the Thousand Islands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.5	3	5.7	6	4.0	3	5.6	4	4.5	4	5.3	5	4.8	3
Elizabethtown - Kitley, Township of	East	LT	90.8%	3.3	3	5.7	6	3.7	3	6.8	7	2.8	2	6.0	6	4.7	3
Lennox and Addington, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Greater Napanee, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	5.6	6	7.0	8	6.4	6	7.0	8	7.7	9	6.5	8
Addington Highlands, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	5.5	6	6.3	7	6.3	5	8.8	10	6.2	7	6.8	9
Loyalist, Township of	East	LT	54.5%	7.0	7	6.7	8	5.7	6	5.0	2	5.3	5	6.1	7	5.9	7
Stone Mills, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6.5	7	5.0	5	4.5	4	5.5	3	4.3	4	3.8	3	4.9	3
Middlesex, County of	sw	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
London, City of	sw	ST	1.0%	8.3	9	3.7	2	7.5	9	3.5	1	6.8	7	7.8	9	6.2	8
Newbury, Village of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.8	5	6.2	7	5.5	6	7.2	8	5.0	5	2.6	1	5.2	4
Middlesex Centre, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.5	3	4.6	4	2.3	1	6.8	7	2.0	1	6.6	7	4.3	2

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	CATOR CATE	GORY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	NT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL	ROGRAM, RE, PUBLIC , LAND	DEMOGR	APHICS	ECON	оміс	FINA	NCIAL	Fisca (1-Good	cator of Municipal al Health fiscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Lucan Biddulph, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.3	1	5.3	5	2.0	1	7.1	8	4.3	4	4.0	3	4.1	1
Adelaide Metcalfe, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.8	5	5.4	6	2.7	1	7.8	9	4.3	4	7.4	8	5.4	5
North Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	4.8	4	2.3	1	7.5	9	4.0	4	7.5	9	5.0	4
Southwest Middlesex, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	2.5	2	6.0	7	2.0	1	7.7	9	3.5	3	4.0	3	4.3	1
Strathroy - Caradoc, Township of	SW	LT	33.0%	6.8	7	4.8	4	3.8	3	5.5	3	3.8	3	5.6	6	5.0	4
Thames Centre, Municipality of	SW	LT	65.9%	3.0	2	4.6	4	1.8	1	5.7	4	2.0	1	5.9	6	3.8	1
Northumberland, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Cobourg, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	9.8	10	4.4	3	7.0	8	4.5	2	7.5	8	8.0	10	6.9	9
Brighton, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.3	8	4.8	4	4.3	4	6.3	5	7.0	8	5.1	5	5.8	6
Trent Hills, Municipality of	Central	LT	100.0%	8.8	10	5.7	6	5.5	6	7.0	7	7.8	9	6.1	7	6.8	9
Port Hope, Municipality of	Central	LT	24.9%	8.8	10	5.1	5	6.5	7	4.2	2	5.3	5	5.8	6	5.9	7
Hamilton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.8	8	4.2	3	4.0	3	5.8	4	4.0	4	5.5	6	5.2	4
Alnwick/Haldimand, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	4.0	2	5.0	5	6.0	5	4.5	4	5.3	5	5.4	5
Cramahe, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	9.0	10	4.8	4	4.7	4	6.7	6	6.0	6	6.2	7	6.2	8
Perth, County of	sw	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Stratford, City of	sw	ST	0.0%	7.5	8	4.2	3	7.2	8	4.3	2	4.3	4	8.3	10	5.9	7
St. Marys, Town of	sw	ST	100.0%	7.5	8	5.6	6	3.3	2	7.6	9	4.0	4	7.6	9	5.9	7
North Perth, Town of	SW	LT	100.0%	3.3	3	4.8	4	3.5	2	7.7	9	3.0	2	7.6	9	5.0	4
Perth East, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	1.3	1	4.8	4	3.2	2	7.6	9	2.3	1	3.9	3	3.8	1
Perth South, Township of	SW	LT	100.0%	1.5	1	5.7	6	3.5	2	7.3	8	1.8	1	3.0	1	3.8	1
West Perth, Municipality of	SW	LT	100.0%	1.5	1	4.3	3	2.8	2	7.6	9	3.3	2	4.0	3	3.9	1
Peterborough, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Peterborough, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	9.0	10	4.3	3	8.5	10	4.3	2	7.8	9	5.2	5	6.5	8
Asphodel-Norwood, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.3	5	5.7	6	3.3	2	6.3	6	5.5	6	6.9	8	5.5	5
North Kawartha, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.8	9	4.2	3	4.7	4	5.6	4	7.3	8	4.5	4	5.7	6
Cavan-Millbrook-North Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	2.8	2	4.3	3	2.8	2	5.5	3	2.8	2	6.5	7	4.1	1
Douro-Dummer, Township of	Central	LT	82.2%	4.0	4	4.2	3	2.3	1	5.8	4	4.8	5	5.0	5	4.3	2
Galway-Cavendish-Harvey, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.8	9	3.3	1	4.3	4	5.4	3	5.8	6	4.2	3	5.1	4
Havelock-Belmont-Methuen, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.5	4	5.2	5	3.3	2	6.5	6	7.0	8	4.3	4	5.1	4
Otonabee-South Monaghan, Township of	Central	LT	95.5%	2.8	2	5.2	5	2.5	1	5.5	3	4.0	4	7.6	9	4.6	2
Smith-Ennismore-Lakefield, Township of	Central	LT	67.2%	3.3	3	3.3	1	2.5	1	4.8	2	4.0	4	5.8	6	3.9	1
Prescott and Russell, United Counties of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Clarence-Rockland, City of	East	LT	51.3%	5.0	5	2.9	1	5.5	5	4.0	2	3.3	2	7.9	9	4.8	3
Hawkesbury, Town of	East	LT	0.0%	9.0	10	5.3	5	8.5	10	4.0	1	8.8	10	9.1	10	7.4	10

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMBO			CORV						
						-		COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	ATOR CATE	JURY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL	Rogram, E, Public , Land	DEMOGR	APHICS	ECON	оміс	FINAN	NCIAL	Fisca (1-Good f	cator of Municipal Il Health fiscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Casselman, Village of	East	LT	100.0%	6.5	7	4.3	3	7.2	8	4.6	2	4.0	4	8.6	10	5.9	7
East Hawkesbury, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.5	4	6.4	7	6.0	6	6.3	5	5.8	6	5.6	6	5.8	6
Russell, Township of	East	LT	31.3%	5.8	6	2.9	1	5.8	6	4.1	2	3.3	2	7.9	9	4.9	3
Alfred and Plantagenet, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.0	5	4.2	3	6.3	7	6.3	6	5.8	6	4.6	4	5.4	5
Champlain, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	5.1	5	5.5	5	6.1	5	6.3	7	6.8	8	5.6	6
the Nation, Municipality of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	4.0	2	5.8	6	6.3	6	3.8	3	7.8	9	5.5	5
Prince Edward, County of	East	ST	100.0%	6.0	6	4.0	2	5.2	5	6.8	7	7.3	8	7.0	8	6.0	7
Renfrew, County of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Pembroke, City of	East	ST	0.0%	9.3	10	6.7	8	10.0	10	4.9	2	8.5	10	7.2	8	7.8	10
Arnprior, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	8.3	9	5.6	6	6.7	8	7.0	7	7.0	8	7.6	9	7.0	10
Deep River, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	4.8	5	7.2	9	5.5	6	7.6	9	5.0	5	7.6	9	6.3	8
Renfrew, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	5.2	5	6.7	8	8.2	10	8.5	10	6.2	7	7.0	10
Petawawa, Town of	East	LT	26.0%	1.8	1	7.1	9	2.0	1	5.1	3	3.5	3	5.0	5	4.1	1
Laurentian Hills, Town of	East	LT	100.0%	4.3	4	7.9	10	6.0	6	5.8	4	5.3	5	5.8	6	5.8	6
Head, Clara and Maria, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.0	2	7.5	9	5.5	6	7.0	7	6.8	7	5.0	5	5.8	6
Horton, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.8	5	7.5	9	4.3	4	5.0	3	3.5	3	6.1	7	5.2	4
McNab-Braeside, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.5	3	6.7	8	3.7	3	6.0	4	2.8	2	5.6	6	4.7	3
Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.8	3	6.9	8	4.7	4	7.2	8	7.8	9	5.3	5	5.9	7
North Algona-Wilberforce, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	4.6	4	4.8	4	6.2	5	4.8	5	5.1	5	5.2	4
Admaston-Bromley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	3.0	2	6.9	8	5.5	6	7.4	8	3.3	2	6.6	7	5.4	5
Laurentian Valley, Township of	East	LT	82.5%	3.0	2	5.5	6	4.8	4	5.7	4	4.8	5	5.8	6	4.9	3
Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	9.0	10	5.3	5	4.7	4	6.9	7	7.8	9	3.9	3	6.2	8
Madawaska Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7.8	8	5.2	5	4.8	4	8.3	10	7.0	8	7.6	9	6.8	9
Bonnechere Valley, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	5.3	5	4.8	4	6.6	6	7.8	9	8.2	10	6.7	9
Whitewater Region, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	6.6	8	4.3	4	7.3	8	5.5	6	6.7	8	5.7	6
Greater Madawaska, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	6.3	7	7.4	9	5.2	5	5.8	4	5.5	6	8.3	10	6.4	8
Simcoe, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Barrie, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	8.8	10	2.5	1	7.0	8	3.3	1	5.0	5	3.9	3	5.1	4
Orillia, City of	Central	ST	0.0%	8.8	10	4.4	3	7.3	8	3.9	1	6.5	7	2.8	1	5.6	6
Collingwood, Town of	Central	LT	2.7%	8.5	9	3.3	1	4.7	4	3.7	1	6.3	7	9.1	10	5.9	7
Midland, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	9.0	10	5.1	5	5.2	5	5.0	2	6.8	7	6.8	8	6.3	8
Penetanguishene, Town of	Central	LT	0.0%	9.0	10	4.6	4	4.3	4	3.8	1	6.8	7	3.6	2	5.3	5
Wasaga Beach, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	3.2	1	4.3	4	6.3	5	6.0	6	6.3	7	5.7	6
Innisfil, Town of	Central	LT	18.0%	6.8	7	4.6	4	4.5	4	4.0	1	3.8	3	3.8	3	4.6	2

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	CATOR CATE	GORY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL	ROGRAM, E, PUBLIC , LAND	DEMOGR	APHICS	ECON	ОМІС	FINAN	NCIAL	Fisca (1-Good	cator of Municipal Il Health fiscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Bradford West Gwillimbury, Town of	Central	LT	23.6%	6.8	7	3.4	2	4.5	4	3.5	1	2.0	1	7.4	8	4.6	2
New Tecumseth, Town of	Central	LT	29.9%	4.3	4	4.2	3	2.8	2	4.7	2	2.5	1	4.5	4	3.8	1
Essa, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	1.8	1	5.7	6	1.7	1	6.2	5	2.8	2	8.6	10	4.4	2
Tiny, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	3.8	2	3.8	3	5.3	3	4.5	4	3.9	3	4.2	1
Adjala-Tosorontio, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	1.8	1	4.3	3	2.3	1	5.2	3	2.0	1	3.5	2	3.2	1
Clearview, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.0	5	4.4	3	3.0	2	6.8	7	2.5	1	8.0	9	4.9	3
Oro-Medonte, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	4.0	4	3.8	2	2.2	1	5.5	3	2.5	1	5.8	6	4.0	1
Ramara, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	4.7	4	2.2	1	6.2	5	4.8	5	6.2	7	5.0	3
Severn, Township of	Central	LT	90.4%	4.0	4	4.5	4	2.3	1	6.0	4	3.8	3	6.7	8	4.5	2
Springwater, Township of	Central	LT	60.5%	4.3	4	3.0	1	3.5	2	5.2	3	2.8	2	5.1	5	4.0	1
Tay, Township of	Central	LT	42.2%	6.0	6	5.0	5	2.7	1	4.7	2	6.3	7	7.8	9	5.4	5
Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, United Counties of	East	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Cornwall, City of	East	ST	0.0%	8.5	9	7.5	9	10.0	10	5.0	3	9.3	10	2.5	1	7.1	10
North Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.8	6	7.1	9	5.7	6	7.0	7	5.0	5	2.6	1	5.5	5
South Dundas, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	7.5	9	5.3	5	7.7	9	7.5	8	6.1	7	7.0	10
North Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	5.5	6	5.9	7	5.0	5	7.5	9	8.0	9	6.2	7	6.3	8
South Glengarry, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	7.0	7	6.4	7	6.2	7	6.3	6	5.5	6	5.0	5	6.1	7
North Stormont, Township of	East	LT	100.0%	4.8	5	4.8	4	4.8	5	6.7	7	5.5	6	4.8	4	5.2	4
South Stormont, Township of	East	LT	77.8%	4.8	5	7.1	9	5.3	5	6.2	5	3.8	3	7.0	8	5.7	6
Kawartha Lakes, City of	Central	ST	74.3%	6.3	7	4.1	3	4.2	3	5.6	4	6.3	7	8.2	10	5.8	6
Wellington, County of	Central	UT			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Guelph, City of	Central	ST	0.4%	7.3	8	3.3	1	6.8	8	3.0	1	4.3	4	5.4	5	5.0	4
Erin, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	3.7	2	2.7	1	6.3	6	1.3	1	6.4	7	4.6	2
Minto, Town of	Central	LT	100.0%	8.0	9	4.8	4	3.0	2	7.7	9	4.8	5	7.0	8	5.9	6
Puslinch, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	8.3	9	4.1	2	5.0	5	5.6	4	1.8	1	6.0	7	5.1	4
Centre Wellington, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.5	8	4.1	2	1.8	1	6.0	5	2.5	1	5.2	5	4.5	2
Guelph-Eramosa, Township of	Central	LT	64.4%	8.0	9	3.5	2	3.0	2	5.3	3	1.3	1	3.3	2	4.1	1
Mapleton, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.0	7	4.6	4	2.2	1	6.0	4	1.3	1	7.3	8	4.7	3
Wellington North, Township of	Central	LT	100.0%	7.8	8	5.3	5	1.8	1	8.2	10	4.5	4	3.8	3	5.2	4
Algoma, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Sault Ste Marie, City of	North	ST	9.6%	7.8	8	7.3	9	9.0	10	4.6	2	9.0	10	5.8	6	7.2	10
Elliot Lake, City of	North	ST	1.0%	10.0	10	7.6	9	7.7	9	5.1	3	10.0	10	2.8	1	7.2	10
Blind River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	6.5	7	7.0	8	8.3	10	6.8	7	9.8	10	9.0	10	7.9	10
Bruce Mines, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	9.8	10	7.4	9	9.2	10	9.0	10	8.8	10	7.1	8	8.5	10

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

			1					COMPO	SITE BY INDIC		CORV						POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL P	L COSTS ROGRAM, RE, PUBLIC I, LAND	DEMOGR		ECON	оміс	FINAN	NCIAL	Composite Indi Fisca (1-Good f	cator of Municipal I Health iscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Thessalon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	6.1	7	8.8	10	7.8	9	9.3	10	5.9	6	6.9	9
Spanish, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	6.0	6	6.9	8	8.5	10	8.5	10	10.0	10	4.0	3	7.3	10
Hilton Beach, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	9.5	10	7.6	10	8.7	10	7.8	9	8.3	9	9.4	10	8.5	10
Hilton, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5	2	6.9	8	8.8	10	7.5	9	6.0	6	1.8	1	5.6	5
Jocelyn, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	6.7	8	7.7	9	7.5	9	6.3	7	2.8	1	5.7	6
Johnson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	9.0	10	6.7	8	8.7	10	6.8	7	10.0	10	2.4	1	7.3	10
Laird, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3	1	6.5	7	7.3	8	4.8	2	6.5	7	1.6	1	4.8	3
Macdonald, Meredith and Aberdeen Add'l, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.3	5	6.1	7	7.8	9	5.1	3	8.5	10	3.0	2	6.0	7
Wawa, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	6.3	7	7.8	10	9.8	10	6.7	7	7.0	8	8.0	9	7.6	10
Plummer Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8.5	9	7.4	9	7.2	8	8.8	10	9.8	10	2.8	1	7.4	10
Prince, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0	2	6.6	8	7.5	9	6.0	5	6.8	7	3.8	3	5.6	6
St Joseph, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0	2	5.6	6	7.2	8	9.5	10	5.8	6	3.5	2	5.8	6
Tarbutt and Tarbutt Additional, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5	3	5.7	6	7.5	9	8.0	10	3.8	3	2.3	1	5.1	4
Hornepayne, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.8	5	7.4	9	7.3	8	8.0	10	6.3	7	8.3	10	7.0	9
The North Shore, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	7.6	10	9.3	10	6.9	7	6.3	7	1.8	1	5.9	7
White River, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	7.8	10	8.7	10	6.0	4	4.8	5	8.8	10	6.7	9
Dubreuilville, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	5.2	5	7.8	9	7.5	9	3.3	2	7.4	8	5.9	6
Huron Shores, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	4.8	5	7.2	9	7.8	9	7.5	9	7.8	9	3.2	2	6.4	8
Cochrane, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Timmins, City of	North	ST	12.2%	7.8	8	6.8	8	9.0	10	4.9	2	8.5	10	6.3	7	7.2	10
Hearst, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0	2	6.9	8	8.7	10	6.1	5	6.8	7	4.5	4	6.0	7
Iroquois Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	8.4	10	8.3	10	7.8	9	8.0	9	6.8	8	7.2	10
Kapuskasing, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	8.0	10	7.5	9	7.0	7	8.3	9	7.1	8	7.2	10
Smooth Rock Falls, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	8.0	10	7.5	9	7.5	9	6.3	7	5.3	5	6.3	8
Cochrane, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	8.2	10	7.5	9	6.6	6	8.0	9	8.5	10	7.0	10
Moosonee, Town of	North	ST			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Black River Matheson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8	2	8.4	10	7.8	9	8.5	10	8.5	10	3.5	2	6.6	9
Moonbeam, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0	2	7.6	9	6.5	7	5.4	3	8.3	9	4.3	4	5.8	6
Fauquier-Strickland, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0	1	8.1	10	6.8	8	7.5	9	5.3	5	7.7	9	6.2	8
Val Rita-Harty, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3	1	7.3	9	7.2	8	7.8	9	8.8	10	4.2	3	6.2	8
Mattice-Val Cote, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0	2	6.5	7	8.2	9	6.0	5	9.3	10	6.3	7	6.5	8
Opasatika, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	6.8	8	9.3	10	7.8	9	9.8	10	2.0	1	6.6	9
Kenora, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Dryden, City of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	6.3	7	7.8	9	7.1	8	6.3	7	7.9	9	6.5	8

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPO	SITE BY INDIC	ATOR CATE	GORY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	Y TAXES	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PI POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL	ROGRAM, RE, PUBLIC , LAND	DEMOGR	APHICS	ECON	оміс	FINAM	ICIAL	Fisca (1-Good	cator of Municipal I Health ïscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Kenora, City of	North	ST	25.5%	4.5	4	6.0	7	7.7	9	5.7	4	6.5	7	4.7	4	5.8	6
Sioux Lookout, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	6.8	7	5.2	5	8.0	9	7.3	8	6.5	7	6.6	7	6.7	9
Red Lake, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	7.3	9	7.0	8	5.5	3	5.0	5	7.5	9	6.3	8
Ignace, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	7.6	9	6.3	7	7.4	8	6.5	7	4.1	3	6.2	8
Machin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0	1	7.6	9	6.2	7	8.2	10	5.8	6	7.6	9	6.2	8
Ear Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	6.3	7	7.5	9	7.0	8	7.3	8	7.5	8	5.4	5	6.8	9
Pickle Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7.8	8	5.4	5	7.5	9	5.9	4	6.3	7	6.8	8	6.6	9
Sioux Narrows - Nestor Falls, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7.8	9	4.2	3	6.5	7	5.6	4	5.0	5	3.2	2	5.4	5
Manitoulin, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Gore Bay, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	6.4	7	6.2	7	6.6	6	5.3	5	6.4	7	5.8	6
Northeastern Manitoulin and The Islands, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	6.0	6	5.3	5	7.5	9	6.0	4	8.0	9	3.1	2	6.0	7
Assiginack, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7.0	7	6.4	7	7.5	9	7.7	9	5.5	6	7.7	9	7.0	9
Barrie Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5	3	8.0	10	5.8	6	7.4	8	7.3	8	4.7	4	6.1	7
Billings, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8	2	5.9	7	7.0	8	7.5	9	3.8	3	3.7	2	5.1	4
Burpee and Mills, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3	1	7.1	9	6.5	7	8.1	10	2.5	1	3.0	2	4.9	3
Cockburn Island, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	0.0	1	7.8	10	3.5	2	9.5	10	7.3	8	3.3	2	5.2	4
Gordon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	5.9	7	5.5	5	8.4	10	3.3	2	2.7	1	4.5	2
Tehkummah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8.5	9	7.5	9	7.0	8	6.7	6	4.8	5	5.6	6	6.7	9
Central Manitoulin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8.5	9	5.9	7	6.7	8	6.8	7	7.8	9	7.3	8	7.2	10
Nipissing, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
North Bay, City of	North	ST	4.4%	8.3	9	6.3	7	9.5	10	3.9	1	8.8	10	4.1	3	6.8	9
Mattawa, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	8.3	9	7.2	9	8.0	9	8.4	10	9.5	10	4.9	4	7.7	10
Temagami, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	6.6	8	7.7	9	6.2	5	8.5	10	7.5	9	6.7	9
West Nipissing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	7.3	8	5.5	6	8.0	9	6.6	6	9.5	10	7.7	9	7.4	10
South Algonquin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.3	1	6.4	7	6.5	7	7.0	7	8.3	9	5.9	6	6.0	7
Bonfield, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8	2	7.3	9	5.7	6	7.3	8	6.8	7	5.3	5	5.8	6
Calvin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.3	4	8.0	10	9.3	10	6.1	5	7.0	8	4.3	4	6.5	8
Chisholm, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7.0	7	5.3	5	5.8	6	6.3	5	5.5	6	5.2	5	5.8	6
East Ferris, Township of	North	ST	97.6%	2.5	2	5.2	5	5.2	5	6.3	5	4.5	4	4.2	3	4.6	2
Mattawan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8.8	10	8.4	10	9.5	10	7.9	9	6.3	7	2.4	1	7.2	10
Papineau-Cameron, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5	3	7.0	8	8.2	9	5.5	3	9.0	10	4.5	4	6.3	8
Parry Sound, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Kearney, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	7.8	9	4.0	2	3.8	3	6.0	5	6.8	7	7.1	8	5.9	7
Parry Sound, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	6.0	6	5.6	6	5.2	5	7.6	9	7.0	8	4.7	4	6.0	7

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

								COMPOS	SITE BY INDIC	ATOR CATE	GORY					OVERALL COM	POSITE INDICATOR
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERT	-	ASSESSME	INT BASE	MUNICIPA (SOCIAL PF POLICE, FIR HEALTH AMBUL/	L COSTS Rogram, E, PUBLIC , LAND	DEMOGR	APHICS	ECON	ОМІС	FINAM	NCIAL	Composite Indi Fisca (1-Good	icator of Municipal al Health fiscal health iscal health)
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Powassan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	7.2	9	2.5	1	7.0	7	4.3	4	4.8	4	4.8	3
Burk's Falls, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	7.3	8	7.1	9	4.8	5	8.8	10	7.3	8	3.9	3	6.5	8
South River, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	7.5	8	6.7	8	4.2	3	7.0	7	7.8	9	5.6	6	6.4	8
Sundridge, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	7.0	7	6.0	7	4.3	4	7.6	9	6.3	7	3.5	2	5.8	6
Armour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.8	5	5.8	6	2.8	2	6.8	7	6.0	6	5.5	6	5.3	5
Carling, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5	2	4.8	4	5.0	5	5.9	4	3.3	2	4.0	3	4.2	1
Whitestone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	4.3	3	3.5	2	6.0	4	6.3	7	7.9	9	4.8	3
Callander, Municipality of	North	ST	57.9%	5.0	5	3.5	2	2.5	1	4.5	2	4.5	4	5.8	6	4.3	1
Joly, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	8.8	10	5.9	7	1.5	1	6.6	6	4.8	5	5.2	5	5.5	5
Machar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	6.3	7	1.8	1	6.2	5	4.3	4	4.1	3	4.4	2
McDougall, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5	2	5.5	6	2.5	1	6.0	5	2.3	1	6.5	7	4.2	1
McKellar, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	4.4	3	3.8	3	5.5	3	3.0	2	4.4	4	4.2	1
McMurrich/Monteith, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	5.9	7	3.7	3	6.0	5	7.3	8	5.0	5	5.2	4
Nipissing, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5	2	4.2	3	1.7	1	5.6	4	3.8	3	5.3	5	3.8	1
Perry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8	1	5.6	6	1.7	1	7.5	9	5.5	6	4.2	3	4.4	2
Ryerson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7.3	8	5.7	6	3.2	2	5.9	4	7.8	9	8.1	10	6.3	8
Strong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.8	6	6.7	8	2.0	1	9.4	10	6.5	7	5.8	6	6.0	7
The Archipelago, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	7.8	9	5.8	6	4.7	4	6.2	5	3.3	2	4.5	4	5.4	5
Magnetawan, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	3.9	2	3.5	2	5.5	3	7.8	9	4.6	4	4.9	3
Seguin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	3.8	2	4.8	5	5.7	4	3.0	2	8.3	10	4.8	3
Rainy River, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Fort Frances, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	6.3	7	6.9	8	8.2	9	7.8	9	8.0	9	3.7	2	6.8	9
Rainy River, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8	2	7.5	9	6.8	8	9.5	10	8.3	9	2.9	1	6.3	8
Alberton, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.3	1	5.7	6	6.3	7	6.4	6	3.3	2	3.8	2	4.4	2
Atikokan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	5.6	6	8.3	10	7.5	9	7.8	9	2.4	1	6.2	7
Chapple, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.5	1	7.6	9	9.2	10	7.8	9	5.3	5	2.0	1	5.5	5
Emo, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.8	6	6.5	7	6.3	7	8.6	10	8.5	10	2.6	1	6.4	8
La Vallee, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8	1	6.8	8	6.0	6	7.1	8	4.0	4	2.7	1	4.7	3
Morley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5	2	6.4	7	6.7	8	8.5	10	4.0	4	2.9	1	5.2	4
Dawson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.5	1	8.0	10	5.3	5	8.4	10	5.3	5	1.9	1	5.1	4
Lake of the Woods, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.3	1	6.8	8	6.2	7	7.6	9	7.5	8	2.0	1	5.2	4
Sudbury, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Espanola, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	7.8	8	8.0	10	8.3	10	6.9	7	9.3	10	8.7	10	8.1	10
French River, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	6.0	6	5.6	6	6.3	7	7.1	8	8.3	9	5.1	5	6.4	8

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

		COMPOSITE BY INDICATOR CATEGORY												OVERALL COMPOSITE INDICATOR			
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAXES		ASSESSMENT BASE		MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM,		DEMOGRAPHICS		ECONOMIC		FINANCIAL		Composite Indicator of Municipal Fiscal Health (1-Good fiscal health 10-Poor fiscal health)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Killarney, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	5.8	6	6.9	8	6.8	8	6.2	5	6.3	7	6.5	7	6.4	8
Markstay-Warren, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	5.0	5	7.2	9	6.8	8	6.1	5	9.3	10	6.6	7	6.8	9
St. Charles, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	4.5	4	6.9	8	6.5	7	7.6	9	8.8	10	7.1	8	6.9	9
Baldwin, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.5	4	7.5	9	7.0	8	7.0	7	8.8	10	3.3	2	6.3	8
Chapleau, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	6.9	8	5.8	6	7.0	7	7.0	8	4.4	4	5.8	6
Nairn and Hyman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.0	2	8.3	10	8.3	10	5.5	3	5.3	5	3.7	2	5.7	6
Sables Spanish Rivers, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5	3	7.0	8	6.2	7	7.2	8	9.3	10	4.0	3	6.2	7
Thunder Bay, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Thunder Bay, City of	North	ST	5.3%	7.8	8	6.1	7	9.0	10	4.6	2	8.0	9	8.2	10	7.3	10
Marathon, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	7.6	10	5.8	6	6.2	5	4.8	5	6.1	7	5.6	6
Greenstone, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	4.5	4	4.2	3	8.2	9	6.4	6	6.8	7	8.0	9	6.3	8
Conmee, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.8	3	6.2	7	5.5	6	7.3	8	2.5	1	4.4	4	4.9	3
Dorion, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.8	5	8.5	10	8.7	10	5.9	4	5.0	5	3.0	2	6.0	7
Gillies, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0	1	6.8	8	4.8	4	5.5	3	5.5	6	5.1	5	4.9	3
Neebing, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	1.3	1	4.5	4	5.5	6	4.3	2	3.8	3	3.6	2	3.8	1
Nipigon, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	7.6	9	7.0	8	7.7	9	4.3	4	3.5	2	5.9	7
O'Connor, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.3	1	6.0	7	5.0	5	5.8	4	4.5	4	7.0	8	4.9	3
Schreiber, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	7.1	9	4.5	4	7.4	8	4.3	4	2.4	1	5.2	4
Shuniah, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8	2	6.4	7	6.8	8	5.1	3	4.8	5	6.7	8	5.4	5
Terrace Bay, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	7.8	10	8.0	9	6.7	6	4.8	5	3.6	2	5.7	6
Manitouwadge, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	7.7	10	5.5	6	6.2	5	6.5	7	4.3	4	5.6	5
Red Rock, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	8.1	10	9.2	10	7.9	10	6.3	7	2.0	1	6.2	8
Oliver Paipoonge, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.0	1	5.0	5	6.3	7	7.0	7	3.3	2	4.6	4	4.7	3
Timiskaming, District of	North	D			NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA
Temiskaming Shores, City of	North	ST	100.0%	4.8	5	6.8	8	8.5	10	6.9	7	8.0	9	5.6	6	6.8	9
Cobalt, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	7.9	10	7.8	9	6.8	7	10.0	10	7.1	8	7.3	10
Englehart, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.3	3	7.6	10	7.8	9	8.0	10	9.3	10	5.1	5	6.8	9
Kirkland Lake, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	7.0	7	7.7	10	9.0	10	7.3	8	9.8	10	8.6	10	8.2	10
Latchford, Town of	North	ST	100.0%	3.5	3	3.9	2	6.3	7	5.7	4	10.0	10	7.5	9	6.1	7
Thornloe, Village of	North	ST	100.0%	5.0	5	7.8	10	7.2	8	7.2	8	9.5	10	4.6	4	6.9	9
Armstrong, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8	1	8.0	10	6.7	7	8.0	10	7.3	8	7.5	9	6.5	8
Brethour, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	9.7	10	5.3	5	8.5	10	7.8	9	8.8	10	6.8	9
Casey, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	8.7	10	6.5	7	7.5	9	8.0	9	4.2	3	6.0	7
Chamberlain, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	8.3	10	6.2	7	8.0	10	7.0	8	5.0	5	5.9	7

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.

-Composite indicator calculated by taking all individual indicators each weighted and then dividing by the sum of all indicator weights.

-All categories are equally weighted.

-For each composite indicator, a lower composite value for each category signifies relatively good fiscal health whereas a higher composite value signifies relatively poor 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.

					COMPOSITE BY INDICATOR CATEGORY											OVERALL COMPOSITE INDICATOR	
MUNICIPALITY	Region	tier	RSCM (%)	PROPERTY TAXES		ASSESSMENT BASE		MUNICIPAL COSTS (SOCIAL PROGRAM, POLICE, FIRE, PUBLIC HEALTH, LAND AMBULANCE)		DEMOGRAPHICS		ECONOMIC		FINANCIAL		Composite Indicator of Municipal Fiscal Health (1-Good fiscal health 10-Poor fiscal health)	
				Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile	Value	Decile
Coleman, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	2.5	2	7.8	10	5.8	6	7.0	7	6.8	7	2.4	1	5.4	5
Evanturel, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	8.0	10	6.0	6	8.0	10	6.5	7	2.6	1	5.4	5
Harley, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	6.8	8	7.0	8	5.8	4	7.5	8	4.2	3	5.4	5
Harris, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	7.1	9	4.8	5	6.3	6	5.3	5	4.6	4	4.8	3
Hilliard, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.8	1	9.4	10	5.7	6	8.2	10	8.3	9	7.1	8	6.7	9
Hudson, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	6.6	8	4.8	5	9.2	10	5.8	6	2.8	1	5.0	4
James, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.8	5	5.9	7	7.7	9	7.2	8	9.3	10	3.3	2	6.3	8
Kerns, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	1.0	1	7.6	9	6.5	7	8.7	10	3.3	2	4.1	3	5.2	4
Larder Lake, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	5.5	6	6.8	8	8.5	10	7.0	7	9.5	10	7.0	8	7.4	10
McGarry, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	10.0	10	7.1	9	8.8	10	7.2	8	10.0	10	3.5	2	7.8	10
Gauthier, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	6.8	7	8.2	10	9.7	10	8.7	10	8.8	10	2.8	1	7.5	10
Matachewan, Township of	North	ST	100.0%	4.0	4	8.2	10	7.7	9	5.4	3	10.0	10	5.1	5	6.7	9
Charlton and Dack, Municipality of	North	ST	100.0%	2.8	2	8.0	10	7.5	9	6.7	7	9.0	10	6.9	8	6.8	9