

AMP2017

www.publicsectordigest.com

The 2017 Asset Management Plan for the
Township of Cramahe

Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
I. Introduction & Context.....	7
II. Asset Management.....	8
1. Overarching Principles.....	9
III. AMP Objectives and Content.....	10
IV. Data and Methodology.....	11
1. Condition Data.....	11
2. Financial Data.....	12
3. Infrastructure Report Card.....	13
4. Limitations and Assumptions.....	14
5. Process.....	15
6. Data Confidence Rating.....	16
V. Summary Statistics.....	17
1. Asset Valuation.....	18
2. Source of Condition Data by Asset Class.....	20
3. Historical Investment in Infrastructure – All Asset Classes.....	21
4. Useful Life Consumption – All Asset Classes.....	22
5. Overall Condition – All Asset Classes.....	23
6. Financial Profile.....	24
7. Replacement Profile – All Asset Classes.....	25
8. Data Confidence.....	26
VI. State of Local Infrastructure.....	27
1. Road Network.....	28
2. Bridges & Culverts.....	35
3. Water System.....	42
4. Wastewater Systems.....	49
5. Storm Network.....	56
6. Buildings & Facilities.....	63
7. Machinery & Equipment.....	70
8. Land Improvements.....	77
9. Vehicles.....	84
VII. Levels of Service.....	91
1. Guiding Principles for Developing LOS.....	91
2. Key Performance Indicators and Targets.....	92
3. Future Performance.....	96
4. Monitoring, Updating and Actions.....	97
VIII. Asset Management Strategies.....	98
1. Non-Infrastructure Solutions & Requirements.....	99
2. Condition Assessment Programs.....	99
3. Lifecycle Analysis Framework.....	105
4. Growth and Demand.....	111
5. Project Prioritization and Risk Management.....	111
IX. Financial Strategy.....	119
1. General Overview.....	119
2. Financial Profile: Tax Funded Assets.....	122
3. Financial Profile: Rate Funded Assets.....	126
4. Use of Debt.....	130
5. Use of Reserves.....	133
X. 2016 Infrastructure Report Card.....	134
XI. Appendix: Grading and Conversion Scales.....	135

List of Figures

Figure 1 Distribution of Net Stock of Core Public Infrastructure	7
Figure 2 Developing the AMP – Work Flow and Process	15
Figure 3 Asset Valuation by Class	18
Figure 4 2016 Ownership Per Household	19
Figure 5 Historical Investment in Infrastructure – All Asset Classes.....	21
Figure 6 Useful Life Remaining as of 2015 – All Asset Classes	22
Figure 7 Asset Condition Distribution by Replacement Cost as of 2015 – All Asset Classes.....	23
Figure 8 Annual Requirements by Asset Class	24
Figure 9 Infrastructure Backlog – All Asset Classes.....	24
Figure 10 Replacement Profile – All Asset Classes.....	25
Figure 11 Asset Valuation – Road Network.....	29
Figure 12 Historical Investment – Road Network.....	30
Figure 13 Useful Life Consumption - Road Network.....	31
Figure 14 Asset Condition – Road Network (Age-Based)	32
Figure 15 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Road Network	33
Figure 16 Asset Valuation – Bridges & Culverts	36
Figure 17 Historical Investment – Bridges & Culverts	37
Figure 18 Useful Life Consumption – Bridges & Culverts	38
Figure 19 Asset Condition – Bridges & Culverts (Age-based)	39
Figure 20 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Bridges & Culverts.....	40
Figure 21 Asset Valuation – Water System.....	43
Figure 22 Historical Investment – Water System	44
Figure 23 Useful Life Consumption – Water System	45
Figure 24 Asset Condition – Water System (Age-Based)	46
Figure 25 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Water System	47
Figure 26 Asset Valuation – Wastewater System	50
Figure 27 Historical Investment – Wastewater System.....	51
Figure 28 Useful Life Consumption – Wastewater System.....	52
Figure 29 Asset Condition – Wastewater System (Age-Based)	53
Figure 30 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Wastewater System.....	54
Figure 31 Asset Valuation – Storm Network.....	57
Figure 32 Historical Investment – Storm Network.....	58
Figure 33 Useful Life Consumption – Storm Network.....	59
Figure 34 Asset Condition – Storm Network (Age-based)	60
Figure 35 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Storm Network	61
Figure 36 Asset Valuation – Buildings & Facilities	64
Figure 37 Historical Investment – Buildings & Facilities	65
Figure 38 Useful Life Consumption – Buildings & Facilities	66
Figure 39 Asset Condition – Buildings & Facilities (Age-Based).....	67
Figure 40 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Buildings & Facilities.....	68
Figure 41 Asset Valuation – Machinery & Equipment	71
Figure 42 Historical Investment – Machinery & Equipment	72
Figure 43 Useful Life Consumption – Machinery & Equipment	73
Figure 44 Asset Condition – Machinery & Equipment (Age-based)	74
Figure 45 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Machinery & Equipment.....	75
Figure 46 Asset Valuation – Land Improvements.....	78
Figure 47 Historical Investment – Land Improvements.....	79
Figure 48 Useful Life Consumption – Land Improvements.....	80
Figure 49 Asset Condition - Land Improvements (Age-Based)	81
Figure 50 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Land Improvements	82
Figure 51 Asset Valuation – Vehicles.....	85
Figure 52 Historical Investment – Vehicles	86
Figure 53 Useful Life Consumption – Vehicles	87
Figure 54 Asset Condition – Vehicles (Age-based).....	88

Figure 55 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Vehicles	89
Figure 56 Comparing Age-based and Assessed Condition Data.....	100
Figure 57 Paved Road General Deterioration Profile.....	105
Figure 58 Sewer Main General Deterioration.....	108
Figure 59 Water Main General Deterioration.....	109
Figure 60 Bow Tie Risk Model.....	112
Figure 61 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – All Asset Classes.....	115
Figure 62 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Road Network.....	115
Figure 63 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Bridges & Culverts.....	116
Figure 64 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Water System.....	116
Figure 65 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Buildings & Facilities.....	117
Figure 66 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Machinery & Equipment.....	117
Figure 67 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Land Improvements.....	118
Figure 68 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Vehicles.....	118
Figure 69 Cost Elements	120
Figure 70 Historical Prime Business Interest Rates	131

List of Tables

Table 1 Objectives of Asset Management.....	8
Table 2 Principles of Asset Management.....	9
Table 3 Infrastructure Report Card Description	13
Table 4 Source of Condition Data by Asset Class	20
Table 5 Data Confidence Ratings.....	26
Table 6 Key Asset Attributes – Road Network	28
Table 7 Key Asset Attributes – Bridges & Culverts	35
Table 8 Key Asset Attributes – Water	42
Table 9 Key Asset Attributes – Wastewater Systems.....	49
Table 10 Key Asset Attributes – Storm Network	56
Table 11 Key Asset Attributes – Buildings & Facilities.....	63
Table 12 Key Asset Attributes – Machinery & Equipment.....	70
Table 13 Key Asset Attributes – Land Improvements	77
Table 14 Key Asset Attributes – Vehicles.....	84
Table 15 LOS Categories	91
Table 16 Key Performance Indicators – Road Network and Bridges & Culverts.....	92
Table 17 Key Performance Indicators – Buildings & Facilities.....	93
Table 18 Key Performance Indicators – Vehicles	93
Table 19 Key Performance Indicators – Water, Sanitary and Storm Networks.....	94
Table 20 Key Performance Indicators – Machinery & Equipment.....	95
Table 21 Key Performance Indicators – Land Improvements	95
Table 22 Asset Condition and Related Work Activity for Paved Roads	106
Table 23 Asset Condition and Related Work Activity for Sewer Mains	108
Table 24 Asset Condition and Related Work Activity for Water Mains	110
Table 25 Probability of Failure – All Assets.....	113
Table 26 Consequence of Failure – Roads.....	113
Table 27 Consequence of Failure – Bridges & Culverts.....	113
Table 28 Consequence of Failure – Water Mains.....	114
Table 29 Consequence of Failure – Buildings & Facilities.....	114
Table 30 Consequence of Failure – Machinery & Equipment.....	114
Table 31 Consequence of Failure – Land Improvements	114
Table 32 Consequence of Failure – Vehicles.....	114
Table 33 Infrastructure Requirements and Current Funding Available: Tax Funded Assets	122
Table 34 Tax Change Required for Full Funding.....	123
Table 35 Effect of Changes in OCIF Funding and Reallocating Decreases in Debt Costs	124
Table 36 Summary of Infrastructure Requirements and Current Funding Available	126

Table 37 Rate Change Required for Full Funding.....	127
Table 38 Without Change in Debt Costs.....	128
Table 39 With Change in Debt Costs.....	128
Table 40 Total Interest Paid as a Percentage of Project Costs.....	130
Table 41 Overview of Use of Debt.....	132
Table 42 Overview of Debt Costs	132
Table 43 Summary of Reserves Available	133
Table 44 2016 Infrastructure Report Card.....	134
Table 45 Asset Health Scale.....	135
Table 46 Financial Capacity Scale	136

LEGAL NOTICE

This report has been prepared by The Public Sector Digest Inc. ("PSD") in accordance with instructions received from the Township of Cramahe (the "Client") and for the sole use of the Client. The content of (and recommendations) this report reflects the best judgement of PSD personnel based on the information made available to PSD by the Client. Unauthorized use of this report for any other purpose, or by any third party, without the express written consent of PSD, shall be at such third party's sole risk without liability to PSD. This report is protected by copyright.

Executive Summary

Infrastructure is inextricably linked to the economic, social and environmental advancement of a community. Municipalities own and manage nearly 60% of the public infrastructure stock in Canada. As analyzed in this asset management plan (AMP), the Township of Cramahe's infrastructure portfolio comprises the following asset classes: road network, bridges & culverts, buildings, storm, water, sanitary, machinery & equipment, land improvements, vehicles. The asset classes analyzed in this asset management plan for the municipality had a total 2016 valuation of \$119 million, of which sanitary comprised 27%, followed by the road network at 19%.

Strategic asset management is critical in extracting the highest total value from public assets at the lowest lifecycle cost. This AMP, the municipality's second following the completion of its first edition in 2013, details the state of infrastructure of the municipality's service areas and provides asset management and financial strategies designed to facilitate its pursuit of developing an advanced asset management program and mitigate long-term funding gaps.

In addition to observed field conditions, historical capital expenditures can assist the municipality in identifying impending infrastructure needs, and guide its medium- and long-term capital programs. The municipality has continuously invested into its infrastructure over the decades. Investments fluctuated since the 1950s and peaked in the early 1960s. During this time, \$20.8 million was invested with \$12.6 million put into the water system. Since 2015, \$981,000 has been invested with a focus on roads. In addition, the municipality has plans for \$3.5 million in infrastructure capital investments for 2017.

Based on 2016 replacement cost, and age-based data, 36% of assets, with a valuation of \$43.5 million, are in good to very good condition; 49% are in poor to very poor condition. The municipality is relying on age-based condition data for all assets included within this AMP. 76% of the assets analyzed in this AMP have at least 10 years of useful life remaining. However, 13%, with a valuation of \$15 million, remain in operation beyond their established useful life. An additional 4% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

In order for an AMP to be effective, it must be integrated with financial planning and long-term budgeting. The development of a comprehensive financial plan will allow the municipality to identify the financial resources required for sustainable asset management based on existing asset inventories, desired levels of service, and projected growth requirements.

The average annual investment requirement for the above categories is \$2,243,000. Annual revenue currently allocated to these assets for capital purposes is \$983,000 leaving an annual deficit of \$1,260,000. To put it another way, these infrastructure categories are currently funded at 44% of their long-term requirements.

In 2017, Cramahe has annual tax revenues of \$5,208,000. Our strategy includes full funding being achieved over 10 years by:

- when realized, reallocating the debt cost increases of \$75,000 to the infrastructure deficit.
- increasing tax revenues by 2.5% each year for the next 10 years solely for the purpose of phasing in full funding to the tax funded asset classes covered in this AMP.

- allocating the current gas tax and OCIF revenue and scheduled increases to the infrastructure deficit as they occur.
- increasing existing and future infrastructure budgets by the applicable inflation index on an annual basis in addition to the deficit phase-in.

The average annual investment requirement for wastewater services and water services is \$860,000. Annual revenue currently allocated to these assets for capital purposes is \$575,000 leaving an annual deficit of \$285,000. To put it another way, these infrastructure categories are currently funded at 67% of their long-term requirements.

In 2017, Cramahe has annual wastewater revenues of \$638,000 and annual water revenues of \$640,000.

To achieve financial sustainability for its wastewater services, we recommend a 20-year option that achieves full funding by:

- when realized, reallocating the debt cost reductions of \$185,000 for wastewater services to the applicable infrastructure deficit.
- increasing rate revenues by 2.5% for wastewater services each year for the next 20 years solely for the purpose of phasing in full funding to the asset categories covered in this section of the AMP.
- increasing existing and future infrastructure budgets by the applicable inflation index on an annual basis in addition to the deficit phase-in.

For water services, prior to any rate adjustments, it is recommended that condition data be obtained to better determine financial needs and future operational requirements be determined.


Although our financial strategies allow the municipalities to meet its long-term funding requirements and reach fiscal sustainability, injection of additional revenues will be required to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

A critical aspect of this asset management plan is the level of confidence the municipality has in the data used to develop the state of the infrastructure and form the appropriate financial strategies. The municipality has indicated a high degree of confidence in the accuracy, validity and completeness of the asset data for all categories analyzed in this asset management plan.

I. Introduction & Context

Across Canada, municipal share of public infrastructure increased from 22% in 1955 to nearly 60% in 2013. The federal government's share of critical infrastructure stock, including roads, water and wastewater, declined by nearly 80% in value since 1963.¹

Figure 1 Distribution of Net Stock of Core Public Infrastructure



Ontario's municipalities own more of the province's infrastructure assets than both the provincial and federal government. The asset portfolios managed by Ontario's municipalities are also highly diverse. The Township of Cramahe's capital assets portfolio, as analyzed in this asset management plan (AMP) is valued at \$119 million using 2016 replacement costs. The municipality relies on these assets to provide residents, businesses, employees and visitors with safe access to important services, such as transportation, recreation, culture, economic development and much more. As such, it is critical that the municipality manage these assets optimally in order to produce the highest total value for taxpayers. This asset management plan, (AMP) will assist the municipality in the pursuit of judicious asset management for its capital assets.

¹ Larry Miller, Updating Infrastructure In Canada: An Examination of Needs And Investments Report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, June 2015

II. Asset Management

Asset management can be best defined as an integrated business approach within an organization with the aim to minimize the lifecycle costs of owning, operating, and maintaining assets, at an acceptable level of risk, while continuously delivering established levels of service for present and future customers. It includes the planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of infrastructure used to provide services. By implementing asset management processes, infrastructure needs can be prioritized over time, while ensuring timely investments to minimize repair and rehabilitation costs and maintain municipal assets.

Table 1 Objectives of Asset Management

Inventory	Capture all asset types, inventories and historical data.
Current Valuation	Calculate current condition ratings and replacement values.
Lifecycle Analysis	Identify Maintenance and Renewal Strategies & Lifecycle Costs.
Service Level Targets	Define measurable Levels of Service Targets.
Risk & Prioritization	Integrates all asset classes through risk and prioritization strategies.
Sustainable Financing	Identify sustainable Financing Strategies for all asset classes.
Continuous Processes	Provide continuous processes to ensure asset information is kept current and accurate.
Decision Making & Transparency	Integrate asset management information into all corporate purchases, acquisitions and assumptions.
Monitoring & Reporting	At defined intervals, assess the assets and report on progress and performance.

1. Overarching Principles

The Institute of Asset Management (IAM) recommends the adoption of seven key principles for a sustainable asset management program. According to IAM, asset management must be:²

Table 2 Principles of Asset Management

Holistic	Asset management must be cross-disciplinary, total value focused.
Systematic	Rigorously applied in a structured management system.
Systemic	Looking at assets in their systems context, again for net, total value.
Risk-based	Incorporating risk appropriately into all decision-making.
Optimal	Seeking the best compromise between conflicting objectives, such as costs versus performance versus risks etc.
Sustainable	Plans must deliver optimal asset lifecycles, ongoing systems performance, environmental and other long term consequences.
Integrated	At the heart of good asset management lies the need to be joined-up. The total jigsaw puzzle needs to work as a whole - and this is not just the sum of the parts.

² "Key Principles", The Institute of Asset Management, www.iam.org

III. AMP Objectives and Content

This AMP is one component of Cramahe's overarching corporate strategy. It was developed to support the municipality's vision for its asset management practice and programs. It provides key asset attribute data, including current composition of the municipality's infrastructure portfolio, inventory, replacement costs, useful life etc., summarizes the physical health of the capital assets, enumerates the municipality's current capital spending framework, and outlines financial strategies to achieve fiscal sustainability in the long-term while reducing and eventually eliminating funding gaps.

As with the first edition of the municipality's asset management plan in 2013, this AMP is developed in accordance with provincial standards and guidelines, and new requirements under the Federal Gas Tax Fund (GTF) stipulating the inclusion of all eligible asset classes. The following asset classes are analysed in this document: road network; bridges & culverts; water; wastewater; storm; facilities; machinery & equipment; land improvements; and vehicles.



IV. Data and Methodology

The municipality's dataset for the asset classes analyzed in this AMP are maintained in PSD's CityWide® Tangible Assets module. This dataset includes key asset attributes and PSAB 3150 data, such as historical costs, in-service dates, field inspection data (as available), asset health, and replacement costs.

1. Condition Data

Municipalities implement a straight-line amortization schedule approach to depreciate their capital assets. In general, this approach may not be reflective of an asset's actual condition and the true nature of its deterioration, which tends to accelerate toward the end of the asset's lifecycle. However, it is a useful approximation in the absence of standardized decay models and actual field condition data and can provide a benchmark for future requirements. We analyze each asset individually prior to aggregation and reporting; therefore, many imprecisions that may be highlighted at the individual asset level are attenuated at the class level.

As available, actual field condition data was used to make recommendations more meaningful and representative of the municipality's state of infrastructure. The value of condition data cannot be overstated as they provide a more accurate representation of the state of infrastructure. The type of condition data used for each class is indicated in Chapter V, Section 2.

2. Financial Data

In this AMP, the average annual requirement is the amount, based on current replacement costs, that municipalities should set aside annually for each infrastructure class so that assets can be replaced upon reaching the end of their lifecycle.

To determine current funding capacity, all existing sources of funding are identified and combined to enumerate the total available funding; funding for the previous three years is analyzed as data is available. These figures are then assessed against the average annual requirements, and are used to calculate the annual funding shortfall (surplus) and for forming the financial strategies.

In addition to the annual shortfall, the majority of municipalities face significant infrastructure backlogs. The infrastructure backlog is the accrued financial investment needed in the short-term to bring the assets to a state of good repair. This amount is identified for each asset class.

Only predictable sources of funding are used, e.g., tax and rate revenues, user fees, and other streams of income the municipality can rely on with a high degree of certainty. Government grants and other ad-hoc injections of capital are not included in this asset management plan given their unpredictability. As senior governments make greater, more predictable and permanent commitments to funding municipal infrastructure programs, e.g., the Federal Gas Tax Fund, future iterations of this asset management plan will account for such funding sources.

3. Infrastructure Report Card

The asset management plan is a complex document, but one with direct implications on the public, a group with varying degrees of technical knowledge. To make communications more meaningful and the AMP more accessible, we've developed an Infrastructure Report Card that summarizes our findings in common language that municipalities can use for internal and external distribution. The report card is developed using two key, equally weighted factors: Financial Capacity and Asset Health.

Table 3 Infrastructure Report Card Description

Financial Capacity		A municipality's financial capacity grade is determined by the level of funding available (0-100%) for each asset class for the purpose of meeting the average annual investment requirements.
Asset Health		Using either field inspection data as available or age-based data, the asset health component of the report card uses condition (0-100%) to estimate how capable assets are in performing their required functions. We use replacement cost to determine the weight of each condition group within the asset class.
Letter Grade	Rating	Description
A	Very Good	The asset is functioning and performing well; only normal preventative maintenance is required. The municipality is fully prepared for its long-term replacement needs based on its existing infrastructure portfolio.
B	Good	The municipality is well prepared to fund its long-term replacement needs but requires additional funding strategies in the short-term to begin to increase its reserves.
C	Fair	The asset's performance or function has started to degrade and repair/rehabilitation is required to minimize lifecycle cost. The municipality is underpreparing to fund its long-term infrastructure needs. The replacement of assets in the short- and medium-term will likely be deferred to future years.
D	Poor	The asset's performance and function is below the desired level and immediate repair/rehabilitation is required. The municipality is not well prepared to fund its replacement needs in the short-, medium- or long-term. Asset replacements will be deferred and levels of service may be reduced.
F	Very Poor	The municipality is significantly underfunding its short-term, medium-term, and long-term infrastructure requirements based on existing funds allocation. Asset replacements will be deferred indefinitely. The municipality may have to divest some of its assets (e.g., bridge closures, arena closures) and levels of service will be reduced significantly.

4. Limitations and Assumptions

Several limitations continue to persist as municipalities advance their asset management practices.


- As available, we use field condition assessment data to illustrate the state of infrastructure and develop the requisite financial strategies. However, in the absence of observed data, we rely on the age of assets to estimate their physical condition.
- A second limitation is the use of inflation measures, for example using CPI/NRBCPI to inflate historical costs in the absence of actual replacement costs. While a reasonable approximation, the use of such multipliers may not be reflective of market prices and may over- or understate the value of a municipality's infrastructure portfolio and the resulting capital requirements.
- Our calculations and recommendations will reflect the best available data at the time this AMP was developed.
- The focus of this plan is restricted to capital expenditures and does not capture O&M expenditures on infrastructure.



5. Process

High data quality is the foundation of intelligent decision-making. Generally, there are two primary causes of poor decisions: inaccurate or incomplete data, and the misinterpretation of data used. The figure below illustrates an abbreviated version of our work order/work flow process between PSD and municipal staff. It is designed to ensure maximum confidence in the raw data used to develop the AMP, the interpretation of the AMP by all stakeholders, and ultimately, the application of the strategies outlined in this AMP.

Figure 2 Developing the AMP – Work Flow and Process



6. Data Confidence Rating

Staff confidence in the data used to develop the AMP can determine the extent to which recommendations are applied. Low confidence suggests uncertainty about the data and can undermine the validity of the analysis. High data confidence endorses the findings and strategies, and the AMP can become an important, reliable reference guide for interdepartmental communication as well as a manual for long-term corporate decision-making. Having a numerical rating for confidence also allows the municipality to track its progress over time and eliminate data gaps.

Data confidence in this AMP is determined using five key factors and is based on the City of Brantford's approach. Municipal staff provide their level of confidence (score) in each factor for major asset classes along a spectrum, ranging from 0, suggesting low confidence in the data, to 100 indicative of high certainty regarding inputs. The five factors used to calculate the municipality's data confidence ratings are:

F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
The data is up to date.	The data is complete and uniform.	The data comes from an authoritative source	The data is error free.	The data is verified by an authoritative source.

The municipality's self-assessed score in each factor is then used to calculate data confidence in each asset class using Equation 1 below.

$$\text{Asset Class Data Confidence Rating} = \sum (\text{Score in each factor}) \times \left(\frac{1}{5}\right)$$

V. Summary Statistics

In this section, we aggregate technical and financial data across all asset classes analyzed in this AMP, and summarize the state of the infrastructure using key indicators, including asset condition, useful life consumption, and important financial measurements.



1. Asset Valuation

The asset classes analyzed in this asset management plan for the municipality had a total 2016 valuation of \$119 million, of which sanitary comprised 27%, followed by the road network at 19%. The ownership per household (Figure 4) totaled \$85,000 based on 2,570 households for all asset categories except for water services with 985 households and wastewater services with 846 households.

Figure 3 Asset Valuation by Class





Figure 4 2016 Ownership Per Household



2. Source of Condition Data by Asset Class

Observed data will provide the most precise indication of an asset's physical health. In the absence of such information, the age of capital assets can be used as a meaningful approximation of the asset's condition. Table 4 indicates the source of condition data used for the various asset classes in this AMP. The municipality has used age-based condition for all assets within this AMP. Note that the municipality does have regular condition assessments completed for all assets with the exception of Vehicles, Machinery & Equipment, Sewer mains and Sidewalks. Therefore it is recommended that this information be incorporated into future AMPs.


Table 4 Source of Condition Data by Asset Class

Asset class	Component	Source of Condition Data
Roads Network	All	Age-based
Bridges & Culverts	All	Age-based
Water System	All	Age-based
Sanitary Services	All	Age-based
Storm	All	Age-based
Buildings	All	Age-based
Machinery & Equipment	All	Age-based
Land Improvements	All	Age-based
Vehicles	All	Age-based

3. Historical Investment in Infrastructure – All Asset Classes

In conjunction with condition data, two other measurements can augment staff understanding of the state of infrastructure and impending and long-term infrastructure needs: installation year profile, and useful life remaining. Using 2016 replacement costs, Figure 5 illustrates the historical investments made in the asset classes analyzed in this AMP since 1950. Often, investment in critical infrastructure parallels population growth or other significant shifts in demographics; they can also fluctuate with provincial and federal stimulus programs. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 5 Historical Investment in Infrastructure – All Asset Classes




The municipality has continuously invested into its infrastructure over the decades. Investments fluctuated since the 1950s and peaked in the early 1960s. During this time, \$20.8 million was invested with \$12.6 million put into the water system. Since 2015, \$981,000 has been invested with a focus on roads. In addition, the municipality has plans for \$3.5 million in infrastructure capital investments for 2017.

4. Useful Life Consumption – All Asset Classes

While age is not a precise indicator of an asset's health, in the absence of observed condition assessment data, it can serve as a high-level, meaningful approximation and help guide replacement needs and facilitate strategic budgeting. Figure 6 shows the distribution of assets based on the percentage of useful life already consumed.

Figure 6 Useful Life Remaining as of 2015 – All Asset Classes




76% of the assets analyzed in this AMP have at least 10 years of useful life remaining. However, 13%, with a valuation of \$15 million, remain in operation beyond their established useful life. An additional 4% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

5. Overall Condition – All Asset Classes

Based on 2016 replacement cost, and age-based data, 36% of assets, with a valuation of \$43.5 million, are in good to very good condition; 49% are in poor to very poor condition.


Figure 7 Asset Condition Distribution by Replacement Cost as of 2015 – All Asset Classes



6. Financial Profile


This section details key high-level financial indicators for the municipality's asset classes.

Figure 8 Annual Requirements by Asset Class



The annual requirements represent the amount the municipality should allocate annually to each of its asset classes to meet replacement needs as they arise, prevent infrastructure backlogs and achieve long-term sustainability. In total, the municipality must allocate \$3.1 million annually for the assets covered in this AMP.

Figure 9 Infrastructure Backlog – All Asset Classes




The municipality has a combined infrastructure backlog of \$13.3 million, with buildings & facilities comprising 29%. The backlog represents the investment needed today to meet previously deferred replacement needs. In the absence of assessed data, the backlog represents the value of assets still in operation beyond their established useful life.

7. Replacement Profile – All Asset Classes

In this section, we illustrate the aggregate short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's asset classes. The backlog is the total investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 10 Replacement Profile – All Asset Classes



Based on age data, the municipality has a combined backlog of \$13.3 million, of which buildings & facilities comprises \$3.8 million. Aggregate replacement needs will total \$5.6 million over the next five years. An additional \$7.6 million will be required between 2021 and 2025. The municipality's aggregate annual requirements (indicated by the black line) total \$3.1 million. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet the replacement needs for its various asset classes as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. Currently, the municipality is funding 44% of the annual requirements for tax-funded assets and 67% for rate-funded assets. See the 'Financial Strategy' chapter for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

8. Data Confidence

The municipality has a high degree of confidence in the data used to develop this AMP, receiving an overall confidence rating of 86%. This is indicative of significant effort in collecting and refining its data set.

Table 5 Data Confidence Ratings

Asset Class	The data is up-to-date.	The data is complete and uniform.	The data comes from an authoritative source.	The data is error free.	The data is verified by an authoritative source.	Average Confidence Rating
Road Network	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Bridges & Culverts	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Water Services	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Sanitary Services	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Storm Water	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Buildings & Facilities	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Machinery & Equipment	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Land Improvements	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Fleet	100%	90%	80%	80%	80%	86%
Overall Weighted Average Data Confidence Rating						86%

VI. State of Local Infrastructure

The state of local infrastructure includes the full inventory, condition ratings, useful life consumption data and the backlog and upcoming infrastructure needs for each asset class. As available, assessed condition data was used to inform the discussion and recommendations; in the absence of such information, age-based data was used as the next best alternative.



1. Road Network


1.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 6 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's road network, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, their replacement cost, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's roads assets are valued at \$22.8 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 6 Key Asset Attributes – Road Network

Asset Type	Asset Component	Quantity	Useful Life (Years)	2016 Unit Replacement Cost	2016 Overall Replacement Cost
Road Network	Cross Walk	15m	20	User Defined Cost	\$31,680
	Gravel	641km	40	Not Planned For Replacement	\$0
	Roads – Hot Mixed Paved	67km	30, 40	User Defined Cost/NRBCPI (Toronto)	\$6,118,988
	Roads – Surface Treated	353km	15, 40	User Defined Cost/ NRBCPI (Toronto)	\$14,504,497
	Sidewalks	15648m	40	User Defined Cost	\$1,722,200
	Streetlights	506	10, 20, 30	User Defined Cost/ NRBCPI (Toronto)	\$418,300
Total					\$22,795,665


Figure 11 Asset Valuation – Road Network



1.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 12 shows the municipality's historical investments in its road network since 1950. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 1.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 12 Historical Investment – Road Network




Investments in the municipality's road network mostly occurred in the early 1950s with it being the period of the largest investment at \$16 million. Investments began to pick up again in the early 2000s and \$525,000 has been invested since 2015. In addition, the municipality has plans for over \$3 million in capital investments for 2017 including road rehabilitation and resurfacing projects.

1.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 13 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's road network.

Figure 13 Useful Life Consumption - Road Network




While 67% of the municipality's road network has at least 10 years of useful life remaining, 9%, with a valuation of \$2 million, remain in operation beyond their useful life. An additional 3% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

1.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's road network as of 2016. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its road assets. Note that the municipality is completing a roads needs study in 2017 to gather condition data for road surfaces.

Figure 14 Asset Condition – Road Network (Age-Based)




Based on age-based condition data, 74% of assets, with a valuation of \$17 million are in good to very good condition; 14% are in poor to very poor condition.

1.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's road network assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 15 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Road Network



In addition to a backlog of \$2 million, replacement needs are forecasted to be \$570,000 in the next five years; an additional \$3.6 million is forecasted in replacement needs between 2021-2025. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its road network total \$826,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. However, the municipality is currently allocating \$544,000, leaving an annual deficit of \$282,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

1.6 Recommendations – Road Network

- Age-based data indicates backlog of \$2 million and 10-year replacement needs of \$4.1 million. The municipality should incorporate its 2017 roads needs study assessment information into the AMP analysis to better estimate financial requirements and field needs. See Section 2, 'Condition Assessment Programs' in the 'Asset Management Strategies' chapter.
- Road network key performance indicators should be established and tracked annually as part of an overall level of service model. See Section 7 'Levels of Service'.
- The municipality is funding 66% of its long-term requirements on an annual basis. See the 'Financial Strategy' section on how to achieve more sustainable funding levels.

2. Bridges & Culverts


2.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 7 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's bridges & culverts, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, their replacement cost, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's bridges & culverts assets are valued at \$13.7 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 7 Key Asset Attributes – Bridges & Culverts

Asset Type	Asset Component	Quantity	Useful Life (Years)	2016 Unit Replacement Cost	2016 Overall Replacement Cost
Bridges & Culverts	Bridges	19	25, 75	NRBCPI (Toronto)	\$12,883,263
	Culverts	2	30	NRBCPI (Toronto)	\$772,007
Total					\$13,655,270


Figure 16 Asset Valuation – Bridges & Culverts



2.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 17 shows the municipality's historical investments in its bridges & culverts since 1950. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 2.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 17 Historical Investment – Bridges & Culverts




The municipality has invested sporadically in its bridges and culverts since 1950. In the late 1960s, the period of largest investment, \$10 million was invested with \$9.5 million put into bridges.

2.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 18 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's bridges & culverts.

Figure 18 Useful Life Consumption – Bridges & Culverts




79% of the assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining while 20%, with a valuation of \$2.8 million, remain in operation beyond their useful life. An additional 1% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

2.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's bridges & culverts as of 2016. By default, we rely on observed field data adapted from OSIM inspections as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. All assets are based on age-based data.

Figure 19 Asset Condition – Bridges & Culverts (Age-based)




Age-based data indicates that while 8% of the municipality's bridges & culverts are in good condition, 90%, with a valuation of \$12.3 million, are in poor to very poor condition.

2.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's bridges & culverts. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 20 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Bridges & Culverts



In addition to a backlog of \$2.8 million, replacement needs will total \$128,000 in the next five years. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its bridges & culverts total \$269,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. The municipality is currently allocating \$20,000, leaving an annual deficit of \$249,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

2.6 Recommendations – Bridges & Culverts

- The results and recommendations from the OSIM inspections should be incorporated into the AMP analysis and be used to generate the short-and long-term capital and maintenance budgets for the bridge and large culvert structures. See Section VIII, 'Asset Management Strategies'.
- Bridge & culvert structure key performance indicators should be established and tracked annually as part of an overall level of service model. See Section VII 'Levels of Service'.
- The municipality is funding 7% of its long-term requirements on an annual basis. See the 'Financial Strategy' section on how to achieve more sustainable and optimal funding levels.

3. Water System


3.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 8 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's water system, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, replacement costs, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's water system assets are valued at \$20.9 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 8 Key Asset Attributes – Water

Asset Type	Asset Component	Quantity	Useful Life (Years)	2016 Unit Replacement Cost	2016 Overall Replacement Cost
Water System	Mains	23844m	50, 75, 90	User Defined Cost	\$17,798,171
	Hydrants	111	40	User Defined Cost	\$555,000
	SCADA System	1	20	User Defined Cost	\$30,000
	Spoolers	1	50	User Defined Cost	\$50,000
	Water Meters	956	15	User Defined Cost	\$705,500
	Water Tower	1	40	User Defined Cost	\$866,262
	Water Equipment	1	15	User Defined Cost	\$63,162
	Wells	2	40, 60	User Defined Cost	\$870,000
Total					\$20,938,125


Figure 21 Asset Valuation – Water System



3.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 22 shows the municipality's historical investments in its water system since 1960. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 3.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 22 Historical Investment – Water System




Investments in the water system have been sporadic over the decades. In the early 1960s, the period of largest investment, \$12.6 million was invested in the water systems with \$12 million put into mains.

3.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 23 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's water system.

Figure 23 Useful Life Consumption – Water System




96% of the assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining while 4%, with a valuation of \$845,000, remain in operation beyond their useful life.

3.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's water services. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its water assets.

Figure 24 Asset Condition – Water System (Age-Based)




Based on age-based data, 29% of assets are in good to very good condition while 62%, with a valuation of \$12.9 million, are in poor to very poor condition.

3.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's water system assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 25 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Water System



In addition to a backlog of \$845,000, replacement needs will total \$15,000 in the next ten years. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its water system assets total \$330,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. However, the municipality is currently allocating \$500,000 towards this asset category resulting in an annual surplus of \$170,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

3.6 Recommendations – Water System

- In time, the municipality should incorporate its water system condition data into the AMP analysis to more precisely estimate its financial requirements and field needs. See Section 2, ‘Condition Assessment Programs’ in the ‘Asset Management Strategies’ chapter.
- Water distribution system key performance indicators should be established and tracked annually as part of an overall level of service model. See Section VII ‘Levels of Service’.
- The municipality should assess its short-, medium- and long-term capital, and operations and maintenance needs.
- An appropriate percentage of the replacement costs should then be allocated for the municipality’s O&M requirements.
- The municipality is over funding its long-term requirements on an annual basis. See the ‘Financial Strategy’ section on how to achieve more sustainable and optimal funding levels.

4. Wastewater Systems


4.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 9 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's wastewater system portfolio, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, replacement costs, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's wastewater system assets are valued at \$32 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 9 Key Asset Attributes – Wastewater Systems

Asset Type	Asset Component	Quantity	Useful Life (Years)	2016 Unit Replacement Cost	2016 Overall Replacement Cost
Wastewater Systems	Maintenance Holes	204	40	User Defined Cost	\$1,972,500
	Sanitary Sewers	17099m	80, 90	User Defined Cost	\$17,356,724
	Sewer Treatment Plant (HVAC, Roof, Structure, Internal and External Components)	1	15, 20, 30, 50	User Defined Cost	\$12,664,568
	Total				\$31,993,792


Figure 26 Asset Valuation – Wastewater System



4.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 27 shows the municipality's historical investments in its wastewater system since 1960. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 4.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 27 Historical Investment – Wastewater System




Major investments into the municipality's wastewater assets began in the early 1960s. Investments then fluctuated and peaked in the late 1970s at \$8.5 million. During this time \$5.3 million was put into sanitary sewers.

4.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 28 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's wastewater system.

Figure 28 Useful Life Consumption – Wastewater System




92% of the assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining while 4%, with a valuation of \$1.4 million, remain in operation beyond their useful life. An additional 3% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

4.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's sanitary services as of 2016. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its wastewater system assets.

Figure 29 Asset Condition – Wastewater System (Age-Based)




Age-based data indicates that 36% of the assets are in good to very good condition, while 37%, with a valuation of \$11.8 million, are in poor to very poor condition.

4.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's wastewater system assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 30 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Wastewater System



In addition to a backlog of \$1.4 million, replacement needs will total \$1 million in the next five years. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its wastewater system assets total \$530,000. At this level, funding would be sustainable and replacement needs could be met as they arise without the need for deferring projects. The municipality is currently allocating \$75,000 towards this asset category, leaving an annual deficit of \$455,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

4.6 Recommendations – Wastewater System

- Age-based data indicates a backlog of \$1.4 million and five-year replacement needs of \$1 million. The municipality should implement a condition assessment program of its wastewater assets to precisely estimate its financial requirements and field needs. See Section 2, ‘Condition Assessment Programs’ in the ‘Asset Management Strategies’ chapter.
- Wastewater collection system key performance indicators should be established and tracked annually as part of an overall level of service model. See Section VII ‘Levels of Service’.
- The municipality should assess its short-, medium- and long-term operations and maintenance needs. An appropriate percentage of the replacement costs should then be allocated for the municipality’s O&M requirements.
- The municipality is funding 14% of its long-term requirements on an annual basis. See the ‘Financial Strategy’ section on how to achieve more sustainable and optimal funding levels.

5. Storm Network


5.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 10 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's storm network, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, their replacement cost, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's storm network assets are valued at \$4 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 10 Key Asset Attributes – Storm Network

Asset Type	Asset Component	Quantity	Useful Life in Years	Valuation Method	2016 Replacement Cost
Storm Network	Storm Sewer	5089m	80, 90	User Defined Cost	\$3,123,790
	Catch basins	107	40	User Defined Cost	\$561,500
	Manholes	53	40	User Defined Cost/NRBCPI (Toronto)	\$358,422
Total					\$4,043,712


Figure 31 Asset Valuation – Storm Network



5.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 32 shows the municipality's historical investments in its storm network since 1960. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 5.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 32 Historical Investment – Storm Network




Investments in the storm water network have been fairly consistent over the decades. Between 1975-1979, the period of largest investment, \$674,000 was invested with a focus on storm sewer. Note that budgeting for storm network projects has historically been incorporated into road infrastructure projects however is attributes to storm assets once the expenditure occurs.

5.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 33 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's storm assets.

Figure 33 Useful Life Consumption – Storm Network




88% of the assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining while 4%, with a valuation of \$177,000, remain in operation beyond their useful life. An additional 3% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

5.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's storm services. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its storm network assets.

Figure 34 Asset Condition – Storm Network (Age-based)




Age-based data indicates that 50% of the assets are in good to very good condition, while 24%, with a valuation of \$959,000, are in poor to very poor condition.

5.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's storm assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 35 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Storm Network



Age-based data shows a backlog of \$177,000 and five-year replacement needs of \$124,000. An additional \$157,000 will be required between 2021-2025. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for storm assets total \$60,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. The municipality is currently not allocating any funding towards this asset category. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs. Note that budgeting for storm network projects has historically been incorporated into road infrastructure projects.

5.6 Recommendations – Storm Network

- In time, the municipality should implement a condition assessment program of its storm mains to further define field needs and to assist the prioritization of the short and long term capital budget. See Section 2, ‘Condition Assessment Programs’ in the ‘Asset Management Strategies’ chapter.
- Using the above information, the municipality should assess its short-, medium- and long-term capital, and operations and maintenance needs.
- An appropriate percentage of the replacement value of the assets should then be allocated for the municipality’s O&M requirements.
- Storm network key performance indicators should be established and tracked annually as part of an overall level of service model. See Section VII ‘Levels of Service’.
- The municipality is not funding any portion of its long-term requirements on an annual basis. See the ‘Financial Strategy’ section on how to achieve more sustainable and optimal funding levels.

6. Buildings & Facilities


6.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 11 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's buildings & facilities, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, their replacement cost, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's buildings assets are valued at \$19.8 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 11 Key Asset Attributes – Buildings & Facilities

Asset Type	Asset Component	Quantity	Useful Life in Years	Valuation Method	2016 Replacement Cost
Buildings & Facilities	Keeler Centre Arena	10	15, 20, 30, 50	User Defined Cost	\$7,507,115
	Buildings Under 1,000 Sq Ft	8	50	User Defined Cost	\$1,438,845
	Buildings Over 1,000 Sq Ft	33	15, 20, 50	User Defined Cost/CPI (ON)	\$10,811,900
Total					\$19,757,860


Figure 36 Asset Valuation – Buildings & Facilities



6.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 37 shows the municipality's historical investments in its buildings & facilities since 1950. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 6.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 37 Historical Investment – Buildings & Facilities




The municipality's investments into its building assets have fluctuated since the 1970s. Between 2000 and 2004, the period of largest investment, \$7.5 million was invested into the building assets with a focus on the arena. Note that \$2 million was invested into the firehall in 2016 with the project completed in 2017. In addition, the municipality has plans for \$40,000 in infrastructure capital investments for 2017 for the Town Hall Administration Office.

6.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 38 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's buildings assets.

Figure 38 Useful Life Consumption – Buildings & Facilities




55% of buildings assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining; 29%, with a valuation of \$5.8 million remain in operation beyond their established useful life. An additional 7% will reach the end of their useful life in the next five years.

6.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's buildings assets. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its structures.

Figure 39 Asset Condition – Buildings & Facilities (Age-Based)




25% of buildings assets, with a valuation of \$4.9 million, are in good to very good condition; 68% are in poor to very poor condition.

6.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's buildings assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 40 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Buildings & Facilities



Age-based data shows a backlog of \$3.8 million and five-year replacement needs of \$2.2 million. An additional \$1.9 million will be required between 2021-2025. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its buildings total \$580,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. The municipality is currently allocating \$47,000, leaving an annual deficit of \$533,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

6.6 Recommendations – Buildings & Facilities

- Age-based data indicates a significant backlog of \$3.8 million and 10-year replacement needs of \$4.1 million. The municipality should incorporate its facilities condition data into the AMP analysis to more precisely estimate future financial needs. See Section 2, ‘Condition Assessment Programs’ in the ‘Asset Management Strategies’ chapter.
- Using the above information, the municipality should assess its short-, medium- and long-term capital, and operations and maintenance needs.
- An appropriate percentage of the replacement costs should then be allocated for the municipality’s O&M requirements.
- Facility key performance indicators should be established and tracked annually as part of an overall level of service model. See Chapter VII, ‘Levels of Service’.
- The municipality is funding 8% of its long-term requirements on an annual basis. See the ‘Financial Strategy’ section on how to achieve more sustainable and optimal funding levels.

7. Machinery & Equipment


7.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 12 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's machinery & equipment, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, their replacement cost, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's machinery & equipment assets are valued at \$905,000 based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 12 Key Asset Attributes – Machinery & Equipment

Asset Type	Components	Quantity	Useful Life in Years	Valuation Method	2016 Replacement Cost
Machinery & Equipment	Community Service	3	7	User Defined Cost	\$37,382
	Fire Department Equipment	170	5, 7, 10, 15, 20	User Defined Cost	\$324,152
	LED Sign	2	15, 25	User Defined Cost	\$44,300
	Library Books & Periodicals	8	7	CPI (ON)	\$226,020
	Public Works Equipment	37	7, 10, 12, 15, 20	User Defined Cost	\$192,735
	Computer Systems	1	5	CPI (ON)	\$80,665
Total					\$905,254


Figure 41 Asset Valuation – Machinery & Equipment



7.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 42 shows the municipality's historical investments in its machinery & equipment since 1990. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 7.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 42 Historical Investment – Machinery & Equipment




The municipality rapidly expanded its machinery & equipment portfolio beginning in the late 1990s. Between 2010 and 2014, the period of largest investment, \$444,000 was invested in the machinery and equipment category. In addition, the municipality has plans for \$265,000 in infrastructure capital investments for 2017 for a new firehall generator and snow plough.

7.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 43 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's machinery & equipment assets.

Figure 43 Useful Life Consumption – Machinery & Equipment




While 18% of assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining, 20%, with a valuation of \$183,000, remain in operation beyond their useful life. An additional 34% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

7.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's machinery & equipment assets as of 2016. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its machinery & equipment.

Figure 44 Asset Condition – Machinery & Equipment (Age-based)




Based on age-based data, 32% of assets, with a valuation of \$287,000, are in poor to very poor condition; 46% are in good to very good condition.

7.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's machinery & equipment assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 45 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Machinery & Equipment



In addition to a backlog of \$139,000, the municipality's replacement needs total \$308,000 in the next five years. An additional \$608,000 will be required between 2021-2025. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its machinery & equipment total \$111,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. However, the municipality is currently allocating \$128,000, leaving an annual surplus of \$17,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for maintaining a sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

7.6 Recommendations – Machinery & Equipment

- The municipality should implement a component based condition inspection program for all machinery & equipment assets to better define financial requirements for its machinery and equipment. See Section 2, ‘Condition Assessment Programs’ in the ‘Asset Management Strategies’ chapter.
- Using the above information, the municipality should assess its short-, medium- and long-term capital, and operations and maintenance needs.
- An appropriate percentage of the replacement costs should then be allocated for the municipality’s O&M requirements.
- The municipality is over funding its long-term requirements on an annual basis. See the ‘Financial Strategy’ section on how to maintain sustainable and optimal funding levels.

8. Land Improvements


8.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 13 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's land improvements, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, their replacement cost, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's land improvements assets are valued at \$1.4 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 13 Key Asset Attributes – Land Improvements

Asset Type	Components	Quantity	Useful Life in Years	Valuation Method	2016 Replacement Cost
Land Improvements	Athletic Fields (Backstops, Infield Clay, Landscaping, Fencing, Stands & Washrooms)	3	10, 20, 25, 50	User Defined Cost	\$966,600
	Bike Paths/Walking Trails	2	30	User Defined Cost	\$29,700
	Parking Lots	7	15, 40	User Defined Cost	\$204,780
	Park Assets	1	10, 50	User Defined Cost	\$45,000
	Playground Equipment	1	15	User Defined Cost	\$68,400
	Tennis Courts	1	15	User Defined Cost	\$72,650
Total					\$1,387,130


Figure 46 Asset Valuation – Land Improvements



8.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 47 shows the municipality's historical investments in its land improvements since 1970. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 8.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 47 Historical Investment – Land Improvements




Expenditures in land improvements have fluctuated across the decades. Between 1985 and 1989, the period of largest investment, \$530,000 was invested with a focus on athletic fields.

8.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 48 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's land improvement assets.

Figure 48 Useful Life Consumption – Land Improvements




While 22% of assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining, 64%, with a valuation of \$888,000, remain in operation beyond their useful life. An additional 8% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

8.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section we summarize the condition of the municipality's land improvement assets. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its land improvement assets.

Figure 49 Asset Condition - Land Improvements (Age-Based)




Based on age-based data, 21% of the municipality's land improvement assets, with a valuation of \$298,000, are in good to very good condition; 71% are in poor to very poor condition.

8.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's land improvements assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 50 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Land Improvements



In addition to a backlog of \$888,000, the municipality's replacement needs total \$104,000 in the next five years. An additional \$72,000 will be required between 2021-2025. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its land improvements total \$78,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. However, the municipality is currently allocating \$3,000, leaving an annual deficit of \$75,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs

8.6 Recommendations – Land Improvements

- The municipality should incorporate condition data for its land improvement assets into the AMP analysis to estimate financial needs more precisely. See Section 2, ‘Condition Assessment Programs’ in the ‘Asset Management Strategies’ chapter.
- Using the above information, the municipality should assess its short-, medium- and long-term capital and operations and maintenance needs.
- An appropriate percentage of the replacement costs should then be allocated for the municipality’s O&M requirements.
- The municipality is funding 4% of its long-term replacement needs on an annual basis. See the ‘Financial Strategy’ section on how to achieve more sustainable and optimal funding levels

9. Vehicles


9.1 Asset Portfolio: Quantity, Useful Life and Replacement Cost

Table 14 illustrates key asset attributes for the municipality's vehicles portfolio, including quantities of various assets, their useful life, their replacement cost, and the valuation method by which the replacement costs were derived. In total, the municipality's vehicles assets are valued at \$4 million based on 2016 replacement costs. The useful life indicated for each asset type below was assigned by the municipality.

Table 14 Key Asset Attributes – Vehicles

Asset Type	Components	Quantity	Useful Life in Years	Valuation Method	2016 Replacement Cost
Vehicles	Community Services	1	14	User Defined Cost	\$92,200
	Fire	9	10, 20	User Defined Cost	\$1,147,649
	Public Works	21	8, 10, 12, 15	User Defined Cost/CPI (ON)	\$2,831,484
Total					\$4,071,333


Figure 51 Asset Valuation – Vehicles



9.2 Historical Investment in Infrastructure

Figure 52 shows the municipality's historical investments in its vehicles portfolio since 1970. While observed condition data will provide superior accuracy in estimating replacement needs and should be incorporated into strategic plans, in the absence of such information, understanding past expenditure patterns and current useful life consumption levels (Section 9.3) can inform the forecasting and planning of infrastructure needs and in the development of a capital program. Note that this graph only includes the active asset inventory as of December 31, 2016.

Figure 52 Historical Investment – Vehicles




Investments in vehicles quickly increased starting in the late 1970s. In 2010-2014, the period of largest investment, \$1.3 million was invested with \$1 million put into public works vehicles. In addition, the municipality has plans for \$65,000 in infrastructure capital investments for 2017 for 2 new pick-up trucks.

9.3 Useful Life Consumption

In conjunction with historical spending patterns and observed condition data, understanding the consumption rate of assets based on industry established useful life standards provides a more complete profile of the state of a community's infrastructure. Figure 53 illustrates the useful life consumption levels as of 2016 for the municipality's vehicles.

Figure 53 Useful Life Consumption – Vehicles




7% of assets have at least 10 years of useful life remaining; 34%, with a valuation of \$1.4 million remain in operation beyond their useful life. An additional 26% will reach the end of their useful life within the next five years.

9.4 Current Asset Condition

Using replacement cost, in this section, we summarize the condition of the municipality's vehicles assets as of 2015. By default, we rely on observed field data as provided by the municipality. In the absence of such information, age-based data is used as a proxy. The municipality has not provided condition data for its vehicle assets.

Figure 54 Asset Condition – Vehicles (Age-based)




Age-based data shows that 67% of the municipality's vehicle assets are in poor to very poor condition; 17%, with a valuation of \$648,000 are in good to very good condition.

9.5 Forecasting Replacement Needs

In this section, we illustrate the short-, medium- and long-term infrastructure spending requirements (replacement only) for the municipality's vehicles assets. The backlog is the aggregate investment in infrastructure that was deferred over previous years or decades. In the absence of observed data, the backlog represents the value of assets that remain in operation beyond their useful life.

Figure 55 Forecasting Replacement Needs – Vehicles



In addition to a backlog of \$1.3 million, replacement needs will total over \$1.1 million over the next five years; an additional \$1.3 million will be required between 2021-2025. The municipality's annual requirements (indicated by the black line) for its vehicles total \$319,000. At this funding level, the municipality would be allocating sufficient funds on an annual basis to meet replacement needs as they arise without the need for deferring projects and accruing annual infrastructure deficits. However, the municipality is currently allocating \$241,000, leaving an annual deficit of \$78,000. See the 'Financial Strategy' section for achieving a more optimal and sustainable funding level. Further, while fulfilling the annual requirements will position the municipality to meet its future replacement needs, injection of additional revenues will be needed to mitigate existing infrastructure backlogs.

9.6 Recommendations – Vehicles

- Age-based data indicates a backlog of \$1.3 million and 10-year replacement needs of \$2.4 million. A preventative maintenance and lifecycle assessment program should be established for all vehicle assets to gain a better understanding of current condition and performance as well as the short- and medium-term replacement needs. See Section 2, ‘Condition Assessment Programs’ in the ‘Asset Management Strategies’ chapter.
- Using the above information, the municipality should assess its short-, medium- and long-term capital and operations and maintenance needs.
- An appropriate percentage of the replacement costs should then be allocated for the municipality’s O&M requirements.
- The municipality is funding 76% of its long-term replacement needs on an annual basis. See the ‘Financial Strategy’ section on how to achieve more sustainable and optimal funding levels.

VII. Levels of Service

The two primary risks to a municipality's financial sustainability are the total lifecycle costs of infrastructure, and establishing levels of service (LOS) that exceed its financial capacity. In this regard, municipalities face a choice: overpromise and underdeliver; under promise and overdeliver; or promise only that which can be delivered efficiently without placing inequitable burden on taxpayers. In general, there is often a trade-off between political expedience and judicious, long-term fiscal stewardship.

Developing realistic LOS using meaningful key performance indicators (KPIs) can be instrumental in managing citizen expectations, identifying areas requiring higher investments, driving organizational performance and securing the highest value for money from public assets. However, municipalities face diminishing returns with greater granularity in their LOS and KPI framework. That is, the objective should be to track only those KPIs that are relevant and insightful and reflect the priorities of the municipality.

1. Guiding Principles for Developing LOS

Beyond meeting regulatory requirements, levels of service established should support the intended purpose of the asset and its anticipated impact on the community and the municipality. LOS generally have an overarching corporate description, a customer oriented description, and a technical measurement. Many types of LOS, e.g., availability, reliability, safety, responsiveness and cost effectiveness, are applicable across all service areas in a municipality. The following LOS categories are established as guiding principles for the LOS that each service area in the municipality should strive to provide internally to the municipality and to residents/customers. These are derived from the Town of Whitby's *Guide to Developing Service Area Asset Management Plans*.

Table 15 LOS Categories

LOS Category	Description
Reliable	Services are predictable and continuous; services of sufficient capacity are convenient and accessible to the entire community.
Cost Effective	Services are provided at the lowest possible cost for both current and future customers, for a required level of service, and are affordable.
Responsive	Opportunities for community involvement in decision making are provided; and customers are treated fairly and consistently, within acceptable timeframes, demonstrating respect, empathy and integrity.
Safe	Services are delivered such that they minimize health, safety and security risks.
Suitable	Services are suitable for the intended function (fit for purpose).
Sustainable	Services preserve and protect the natural and heritage environment.

2. Key Performance Indicators and Targets

In this section, we identify industry standard KPIs for major infrastructure classes that the municipality can incorporate into its performance measurement and for tracking its progress over future iterations of its AMPs. The municipality should develop appropriate and achievable targets that reflect evolving demand on infrastructure, its fiscal capacity and the overall corporate objectives.

Table 16 Key Performance Indicators – Road Network and Bridges & Culverts

Level	KPI (Reported Annually)
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of total reinvestment compared to asset replacement value – Completion of strategic plan objectives (related to roads, and bridges & culverts)
Financial Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Annual revenues compared to annual expenditures – Annual replacement value depreciation compared to annual expenditures – Cost per capita for roads, and bridges & culverts – Maintenance cost per square metre – Revenue required to maintain annual network growth – Total cost of borrowing vs. total cost of service
Tactical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Overall Bridge Condition Index (BCI) as a percentage of desired BCI – Percentage of road network rehabilitated/reconstructed – Percentage of paved road lane kilometres rated as poor to very poor – Percentage of bridges and large culverts rated as poor to very poor – Percentage of asset class value spent on O&M
Operational Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of roads inspected within the last five years – Percentage of bridges and large culverts inspected within the last two years – Operating costs for paved lane per kilometres – Operating costs for bridge and large culverts per square metre – Percentage of customer requests with a 24-hour response rate

Table 17 Key Performance Indicators – Buildings & Facilities

Level	KPI (Reported Annually)
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of total reinvestment compared to asset replacement value – Completion of strategic plan objectives (related to buildings & facilities)
Financial Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Annual revenues compared to annual expenditures – Annual replacement value depreciation compared to annual expenditures – Revenue required to meet growth related demand – Repair and maintenance costs per square metre – Energy, utility and water cost per square metre
Tactical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of component value replaced – Percent of facilities rated poor or critical – Percentage of facilities replacement value spent on O&M – Facility utilization rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – $Utilization Rate = \frac{Occupied Space}{Facility Usable Area}$
Operational Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of facilities inspected within the last five years – Number/type of service requests – Percentage of customer requests addressed within 24 hours

Table 18 Key Performance Indicators – Vehicles

Level	KPI (Reported Annually)
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of total reinvestment compared to asset replacement value – Completion of strategic plan objectives (related to vehicles)
Financial Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Annual revenues compared to annual expenditures – Annual replacement value depreciation compared to annual expenditures – Cost per capita for vehicles – Revenue required to maintain annual fleet portfolio growth – Total cost of borrowing vs. total cost of service
Tactical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of all vehicles replaced – Average age of vehicles – Percent of vehicles rated poor or critical – Percentage of vehicles replacement value spent on O&M
Operational Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Average downtime per vehicles category – Average utilization per vehicles category and/or each vehicle – Ratio of preventative maintenance repairs vs. reactive repairs – Percent of vehicles that received preventative maintenance – Number/type of service requests – Percentage of customer requests addressed within 24 hours

Table 19 Key Performance Indicators – Water, Sanitary and Storm Networks

Level	KPI (Reported Annually)
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of total reinvestment compared to asset replacement value – Completion of strategic plan objectives (related to water, sanitary and storm)
Financial Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Annual revenues compared to annual expenditures – Annual replacement value depreciation compared to annual expenditures – Total cost of borrowing compared to total cost of service – Revenue required to maintain annual network growth
Tactical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of water, sanitary and storm network rehabilitated/reconstructed – Annual percentage of growth in water, sanitary and storm network – Percentage of mains where the condition is rated poor or critical for each network – Percentage of water, sanitary and storm network replacement value spent on O&M
Operational Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of water, sanitary and storm network inspected – Operating costs for the collection of wastewater per kilometre of main – Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of main – Operating costs for storm water management (collection, treatment, and disposal) per kilometre of drainage system. – Operating costs for the distribution/transmission of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe – Number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the medical officer of health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect – Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year – Number of customer requests received annually per water, sanitary and storm – Percentage of customer requests addressed within 24 hours per water, sanitary and storm network

Table 20 Key Performance Indicators – Machinery & Equipment

Level	KPI (Reported Annually)
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of total reinvestment compared to asset replacement value – Completion of strategic plan objectives (related to machinery & equipment)
Financial Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Annual revenues compared to annual expenditures – Annual replacement value depreciation compared to annual expenditures – Cost per capita for machinery & equipment – Revenue required to maintain annual portfolio growth – Total cost of borrowing vs. total cost of service
Tactical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of all machinery & equipment replaced – Average age of machinery & equipment assets – Percent of machinery & equipment rated poor or critical – Percentage of vehicles replacement value spent on O&M
Operational Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Average downtime per machinery & equipment asset – Ratio of preventative maintenance repairs vs. reactive repairs – Percent of machinery & equipment that received preventative maintenance – Number/type of service requests

Table 21 Key Performance Indicators – Land Improvements

Level	KPI (Reported Annually)
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of total reinvestment compared to asset replacement value – Completion of strategic plan objectives (related to land improvements)
Financial Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Annual revenues compared to annual expenditures – Annual replacement value depreciation compared to annual expenditures – Cost per capita for supplying parks, playgrounds, etc. – Repair and maintenance costs per square metre
Tactical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percent of land improvements rated poor or critical – Percentage of replacement value spent on O&M – Parkland per capita
Operational Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Percentage of land improvements inspected within the last five years – Number/type of service requests – Percentage of customer requests addressed within 24 hours

3. Future Performance

In addition to a municipality's financial capacity and legislative requirements, many factors, internal and external, can influence the establishment of LOS and their associated KPI. These can include the municipality's overarching mission as an organization, the current state of its infrastructure and the wider social, political and macroeconomic context. The following factors should inform the development of most levels of service targets and their associated KPIs:

Strategic Objectives and Corporate Goals

The municipality's long-term direction is outlined in its corporate and strategic plans. This direction will dictate the types of services it aims to deliver to its residents and the quality of those services. These high-level goals are vital in identifying strategic (long-term) infrastructure priorities and as a result, the investments needed to produce desired levels of service.

State of the Infrastructure

The current state of capital assets will determine the quality of services the municipality can deliver to its residents. As such, levels of service should reflect the existing capacity of assets to deliver those services, and may vary (increase) with planned maintenance, rehabilitation or replacement activities and timelines.

Community Expectations

The general public will often have qualitative and quantitative insights regarding the levels of service a particular asset or a network of assets should deliver, e.g., what a road in 'good' condition should look like or the travel time between destinations. The public should be consulted in establishing LOS; however, the discussions should be centered on clearly outlining the lifecycle costs associated with delivering any improvements in LOS.

Economic Trends

Macroeconomic trends will have a direct impact on the LOS for most infrastructure services. Fuel costs, fluctuations in interest rates and the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar can impede or accelerate any planned growth in infrastructure services.

Demographic Changes

The composition of residents in a municipality can also serve as an infrastructure demand driver, and as a result, can change how a municipality allocates its resources (e.g., an aging population may require diversion of resources from parks and sports facilities to additional wellbeing centers). Population growth is also a significant demand driver for existing assets (lowering LOS), and may require the municipality to construct new infrastructure to parallel community expectations.

Environmental Change

Forecasting for infrastructure needs based on climate change remains an imprecise science. However, broader environmental and weather patterns have a direct impact on the reliability of critical infrastructure services.

4. Monitoring, Updating and Actions

The municipality should collect data on its current performance against the KPIs listed and establish targets that reflect the current fiscal capacity of the municipality, its corporate and strategic goals, and as feasible, changes in demographics that may place additional demand on its various asset classes. For some asset classes, e.g., minor equipment, furniture, etc., cursory levels of service and their respective KPIs will suffice. For major infrastructure classes, detailed technical and customer-oriented KPIs can be critical. Once this data is collected and targets are established, the progress of the municipality should be tracked annually.

VIII. Asset Management Strategies

The asset management strategy section will outline an implementation process that can be used to identify and prioritize renewal, rehabilitation and maintenance activities. This will assist in the development of a 10-year capital plan, including growth projections, to ensure the best overall health and performance of the municipality's infrastructure. This section includes an overview of condition assessment, the lifecycle interventions required, and prioritization techniques, including risk, to determine which capital projects should move forward into the budget first.



1. Non-Infrastructure Solutions & Requirements

The municipality should explore, as requested through the provincial requirements, which non-infrastructure solutions should be incorporated into the budgets for its infrastructure services. Non-infrastructure solutions are such items as studies, policies, condition assessments, consultation exercises, etc., that could potentially extend the life of assets or lower total asset program costs in the future without a direct investment into the infrastructure.

Typical solutions for a municipality include linking the asset management plan to the strategic plan, growth and demand management studies, infrastructure master plans, better integrated infrastructure and land use planning, public consultation on levels of service and condition assessment programs. As part of future asset management plans, a review of these requirements should take place, and a portion of the capital budget should be dedicated for these items in each programs budget.

It is recommended, under this category of solutions, that the municipality should develop and implement holistic condition assessment programs for all asset classes. This will advance the understanding of infrastructure needs, improve budget prioritization methodologies and provide a clearer path of what is required to achieve sustainable infrastructure programs.

2. Condition Assessment Programs

The foundation of an intelligent asset management practice is based on having comprehensive and reliable information on the current condition of the infrastructure. Municipalities need to have a clear understanding regarding the performance and condition of their assets, as all management decisions regarding future expenditures and field activities should be based on this knowledge. An incomplete understanding of an asset may lead to its untimely failure or premature replacement.

Some benefits of holistic condition assessment programs within the overall asset management process are listed below:

- understanding of overall network condition leads to better management practices
- allows for the establishment of rehabilitation programs
- prevents future failures and provides liability protection
- potential reduction in operation/maintenance costs
- accurate current asset valuation
- allows for the establishment of risk assessment programs
- establishes proactive repair schedules and preventive maintenance programs
- avoids unnecessary expenditures
- extends asset service life therefore improving level of service
- improves financial transparency and accountability
- enables accurate asset reporting which, in turn, enables better decision making


Condition assessment can involve different forms of analysis such as subjective opinion, mathematical models, or variations thereof, and can be completed through a very detailed or very cursory approach. When establishing the condition assessment for an entire asset class, a cursory approach (metrics such as good, fair, poor, very poor) is used. This is an economical strategy that will still provide up to date information, and will allow for detailed assessment or follow-up inspections on those assets captured as poor or critical condition later.

The Impact of Condition Assessments

In 2015, PSD published a study in partnership with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO). The report, *The State of Ontario's Roads and Bridges: An Analysis of 93 Municipalities*, enumerated the infrastructure deficits, annual investment gaps, and the physical state of roads, bridges and culverts with a 2013 replacement value of \$28 billion.

A critical finding of the report was the dramatic difference in the condition profile of the assets when comparing age-based estimates and actual field inspection observations. For each asset group, field data based condition ratings were significantly higher than age-based condition ratings, with paved roads, culverts, and bridges showing an increase in score (0-100) of +29, +30, and +23 points respectively. In other words, age-based measurements maybe underestimating the condition of assets by as much as 30%.

Figure 56 Comparing Age-based and Assessed Condition Data



2.1 Pavement Network

Typical industry pavement inspections are performed by consulting firms using specialized assessment vehicles equipped with various electronic sensors and data capture equipment. The vehicles will drive the entire road network and typically collect two different types of inspection data: surface distress data and roughness data.

Surface distress data involves the collection of multiple industry standard surface distresses, which are captured either electronically using sensing detection equipment mounted on the van, or visually by the van's inspection crew. Roughness data capture involves the measurement of the roughness of the road, measured by lasers that are mounted on the inspection van's bumper, calibrated to an international roughness index.

Another option for a cursory level of condition assessment is for municipal road crews to perform simple windshield surveys as part of their regular patrol. Many municipalities have created data collection inspection forms to assist this process and to standardize what presence of defects would constitute a good, fair, poor, or critical score. Lacking any other data for the complete road network, this can still be seen as a good method and will assist greatly with the overall management of the road network.

The municipality will be conducting a pavement condition assessment in 2017. We recommend that a portion of capital funding is dedicated to this.

2.2 Bridges & Culverts

Ontario municipalities are mandated by the Ministry of Transportation to inspect all structures that have a span of 3 metres or more, according to the OSIM (Ontario Structure Inspection Manual).

Structure inspections must be performed by, or under the guidance of, a structural engineer, must be performed on a biennial basis (once every two years), and include such information as structure type, number of spans, span lengths, other key attribute data, detailed photo images, and structure element by element inspection, rating and recommendations for repair, rehabilitation, and replacement.

The best approach to develop a 10-year needs list for the municipality's structure portfolio relies on the structural engineer who performs the inspections to also produce a maintenance requirements report, and rehabilitation & replacement requirements report as part of the overall assignment. In addition to defining the overall needs requirements, the structural engineer should identify those structures that will require more detailed investigations and non-destructive testing techniques. Examples of these investigations are:

- Detailed deck condition survey
- Non-destructive delamination survey of asphalt covered decks
- Substructure condition survey
- Detailed coating condition survey
- Underwater investigation
- Fatigue investigation
- Structure evaluation

Through the OSIM recommendations and additional detailed investigations, a 10-year needs list can be developed for the municipality's bridges.

2.3 Buildings & Facilities

The most popular and practical type of buildings & facilities assessment involves qualified groups of trained industry professionals (engineers or architects) performing an analysis of the condition of a group of facilities and their components, that may vary in terms of age, design, construction methods and materials. This analysis can be done by walk-through inspection (the most accurate approach), mathematical modeling or a combination of both. The following asset classifications are typically inspected:

- **Site Components** – property around the facility and outdoor components such as utilities, signs, stairways, walkways, parking lots, fencing, courtyards and landscaping
- **Structural Components** – physical components such as the foundations, walls, doors, windows, roofs
- **Electrical Components** – all components that use or conduct electricity such as wiring, lighting, electric heaters, and fire alarm systems
- **Mechanical Components** – components that convey and utilize all non-electrical utilities within a facility such as gas pipes, furnaces, boilers, plumbing, ventilation, and fire extinguishing systems
- **Vertical Movement** – components used for moving people between floors of buildings such as elevators, escalators and stair lifts

Once collected, this information can be uploaded into the CityWide®, the municipality's asset management and asset registry software database in order for short- and long-term repair, rehabilitation and replacement reports to be generated to assist with programming the short- and long-term maintenance and capital budgets.

The municipality does conduct regular condition assessments for its buildings assets. It is recommended that this information be incorporated into the future AMPs. It is also recommended that a portion of capital funding is dedicated to this.

2.4 Vehicles and Machinery & Equipment

The typical approach to optimizing the maintenance expenditures of vehicles and machinery & equipment, is through routine vehicle and component inspections, routine servicing, and a routine preventative maintenance program. Most makes and models of vehicles and machinery assets are supplied with maintenance manuals that define the appropriate schedules and routines for typical maintenance and servicing, and also more detailed restoration or rehabilitation protocols.

The primary goal of sound maintenance is to avoid or mitigate the consequence of failure of equipment or parts. An established preventative maintenance program serves to ensure this, as it will consist of scheduled inspections and follow up repairs of vehicles and machinery & equipment in order to decrease breakdowns and excessive downtimes.

A good preventative maintenance program will include partial or complete overhauls of equipment at specific periods, including oil changes, lubrications, fluid changes and so on. In addition, workers can record equipment or part deterioration so they can schedule to replace or repair worn parts before they fail.

The ideal preventative maintenance program would move progressively further away from reactive repairs and instead towards the prevention of all equipment failure before it occurs.

It is recommended that a preventative maintenance routine is defined and established for all vehicles and machinery & equipment assets, and that a software application is utilized for the overall management of the program.

2.5 Water System

Unlike sewer mains, it is often prohibitively difficult to inspect water mains from the inside due to the constant and high-pressure flow of water. A physical inspection requires a disruption of service to residents, can be an expensive exercise and is time consuming to set up. It is recommended practice that physical inspection of water mains typically occurs only for high-risk, large transmission mains within the system, and only when there is a requirement. There are a number of high tech inspection techniques in the industry for large diameter pipes but these should be researched first for applicability as they are quite expensive. Examples include remote eddy field current (RFEC), ultrasonic and acoustic techniques, impact echo (IE), and Georadar.

For the majority of pipes within the distribution network, gathering key information in regards to the main and its environment can supply the best method to determine a general condition. Key data that may be used, along with weighting factors, to determine an overall condition score include age, material type, breaks, hydrant flow inspections and soil condition.

The municipality does conduct regular condition assessments for its water assets. It is recommended that this information be incorporated into the future AMPs. It is also recommended that a portion of capital funding is dedicated to this.

2.6 Sewer Network Inspection (Sanitary and Storm)

The most popular and practical type of sanitary and storm sewer assessment is the use of Closed Circuit Television Video (CCTV). The process involves a small robotic crawler vehicle with a CCTV camera attached that is lowered down a maintenance hole into the sewer main to be inspected.

The vehicle and camera then travel the length of the pipe, providing a live video feed to a truck on the road above where a technician/inspector records defects and information regarding the pipe. A wide range of construction or deterioration problems can be captured, including open/displaced joints, presence of roots, infiltration & inflow, cracking, fracturing, exfiltration, collapse, deformation of pipe and more. Therefore, sewer CCTV inspection is an effective tool for locating and evaluating structural defects and general condition of underground pipes.

Even though CCTV is an excellent option for inspection of sewers, it is a fairly costly process and does take significant time to inspect a large volume of pipes.

Another option in the industry today is the use of Zoom Camera equipment. This is very similar to traditional CCTV, however, a crawler vehicle is not used. Rather, in its place, a camera is lowered down a maintenance hole attached to a pole like piece of equipment. The camera is then rotated towards each connecting pipe and the operator above progressively zooms in to record all defects and information about each pipe. The downside to this technique is the further down the pipe the image is zoomed, the less clarity is available to accurately record defects and measurement. The

upside is the process is far quicker and significantly less expensive and an assessment of the manhole can be provided as well. Also, it is important to note that 80% of pipe deficiencies generally occur within 20 metres of each manhole.

It is recommended that the municipality conduct a wastewater main assessment program and expand it to include storm sewer mains. A portion of capital funding should be dedicated to this.

2.7 Parks and Land Improvements

CSA standards provide guidance on the process and protocols in regards to the inspection of parks and their associated assets, e.g., play spaces and equipment. The land improvements inspection will involve qualified groups of trained industry professionals (operational staff or landscape architects) performing an analysis of the condition of a group of land improvement assets and their components. The most accurate way of determining the condition requires a walk-through to collect baseline data. The following key asset classifications are typically inspected:

- **Physical Site Components** – physical components on the site of the park such as fences, utilities, stairways, walkways, parking lots, irrigation systems, monuments, fountains
- **Recreation Components** – physical components such as playgrounds, bleachers, back stops, splash pads, and benches
- **Land Site Components** – land components on the site of the park such as landscaping, sports fields, trails, natural areas, and associated drainage systems
- **Minor Park Facilities** – small facilities within the park site such as: sun shelters, washrooms, concession stands, change rooms, storage sheds

The municipality does conduct regular condition assessments for its land improvement assets. It is recommended that this information be incorporated into the future AMPs. It is also recommended that a portion of capital funding is dedicated to this.


3. Lifecycle Analysis Framework

An industry review was conducted to determine which lifecycle activities can be applied at the appropriate time in an asset's life, to provide the greatest additional life at the lowest cost. In the asset management industry, this is simply put as doing the right thing to the right asset at the right time. If these techniques are applied across entire asset networks or portfolios (e.g., the entire road network), the municipality can gain the best overall asset condition while expending the lowest total cost for those programs.

3.1 Paved Roads

The following analysis has been conducted at a fairly high level, using industry standard activities and costs for paved roads. With future updates of this asset management strategy, the municipality may wish to run the same analysis with a detailed review of municipality activities used for roads and the associated local costs for those work activities. All of this information can be entered into the CityWide® software suite in order to perform updated financial analysis as more detailed information becomes available. The following diagram depicts a general deterioration profile of a road with a 30-year life.

Figure 57 Paved Road General Deterioration Profile



As shown above, during the road's lifecycle, there are various windows available for work activity that will maintain or extend the life of the asset. These windows are: maintenance; preventative maintenance; rehabilitation; and replacement or reconstruction.

The windows or thresholds for when certain work activities should be applied to also coincide approximately with the condition state of the asset as shown below:

Table 22 Asset Condition and Related Work Activity for Paved Roads

Condition	Condition Range	Work Activity
Very Good (Maintenance only phase)	81-100	– Maintenance only
Good (Preventative maintenance phase)	61-80	– Crack sealing – Emulsions
Fair (Rehabilitation phase)	41-60	– Resurface - mill & pave – Resurface - asphalt overlay – Single & double surface treatment (for rural roads)
Poor (Reconstruction phase)	21-40	– Reconstruct - pulverize and pave – Reconstruct - full surface and base reconstruction
Very Poor (Reconstruction phase)	0-20	– Critical includes assets beyond their useful lives which make up the backlog. They require the same interventions as the 'poor' category above.

With future updates of this asset management strategy, the municipality may wish to review the above condition ranges and thresholds for when certain types of work activity occur, and adjust to better suit the municipality's work program. Also note: when adjusting these thresholds, it actually adjusts the level of service provided and ultimately changes the amount of money required. These thresholds and condition ranges can be updated and a revised financial analysis can be calculated. These adjustments will be an important component of future asset management plans, as the province requires each municipality to present various management options within the financing plan.

It is recommended that the municipality establish a lifecycle activity framework for the various classes of paved road within their transportation network.

3.2 Bridges & Culverts

The best approach to develop a 10-year needs list for the municipality's bridge structure portfolio relies on the structural engineer who performs the inspections to develop a maintenance requirements report, a rehabilitation and replacement requirements report and identify additional detailed inspections as required.

3.3 Buildings & Facilities

The best approach to develop a 10-year needs list for the municipality's facilities portfolio would be to have the engineers, operational staff or architects who perform the facility inspections to also develop a complete portfolio maintenance requirements report and rehabilitation and replacement requirements report, and also identify additional detailed inspections and follow up studies as

required. This may be performed as a separate assignment once all individual facility audits/inspections are complete.

The above reports could be considered the beginning of a 10-year maintenance and capital plan; however, within the facilities industry, there are other key factors that should be considered to determine over all priorities and future expenditures. Some examples would be functional and legislative requirements, energy conservation programs and upgrades, customer complaints and health and safety concerns, and customer expectations balanced with willingness-to-pay initiatives.

It is recommended that the municipality establish a prioritization framework for the facilities asset class that incorporates the key components outlined above.

3.4 Vehicles and Machinery & Equipment


The best approach to develop a 10-year needs list for the municipality's vehicles and machinery & equipment portfolio would first be through a defined preventative maintenance program, and secondly, through an optimized lifecycle vehicle replacement schedule. The preventative maintenance program would serve to determine budget requirements for operating and minor capital expenditures for renewal of parts, and major refurbishments and rehabilitations. An optimized replacement program will ensure a vehicle or equipment asset is replaced at the correct point in time in order to minimize overall cost of ownership, minimize costly repairs and downtime, while maximizing potential re-sale value. There is significant benchmarking information available within the vehicles industry in regard to vehicle lifecycles which can be used to assist in this process. Once appropriate replacement schedules are established, the short- and long-term budgets can be funded accordingly.

There are, of course, functional aspects of vehicles management that should also be examined in further detail as part of the long-term management plan, such as vehicles utilization and incorporating green vehicles, etc. It is recommended that the municipality establish a prioritization framework for the vehicles asset class that incorporates the key components outlined above.

3.5 Sanitary and Storm Sewers

The following analysis has been conducted at a fairly high level, using industry standard activities and costs for sanitary and storm sewer rehabilitation and replacement. With future updates of this asset management strategy, the municipality may wish to run the same analysis with a detailed review of activities used for sewer mains and the associated local costs for those work activities. This information can be input into the CityWide® software suite in order to perform updated financial analysis as more detailed information becomes available. The following diagram depicts a general deterioration profile of a sewer main with a 100-year life.

Figure 58 Sewer Main General Deterioration



As shown above, during the sewer main's lifecycle there are various windows available for work activity that will maintain or extend the life of the asset. These windows are: maintenance; major maintenance; rehabilitation; and replacement or reconstruction. The windows or thresholds for when certain work activities should be applied also coincide approximately with the condition state of the asset as shown below:

Table 23 Asset Condition and Related Work Activity for Sewer Mains


Condition	Condition Range	Work Activity
Very Good (Maintenance only phase)	81-100	– Maintenance only (cleaning & flushing etc.)
Good (Preventative maintenance phase)	61-80	– Mahhole repairs – Small pipe section repairs
Fair (Rehabilitation phase)	41-60	– Structural relining
Poor (Reconstruction phase)	21-40	– Pipe replacement
Very Poor (Reconstruction phase)	0-20	– Critical includes assets beyond their useful lives which make up the backlog. They require the same interventions as the “poor” category above.

With future updates of this asset management strategy the municipality may wish to review the above condition ranges and thresholds for when certain types of work activity occur, and adjust to better suit the municipality's work program. Also note: when adjusting these thresholds, it actually adjusts the level of service provided and ultimately changes the amount of money required. These adjustments will be an important component of future asset management plans, as the province requires each municipality to present various management options within the financing plan.

3.6 Water System

As with roads and sewers, the following analysis has been conducted at a high level, using industry standard activities and costs for water main rehabilitation and replacement. The following diagram depicts a general deterioration profile of a water main with an 80-year life.

Figure 59 Water Main General Deterioration



As shown above, during the water main's lifecycle, there are various windows available for work activity that will maintain or extend the life of the asset. These windows are: maintenance; major maintenance; rehabilitation; and replacement or reconstruction. The windows or thresholds for when certain work activities should be applied also coincide approximately with the condition state of the asset as shown in Table 24.

Table 24 Asset Condition and Related Work Activity for Water Mains

Condition	Condition Range	Work Activity
Very Good (Maintenance only phase)	81-100	– Maintenance only (cleaning & flushing etc.)
Good (Preventative maintenance phase)	61-80	– Water main break repairs – Small pipe section repairs
Fair (Rehabilitation phase)	41-60	– Structural water main relining
Poor (Reconstruction phase)	21-40	– Pipe replacement
Very Poor (Reconstruction phase)	0-20	– Critical includes assets beyond their useful lives which make up the backlog. They require the same interventions as the “poor” category above.

4. Growth and Demand

Growth is a critical infrastructure demand driver for most infrastructure services. As such, the municipality must not only account for the lifecycle cost for its existing asset portfolio, but those of any anticipated and forecasted capital projects associated specifically with growth. Based on the 2016 census, the population for Cramahe has increased 4.6% since 2011 to reach 6,355. Population changes will require the municipality to determine the impact to expected levels of service and if any changes to the existing asset inventory may be required.

5. Project Prioritization and Risk Management

Generally, infrastructure needs exceed municipal capacity. As such, municipalities rely heavily on provincial and federal programs and grants to finance important capital projects. Fund scarcity means projects and investments must be carefully selected based on the state of infrastructure, economic development goals, and the needs of an evolving and growing community. These factors, along with social and environmental considerations will form the basis of a robust risk management framework.

5.1 Defining Risk Management

From an asset management perspective, risk is a function of the consequences of failure (e.g., the negative economic, financial, and social consequences of an asset in the event of a failure); and, the probability of failure (e.g., how likely is the asset to fail in the short- or long-term). The consequences of failure are typically reflective of:

- **An asset's importance in an overall system:**
For example, the failure of an individual computer workstation for which there are readily available substitutes is much less consequential and detrimental than the failure of a network server or telephone exchange system.
- **The criticality of the function performed:**
For example, a mechanical failure on a road construction equipment may delay the progress of a project, but a mechanical failure on a fire pumper truck may lead to immediate life safety concerns for fire fighters, and the public, as well as significant property damage.
- **The exposure of the public and/or staff to injury or loss of life:**
For example, a single sidewalk asset may demand little consideration and carry minimum importance to the municipality's overall pedestrian network and performs a modest function. However, members of the public interact directly with the asset daily and are exposed to potential injury due to any trip hazards or other structural deficiencies that may exist.

The probability of failure is generally a function of an asset's physical condition, which is heavily influenced by the asset's age and the amount of investment that has been made in the maintenance and renewal of the asset throughout its life.


Risk mitigation is traditionally thought of in terms of safety and liability factors. In asset management, the definition of risk should heavily emphasize these factors but should be expanded to consider the risks to the municipality's ability to deliver targeted levels of service

- The impact that actions (or inaction) on one asset will have on other related assets
- The opportunities for economic efficiency (realized or lost) relative to the actions taken

5.2 Risk Matrices

Using the logic above, a risk matrix will illustrate each asset's overall risk, determined by multiplying the probability of failure (PoF) scores with the consequence of failure (CoF) score, as illustrated in the table that follow. This can be completed as a holistic exercise against any data set by determining which factors (or attributes) are available and will contribute to the PoF or CoF of an asset. Figure 60 (known as a bowtie model in the risk industry) illustrates this concept. The probability of failure is increased as more and more factors collude to cause asset failure.

Figure 60 Bow Tie Risk Model



Probability of Failure

In this AMP, the probability of a failure event is predicted by the condition of the asset.

Table 25 Probability of Failure – All Assets

Asset Classes	Condition Rating	Probability of Failure
ALL	0-20 Very Poor	5 – Very High
	21-40 Poor	4 – High
	41-60 Fair	3 – Moderate
	61-80 Good	2 – Low
	81-100 Excellent	1 – Very Low

Consequence of Failure

The consequence of failure for the asset classes analyzed in this AMP will be determined either by the replacement costs of assets, or other attributes as relevant. These attributes include material types, classifications, or size. Asset classes for which replacement cost is used include: bridges & culverts, buildings & facilities, land improvements, vehicles, and machinery & equipment. This approach is premised on the assumption that the higher the replacement cost, the larger (and likely more important) the asset, requiring a higher risk scoring.

Assets for which other attributes are used include: water, wastewater, storm and roads. Attributes are selected based on their impact on service delivery. Scoring for roads, the risk is based on classification as it reflects the traffic volumes and number of people affected. For linear infrastructure, pipe diameter is used to estimate a suitable consequence of failure score as it reflects the potential upstream service area affected. The municipality does not have pipe diameter information available for its sanitary and storm assets therefore a risk rating cannot be provided for these categories. It is recommended that this information is incorporated into future AMPs.

Table 26 Consequence of Failure – Roads

Road Classification	Consequence of failure
Gravel	Score of 1
Surface Treated	Score of 3
Hot Mix (Paved)	Score of 5

Table 27 Consequence of Failure – Bridges & Culverts

Replacement Value	Consequence of failure
Up to \$200k	Score of 1
\$201 to \$400k	Score of 2
\$401 to \$800k	Score of 3
\$801 to \$1 Million	Score of 4
\$1 Million and over	Score of 5

Table 28 Consequence of Failure – Water Mains

Pipe Diameter	Consequence of Failure
Less than 100mm	Score of 1
101–150mm	Score of 2
151–200mm	Score of 3
201–250mm	Score of 4
251mm and over	Score of 5

Table 29 Consequence of Failure – Buildings & Facilities

Replacement Value	Consequence of failure
Up to \$50k	Score of 1
\$51k to \$100k	Score of 2
\$101k to \$300k	Score of 3
\$301k to \$1 million	Score of 4
Over \$1 million	Score of 5

Table 30 Consequence of Failure – Machinery & Equipment

Replacement Value	Consequence of failure
Up to \$10k	Score of 1
\$11k to \$20k	Score of 2
\$21k to \$30k	Score of 3
\$31k to \$50k	Score of 4
Over \$50k	Score of 5

Table 31 Consequence of Failure – Land Improvements

Replacement Value	Consequence of failure
Up to \$25k	Score of 1
\$26k to \$50k	Score of 2
\$51k to \$80k	Score of 3
\$81k to \$100k	Score of 4
Over \$100k	Score of 5

Table 32 Consequence of Failure – Vehicles

Replacement Value	Consequence of failure
Up to \$25k	Score of 1
\$26k to \$50k	Score of 2
\$51k to \$100k	Score of 3
\$101k to \$250k	Score of 4
Over \$250k	Score of 5

The risk matrices that follow show the distribution of assets within each asset class according to the probability and likelihood of failure scores as discussed above.

Figure 61 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – All Asset Classes




Figure 62 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Road Network



Figure 63 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Bridges & Culverts

Consequence	5	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$1,479,259	0 Assets - \$0
	4	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$1,865,787	0 Assets - \$0
	3	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$505,084	0 Assets - \$0	7 Assets 7 unit(s) \$4,033,899	0 Assets - \$0
	2	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$382,781	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$269,697	6 Assets 6 unit(s) \$1,796,072	5 Assets 5 unit(s) \$1,339,287
	1	0 Assets - \$0	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$138,873	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	17 Assets 17 unit(s) \$1,844,531
		1	2	3	4	5
		Probability				

Figure 64 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Water System

Consequence	5	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 611 m \$1,222,000	1 Assets 20 m \$15,000
	4	0 Assets - \$0	3 Assets 935 m \$748,000	1 Assets 1,776 m \$1,420,800	3 Assets 1,546 m \$1,158,500	0 Assets - \$0
	3	4 Assets 1,316 m \$1,043,500	7 Assets 1,395 m \$1,056,250	1 Assets 301 m \$240,800	23 Assets 4,750 m \$3,586,500	0 Assets - \$0
	2	5 Assets 1,035 m \$776,750	1 Assets 185 m \$138,750	0 Assets - \$0	23 Assets 5,785 m \$4,338,950	0 Assets - \$0
	1	1 Assets 275 m \$281,250	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	12 Assets 3,914 m \$1,771,121	0 Assets - \$0
		1	2	3	4	5
		Probability				

Figure 65 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Buildings & Facilities

Consequence	5	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$4,093,960	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$4,185,000	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$2,816,860
	4	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$773,160	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$1,311,190	5 Assets 5 unit(s) \$3,093,070
	3	0 Assets - \$0	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$424,730	3 Assets 3 unit(s) \$574,980	3 Assets 3 unit(s) \$498,070	4 Assets 4 unit(s) \$766,710
	2	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$99,900	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$91,630	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$54,510	6 Assets 6 unit(s) \$430,800
	1	8 Assets 207 unit(s), sq ft \$173,000	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$37,530	3 Assets 3 unit(s) \$60,910	0 Assets - \$0	10 Assets 10 unit(s) \$271,850
		1	2	3	4	5
		Probability				

Figure 66 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Machinery & Equipment

Consequence	5	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$99,400	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0
	4	2 Assets 1 unit(s) \$75,173	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$34,034	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$36,411	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$35,254	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$85,148
	3	2 Assets 46 unit(s) \$56,500	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$27,000	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$45,400	0 Assets - \$0	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$48,000
	2	4 Assets 26 unit(s) \$59,000	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$20,000	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$30,300	0 Assets - \$0	5 Assets 5 unit(s) \$67,100
	1	14 Assets 25 unit(s) \$23,019	6 Assets 10 unit(s) \$16,150	3 Assets 3 unit(s) \$15,400	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$5,700	12 Assets 12 unit(s) \$45,600
		1	2	3	4	5
		Probability				

Figure 67 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Land Improvements

Consequence	5	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	3 Assets 3 unit(s) \$362,100
	4	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$89,500	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0
	3	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$65,600	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$57,800	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$68,400	0 Assets - \$0
	2	2 Assets 79 unit(s) \$71,810	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$39,800	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$33,700	10 Assets 10 unit(s) \$406,680
	1	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$36,190	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$34,550	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	12 Assets 12 unit(s) \$121,000
		1	2	3	4	5
		Probability				

Figure 68 Distribution of Assets Based on Risk – Vehicles

Consequence	5	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$297,000	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$266,700	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$258,689	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$272,100
	4	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$238,440	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$168,089	4 Assets 4 unit(s) \$745,975	5 Assets 5 unit(s) \$1,078,585
	3	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$65,500	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$153,100	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$65,000	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$147,200
	2	0 Assets - \$0	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$32,471	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$80,000	0 Assets - \$0	4 Assets 4 unit(s) \$144,319
	1	1 Assets 1 unit(s) \$15,000	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	0 Assets - \$0	2 Assets 2 unit(s) \$43,165
		1	2	3	4	5
		Probability				

IX. Financial Strategy

1. General Overview

In order for an AMP to be effective and meaningful, it must be integrated with financial planning and long-term budgeting. The development of a comprehensive financial plan will allow the municipality to identify the financial resources required for sustainable asset management based on existing asset inventories, desired levels of service and projected growth requirements.



Figure 69 Cost Elements




Figure 69 depicts the various cost elements and resulting funding levels that should be incorporated into AMPs that are based on best practices. Municipalities meeting their operational and maintenance needs, and debt obligations are funding only their cash cost. Funding at this level is severely deficient in terms of lifecycle costs.

Meeting the annual amortization expense based on the historical cost of investment will ensure municipalities adhere to accounting rules implemented in 2009; however, funding is still deficient for long-term needs. As municipalities graduate to the next level and meet renewal requirements, funding at this level ensures that need and cost of full replacement is deferred. If municipalities meet inflation requirements, they're positioning themselves to meet replacement needs at existing levels of service. In the final level, municipalities that are funding for service enhancement and growth requirements are fiscally sustainable and cover future investment needs.

This report develops a financial plan by presenting several scenarios for consideration and culminating with final recommendations. It includes recommendations that avoid long-term funding deficits. As outlined below, the scenarios presented model different combinations of the following components:

- the financial requirements (as documented in the SOTI section of this report) for existing assets, existing service levels, requirements of contemplated changes in service levels (none identified for this plan), and requirements of anticipated growth (none identified for this plan)
- use of traditional sources of municipal funds including tax levies, user fees, reserves, debt, and development charges
- use of non-traditional sources of municipal funds, e.g., reallocated budgets
- use of senior government funds, such as the federal Gas Tax Fund, Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund (OCIF)

If the financial plan component of an AMP results in a funding shortfall, the province requires the inclusion of a specific plan as to how the impact of the shortfall will be managed. In determining the legitimacy of a funding shortfall, the province may evaluate a municipality's approach to the following:

- In order to reduce financial requirements, consideration has been given to revising service levels downward.
- All asset management and financial strategies have been considered. For example:
 - If a zero debt policy is in place, is it warranted? If not, the use of debt should be considered.
 - Do user fees reflect the cost of the applicable service? If not, increased user fees should be considered.

2. Financial Profile: Tax Funded Assets

2.1 Funding Objective

We have developed scenarios that would enable the municipality to achieve full funding within five to 20 years for the following assets: road network; bridges & culverts; storm network; buildings & facilities; machinery & equipment; land improvement; and vehicles. For each scenario developed, we have included strategies, where applicable, regarding the use of tax revenues, user fees, reserves and debt.

2.2 Current Funding Position

Table 33 and Table 34 outline, by asset class, the municipality's average annual asset investment requirements, current funding positions, and funding increases required to achieve full funding on assets funded by taxes.

Table 33 Infrastructure Requirements and Current Funding Available: Tax Funded Assets

Asset class	Average Annual Investment Required	Total Funding Available in 2017					Annual Deficit/Surplus
		Taxes	Gas Tax	OCIF	Reserves	Total Funding Available	
Road Network	826,000	97,000	176,000	50,000	221,000	544,000	282,000
Bridges & Culverts	269,000	0	0	0	20,000	20,000	249,000
Storm Sewer System	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	60,000
Machinery & Equipment	111,000	0	0	0	128,000	128,000	-17,000
Facilities	580,000	0	0	0	47,000	47,000	533,000
Land Improvements	78,000	0	0	0	3,000	3,000	75,000
Vehicles	319,000	0	0	0	241,000	241,000	78,000
Total	2,243,000	97,000	176,000	60,000	660,000	983,000	1,260,000

2.3 Recommendations for Full Funding

The average annual investment requirement for tax funded categories is \$2,243,000. Annual revenue currently allocated to these assets for capital purposes is \$983,000, leaving an annual deficit of \$1,260,000. To put it another way, these infrastructure categories are currently funded at 44% of their long-term requirements.

In 2017, the municipality had annual tax revenues of \$5,208,000. As illustrated in Table 34, without consideration of any other sources of revenue, full funding would require the following tax change over time:

Table 34 Tax Change Required for Full Funding

Asset class	Tax Change Required for Full Funding
Road Network	5.4%
Bridges & Culverts	4.8%
Storm Sewer System	1.2%
Machinery & Equipment	-0.3%
Facilities	10.2%
Land Improvements	1.4%
Vehicles	1.5%
Total	24.2%

The following changes in costs and/or revenues over the next number of years should also be considered in the financial strategy:

- Cramahe's formula based OCIF grant is scheduled to grow from \$50,000 in 2017 to \$92,000 in 2019.
- As shown in Table 42, Cramahe's debt payments for these asset categories will be increasing by \$75,000 over the next 5 years and by \$75,000 over the next 10 years. Although not shown in the table, debt payment increases will be \$75,000 over the next 15 and 20 years.

Our recommendations include capturing the above changes and allocating them to the infrastructure deficit. Table 35 outlines this concept and presents a number of options.

Table 35 Effect of Changes in OCIF Funding and Reallocating Decreases in Debt Costs

	Without Capturing Changes				With Capturing Changes			
	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Infrastructure Deficit	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000
Change in OCIF Grant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000	-42,000
Changes in Debt Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Resulting Infrastructure Deficit	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,293,000	1,293,000	1,293,000	1,293,000
Resulting Tax Increase Required:								
Total Over Time	24.2%	24.2%	24.2%	24.2%	24.8%	24.8%	24.8%	24.8%
Annually	4.8%	2.4%	1.6%	1.2%	5.0%	2.5%	1.7%	1.2%

Considering all of the above information, we recommend the 10-year option that includes capturing the changes. This involves full funding being achieved over 10 years by:

- when realized, reallocating the debt cost increases of \$75,000 to the infrastructure deficit as outlined above.
- increasing tax revenues by 2.5% each year for the next 10 years solely for the purpose of phasing in full funding to the tax funded asset classes covered in this AMP.
- allocating the current gas tax and OCIF revenue as outlined in Table 33.
- allocating the scheduled OCIF grant increases to the infrastructure deficit as they occur.
- Reallocating appropriate revenue from categories in a surplus position to those in a deficit position.
- increasing existing and future infrastructure budgets by the applicable inflation index on an annual basis in addition to the deficit phase-in.

Notes:

- As in the past, periodic senior government infrastructure funding will most likely be available during the phase-in period. By Provincial AMP rules, this periodic funding cannot be incorporated into an AMP unless there are firm commitments in place. We have included OCIF formula based funding, if applicable, since this funding is a multi-year commitment.
- We realize that raising tax revenues by the amounts recommended above for infrastructure purposes will be very difficult to do. However, considering a longer phase-in window may have even greater consequences in terms of infrastructure failure.

Although this option achieves full funding on an annual basis in 20 years and provides financial sustainability over the period modeled, the recommendations do require prioritizing capital projects to fit the resulting annual funding available. Current data shows a pent-up investment demand of \$1,985,000 for paved roads, \$2,789,000 for bridges & culverts, \$177,000 for storm sewers, \$139,000 for machinery & equipment, \$3,809,000 for facilities, \$889,000 for land improvements and \$1,256,000 for vehicles. Prioritizing future projects will require the current data to be replaced by condition based data. Although our recommendations include no further use of debt, the results of the condition based analysis may require otherwise.

3. Financial Profile: Rate Funded Assets

3.1 Funding Objective

We have developed scenarios that would enable the municipality to achieve full funding within five to 20 years for the following assets: water, and wastewater. For each scenario developed we have included strategies, where applicable, regarding the use of tax revenues, user fees, reserves and debt.

3.2 Current Funding Position

Table 36 and Table 37 outline, by asset class, the municipality's average annual asset investment requirements, current funding positions, and funding increases required to achieve full funding on assets funded by rates.

Table 36 Summary of Infrastructure Requirements and Current Funding Available

Asset class	Average Annual Investment Required	Total Funding Available in 2016				Annual Deficit/Surplus
		Rates	To Operations	Other	Total Funding Available	
Wastewater Network	530,000	638,000	-563,000	0	75,000	455,000
Water Network	330,000	640,000	-140,000	0	500,000	-170,000
Total	860,000	1,278,000	-703,000	0	575,000	285,000

3.3 Recommendations for Full Funding

The average annual investment requirement for wastewater services and water services is \$860,000. Annual revenue currently allocated to these assets for capital purposes is \$575,000 leaving an annual deficit of \$285,000. To put it another way, these infrastructure categories are currently funded at 67% of their long-term requirements.

In 2017, Cramahe has annual wastewater revenues of \$638,000 and annual water revenues of \$640,000. As illustrated in Table 37, without consideration of any other sources of revenue, full funding would require the following increases over time:

Table 37 Rate Change Required for Full Funding

Asset class	Rate Change Required for Full Funding
Wastewater Network	84.3%
Water Network	-32.1%

As illustrated in Table 42, Cramahe's debt payments for wastewater services will be decreasing by \$61,000 over the next 5 years and by \$185,000 over the next 10 years. Although not shown in the table, debt payment decreases will be \$185,000 over the next 15 years and 20 years. For water services, there is no change in debt payments.

Our recommendations include capturing the above changes and allocating them to the infrastructure deficit outlined above. The tables below outline this concept and present a number of options.

Table 38 Without Change in Debt Costs

	Wastewater Network			Water Network		
	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Infrastructure Deficit	455,000	455,000	455,000	-170,000	-170,000	-170,000
Change in Debt Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Resulting Infrastructure Deficit/Surplus	455,000	455,000	455,000	-170,000	-170,000	-170,000
Resulting Rate Increase Required:						
Total Over Time	84.3%	84.3%	84.3%	-32.1%	-32.1%	-32.1%
Annually	8.4%	5.6%	4.2%	-3.2%	-2.1%	-1.6%

Table 39 With Change in Debt Costs

	Wastewater Network			Water System		
	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years
Infrastructure Deficit	455,000	455,000	455,000	-170,000	-170,000	-170,000
Change in Debt Costs	-185,000	-185,000	-185,000	0	0	0
Resulting Infrastructure Deficit/Surplus	270,000	270,000	270,000	-170,000	-170,000	-170,000
Resulting Rate Increase Required:						
Total Over Time	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	-32.1%	-32.1%	-32.1%
Annually	5.0%	3.3%	2.5%	-3.2%	-2.1%	-1.6%

Recommendations for water services:

At least two factors need to be quantified before implementing the above reductions for water services:

- Age based data shows a pent-up investment demand of \$845,000 for water services. Prioritizing future projects will require the age based data to be replaced by condition based data. The results of the condition based analysis may identify different pent up investment requirements. As a result, rates should not be decreased until a detailed work plan is developed for these projects based on their actual condition. A corresponding financial plan can then be developed taking into account that there are \$1,625,000 of reserves available for water infrastructure (as noted in Table 43).
- 22% of water revenues are currently allocated to operations as opposed to capital. Overall rates should not be decreased until longer term operational requirements are determined and taken into account. This will avoid the complications of lowering rates for capital purposes and then possibly increasing them for operational requirements.

We recommend that the required work for the above points be completed in order to determine what rate reductions can be achieved and over what period those reductions can be implemented.

Recommendations for wastewater services:

Considering all of the above information, we recommend the 20-year option in Table 39 that includes the reallocations. This involves full funding being achieved over 20 years by:

- when realized, reallocating the debt cost reductions of \$185,000 for sanitary services to the infrastructure deficit.
- increasing rate revenues by 2.5% for sanitary services each year for the next 20 years solely for the purpose of phasing in full funding to the asset categories covered in this section of the AMP.
- increasing existing and future infrastructure budgets by the applicable inflation index on an annual basis in addition to the deficit phase-in.

Notes:

- As in the past, periodic senior government infrastructure funding will most likely be available during the phase-in period. By Provincial AMP rules, this periodic funding cannot be incorporated into an AMP unless there are firm commitments in place. We have included OCIF formula based funding, if applicable, since this funding is a multi-year commitment.
- We realize that raising rate revenues by the amounts recommended above for infrastructure purposes will be very difficult to do. However, considering a longer phase-in window may have even greater consequences in terms of infrastructure failure.
- Any increase in rates required for operations would be in addition to the above recommendations.

Although this option achieves full funding on an annual basis in 15 years and provides financial sustainability over the period modeled, the recommendations do require prioritizing capital projects to fit the resulting annual funding available. Current data shows a pent-up investment demand of \$1,437,000 for wastewater services and \$845,000 for water services. Prioritizing future projects will require the current data to be replaced by condition based data. Although our recommendations include no further use of debt, the results of the condition based analysis may require otherwise.

4. Use of Debt

For reference purposes, Table 40 outlines the premium paid on a project if financed by debt. For example, a \$1M project financed at 3.0%³ over 15 years would result in a 26% premium or \$260,000 of increased costs due to interest payments. For simplicity, the table does not take into account the time value of money or the effect of inflation on delayed projects.


Table 40 Total Interest Paid as a Percentage of Project Costs

Interest Rate	Number of Years Financed					
	5	10	15	20	25	30
7.0%	22%	42%	65%	89%	115%	142%
6.5%	20%	39%	60%	82%	105%	130%
6.0%	19%	36%	54%	74%	96%	118%
5.5%	17%	33%	49%	67%	86%	106%
5.0%	15%	30%	45%	60%	77%	95%
4.5%	14%	26%	40%	54%	69%	84%
4.0%	12%	23%	35%	47%	60%	73%
3.5%	11%	20%	30%	41%	52%	63%
3.0%	9%	17%	26%	34%	44%	53%
2.5%	8%	14%	21%	28%	36%	43%
2.0%	6%	11%	17%	22%	28%	34%
1.5%	5%	8%	12%	16%	21%	25%
1.0%	3%	6%	8%	11%	14%	16%
0.5%	2%	3%	4%	5%	7%	8%
0.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

³ Current municipal Infrastructure Ontario rates for 15 year money is 3.2%.

It should be noted that current interest rates are near all-time lows. Sustainable funding models that include debt need to incorporate the risk of rising interest rates. The following graph shows where historical lending rates have been:

Figure 70 Historical Prime Business Interest Rates



As illustrated in Table 40, a change in 15-year rates from 3% to 6% would change the premium from 26% to 54%. Such a change would have a significant impact on a financial plan.

Table 41 and Table 42 outline how Cramahe has historically used debt for investing in the asset categories as listed. There is currently \$1,157,000 of debt outstanding for the assets covered by this AMP with corresponding principal and interest payments of \$341,000, well within its provincially prescribed maximum of \$1,736,000.

Table 41 Overview of Use of Debt

Asset class	Current Outstanding Debt	Use of Debt in Last Five Years				
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Road Network	0	0	0	0	0	2,050,000
Bridges & Culverts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storm Sewer System	0	0	0	0	0	0
Machinery & Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilities	153,000	0	0	0	0	2,200,000
Land Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Tax Funded	153,000	0	0	0	0	4,250,000
Wastewater Network	1,004,000	0	0	0	0	0
Water Network	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Rate Funded	1,004,000	0	0	0	0	0

Table 42 Overview of Debt Costs

Asset class	Principal & Interest Payments in Next Ten Years						
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2027
Road Network	0	112,000	112,000	112,000	112,000	112,000	112,000
Bridges & Culverts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storm Sewer System	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Machinery & Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Facilities	156,000	119,000	119,000	119,000	119,000	119,000	119,000
Land Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Tax Funded	156,000	231,000	231,000	231,000	231,000	231,000	231,000
Wastewater Network	185,000	185,000	185,000	124,000	124,000	124,000	0
Water Network	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Rate Funded	185,000	185,000	185,000	124,000	124,000	124,000	0

The revenue options outlined in this plan allow Cramahe to fully fund its long-term infrastructure requirements without further use of debt. However, project prioritization based on replacing age-based data with observed data for several tax funded and rate funded classes may require otherwise.

5. Use of Reserves

5.1 Available Reserves

Reserves play a critical role in long-term financial planning. The benefits of having reserves available for infrastructure planning include: the ability to stabilize tax rates when dealing with variable and sometimes uncontrollable factors; financing one-time or short-term investments; accumulating the funding for significant future infrastructure investments; managing the use of debt; and, normalizing infrastructure funding requirements. By infrastructure class, Table 43 outlines the details of the reserves currently available to Cramahe.

Table 43 Summary of Reserves Available

Asset class	Balance at December 31 st , 2016
Road Network	502,000
Bridges & Culverts	41,000
Storm Sewer System	0
Machinery & Equipment	907,000
Facilities	257,000
Land Improvements	88,000
Vehicles	405,000
Total Tax Funded	2,200,000
Water System	1,625,000
Wastewater Services	547,000
Total Rate Funded	2,172,000

There is considerable debate in the municipal sector as to the appropriate level of reserves that a municipality should have on hand. There is no clear guideline that has gained wide acceptance. Factors that municipalities should take into account when determining their capital reserve requirements include: breadth of services provided, age and condition of infrastructure, use and level of debt, economic conditions and outlook, and internal reserve and debt policies.

The reserves in Table 43 are available for use by applicable asset classes during the phase-in period to full funding. This, coupled with Cramahe's judicious use of debt in the past, allows the scenarios to assume that, if required, available reserves and debt capacity can be used for high priority and emergency infrastructure investments in the short to medium-term.

5.2 Recommendation

As Cramahe updates its AMP, we recommend that future planning should include determining what its long-term reserve balance requirements are and a plan to achieve such balances.

X. 2016 Infrastructure Report Card

The following infrastructure report card illustrates the municipality's performance on the two key factors: Asset Health and Financial Capacity. Appendix 1 provides the full grading scale and conversion chart, as well as detailed descriptions, for each grading level.

Table 44 2016 Infrastructure Report Card

Asset class	Asset Health Grade	Funding Percentage	Financial Capacity Grade	Average Asset Class Grade	Comments
Roads	C	66%	C	C	Based on 2016 replacement cost, and age-based data, 36% of assets, with a valuation of \$43.5 million, are in good to very good condition; 49% are in poor to very poor condition.
Bridges & Culverts	F	7%	F	F	
Water System	D	152%	A	C	
Wastewater Services	C	14%	F	F	
Storm	C	0%	F	F	
Buildings & Facilities	D	8%	F	F	The municipality is underfunding its assets. Tax-funded categories are funded at 44% while rate-funded categories are funded at 67%.
Machinery & Equipment	C	115%	A	B	
Land Improvements	F	4%	F	F	
Vehicles	D	76%	C	D	
Average Asset Health Grade			D		
Average Financial Capacity Grade			F		
Overall Grade for the Municipality			D		

XI. Appendix: Grading and Conversion Scales

Table 45 Asset Health Scale

Letter Grade	Rating	Description
A	Excellent	Asset is new or recently rehabilitated
B	Good	Asset is no longer new, but is fulfilling its function. Preventative maintenance is beneficial at this stage.
C	Fair	Deterioration is evident but asset continues to full its function. Preventative maintenance is beneficial at this stage.
D	Poor	Significant deterioration is evident and service is at risk.
F	Very Poor	Asset is beyond expected life and has deteriorated to the point that it may no longer be fit to fulfill its function.

Table 46 Financial Capacity Scale

Letter Grade	Rating	Funding percent	Timing Requirements	Description
A	Excellent	90-100 percent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Term	The municipality is fully prepared for its short-, medium- and long-term replacement needs based on existing infrastructure portfolio.
B	Good	70-89 percent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Term	The municipality is well prepared to fund its short-term and medium-term replacement needs but requires additional funding strategies in the long-term to begin to increase its reserves.
C	Fair	60-69 percent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Term	The municipality is underprepared to fund its medium- to long-term infrastructure needs. The replacement of assets in the medium-term will likely be deferred to future years.
D	Poor	40-59 percent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Term	The municipality is not well prepared to fund its replacement needs in the short-, medium- or long-term. Asset replacements will be deferred and levels of service may be reduced.
F	Very Poor	0-39 percent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Term	The municipality is significantly underfunding its short-term, medium-term, and long-term infrastructure requirements based on existing funds allocation. Asset replacements will be deferred indefinitely. The municipality may have to divest some of its assets (e.g., bridge closures, arena closures) and levels of service will be reduced significantly.