Local Government Asset Management Assessment Form
for Federal Gas Tax Agreement Funding Program

The assessment is a mandatory requirement for fulfilling commitments of the Community Works Fund (CWF) Agreement between the Union of BC Municipalities and local governments in BC. As such, this assessment is fully supported and guided by the Gas Tax Agreement Partnership Committee.

This assessment was developed in consultation with local government and Asset Management BC in order to provide baseline data on asset management for individual local governments and provide a provincial baseline of asset management practices, a reporting requirement under the Gas Tax Agreement. Be assured that data collected for this assessment will be used to generate a provincial perspective on asset management and that its findings will only be shared cumulatively. UBCM will not be reporting on the status of individual local governments.

The assessment and results depend on accurate responses that are based on best available information. Given the nature of asset management, it should be expected that multiple departments at your local government may contribute data for this assessment.

The Assessment Form

For this assessment we are looking for data on infrastructure assets your organization owned as of December 31, 2014.

The assessment is broken up into two parts. Part one of the assessment consists of high-level overview of current asset management practices following the process laid out by the Asset Management for Sustainable Service Delivery: A BC Framework for sustainable service delivery. Part two focuses on the condition and financial status of local government owned infrastructure for six asset categories: Roads & Bridges, Potable Water, Stormwater, Wastewater, Sports & Recreation, and Buildings. Attached below is a glossary of terms that can be referred to while the assessment form is being filled out.

This assessment should be considered a corporate directed initiative lead by your local governments CAO and/or CFO. Further to these instructions, a question & answer piece regarding local governments commitments to improving asset management practices and other available resources to support sustainable service delivery for local governments.

We suggest that your local government select a coordinator to facilitate your local governments assessment submission. The deadline for submitting the assessment is July 15, 2016.

How to Submit the Assessment

Unique links to the assessment form have been created for each individual local government. This link is not to be shared outside your local government. The link automatically saves and recalls information as you open, close and move through the assessment. Furthermore PDF and Word documents of the assessment form can be downloaded at any point during the completion of the form. Only responses that have been entered will be displayed. While the save and recall function works well, it is encouraged that local governments download a copy of the assessment before closing the form. This ensures that in the event that data is lost a copy of the pending submission is always on file.

A PDF copy of the assessment form is available for local governments to use internally to collect data. The coordinator can share the PDF form with colleagues and later collect the responses, entering them into the online assessment form. Only the online assessment form submission will be accepted as a complete submission.

If you have any questions please contact Christina Ross, Gas Tax Project Assistant at cross@ubcm.ca or by phone at (250) 356-7123.

Asset Management Assessment Form

Asset Management Assessment Form

Welcome to the Local Government Asset Management Assessment Form for Federal Gas Tax Funding Programs

Thank you for taking part in this important assessment on asset management (referred to herein as AM). This assessment is a mandatory requirement for fulfilling AM commitments set out in the Community Works Fund Agreement between local governments in BC and the Union of BC Municipalities. This assessment was developed and approved by the Gas Tax Agreement Partnership Committee in consultation with local governments and Asset Management BC.

Responses from this assessment will be used to:

- Generate much needed baseline data on the 'status' of AM in British Columbia;
- Measure local government's progress towards meeting AM commitments found in the Community Works Fund Agreement; and
- Support UBCM in the role as advocate for local government in British Columbia.

Please refer to the introduction provided for instructions on how to contribute your local government's responses.

Confidentiality Statement

Be assured that data collected for this assessment will be used to generate a provincial perspective on asset management and that its findings will only be shared cumulatively. UBCM will not be reporting on the status of individual local governments.

Part 1 - Asset Management Framework

One purpose of this assessment is to gather baseline data on local government asset management in British Columbia. In order to undertake this effort effectively, we require each local government to complete the assessment form to the best of their ability, based on information and data that they currently possess. Not having access to data that is required to complete this form is important information. This will establish areas for improvement as asset management practices are improved over time. The outcomes of this form will in no way be used to score or rate local governments. This form establishes a baseline, where future Gas Tax reporting requirements will establish progress, which reflects the commitment, identified in the Gas Tax Agreement.

Part 1 of this assessment form is comprised of five sections and was modeled after the Asset Management for Sustainable Service Delivery: A BC Framework (the Framework). AM is an integrated process of continuous quality improvement where people, assets, information, and finances intersect to provide sustainable service delivery. A comprehensive AM process should include what is described within the Framework. To achieve sustainable service delivery, local governments must assess, plan, and implement AM practices while engaging communities, informing decision makers and reviewing practices on a continuous basis. The integrated process of AM requires attention and contribution from all divisions of the organization.

The terminology used in this form is based on the process described in the Framework. With that said, AM practices will likely vary from one local government to another, therefore the terminology and steps found within this form may not be familiar to you. Please refer to the glossary for more information. It may also be beneficial to have the AM documents/tools listed below available for reference over the duration of the assessment. In addition to the Framework, two other documents are referred to in this assessment form.

They include:

AssetSmart 2.0: A tool that local governments can use to assess and improve organizational capacity for AM.

Guide for Using the Asset Management BC Roadmap: A guide to assist local governments in implementing and improving AM practices.

Contact Information

UBCM will be following up with local governments after assessment forms have been submitted. Please provide contact information for the person coordinating the completion of this form.

Form Coordinator

First Name

Last Name

Title

Phone Number

Email

Section 1: Capacity Building for Asset Management

Core Elements & Capacity Building

People, information, assets, and finances comprise the core of the AM process. As described in the Framework, these four elements are considered core resources required to support the process of AM, and thus necessary for sustainable service delivery.

C.1) Has your local government established a formal AM process?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Other _____

If you need additional space, provide your explanation for 'Other' here:

C.2) AssetSMART 2.0 is a tool used by local governments to assess and improve organizational capacity. Has your local government used AssetSMART to evaluate organizational capacity for AM?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

C.2.1) If you selected Yes to question C.2, choose the option that best describes how your organization became familiar with AssetSMART:

- ○ Staff completed a internally lead (lead by your local government) training session.
- ○ Staff completed a consultant lead training session.
- ○ Other _____

If you need additional space, provide your explanation for 'Other' here:

C.2.2) If you selected Yes to question C.2, Based on your previous assessment using AssetSMART 2.0, for each of the four core elements indicate your local governments overall capacity level for AM:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Unknown
Assets	○	○	○	○	○
Information	○	○	○	○	○
Finances	○	○	○	○	○
People	○	○	○	○	○

Section 1: Capacity Building for Asset Management

People

AM is a corporate responsibility where the importance of having the right people and the right processes cannot be overlooked. Understanding the process of AM is essential for informed decision-making, inclusive governance and improving service delivery over time. When it comes to AM, focusing in on people ensures that communication is central to the process of AM and not an afterthought.

C.3) What best describes the leadership approach for AM at your local government (Select all that apply):

- ☐ A single individual (consultant) is hired to lead AM.
- ☐ AM is led by individual staff following a bottom-up approach.
- ☐ AM is led by council/board members.
- ☐ A combination of staff and council/board members lead AM following an integrated approach.
- ☐ AM is led by CAO/CFO following a corporate, top-down approach.
- ☐ An AM department leads AM activities.
- ☐ Other, please specify... _____

If you need additional space, provide your explanation for 'Other' here:

C.4) What best describes AM communication and information sharing practices between staff and AM leads at your local government (Select all that apply):

- ☐ All staff understand the need for AM.
- ☐ Some staff understand the need for AM.
- ☐ Staff understand the benefits of AM.
- ☐ Staff understand their role in AM.
- ☐ Staff understand the need for continuous learning to develop their knowledge, experience and capacity for AM.
- ☐ Staff work plans include time for AM activities.
- ☐ Integration of AM practices across departments/divisions is commonplace.
- ☐ Other, please specify... _____

If you need additional space, provide your explanation for 'Other' here:

C.5) What best describes AM communication and information sharing practices with elected officials and AM leads at your local government (Select all that apply):

- ☐ Elected officials understand the need for AM.
- ☐ Elected officials understand the benefits of AM.
- ☐ Elected officials have championed AM activities as a special interest.
- ☐ Progress on AM implementation is shared with elected officials.
- ☐ Elected officials understand the need for continuous learning to develop their knowledge, experience and capacity for AM.
- ☐ Elected officials endorse AM practices.
- ☐ Integration of AM practices across departments/divisions is commonplace.
- ☐ Other, please specify... _____

If you need additional space, provide your explanation for 'Other' here:

Section 1: Capacity Building for Asset Management

Finances

A holistic understanding of infrastructure required to deliver services, and associated long-term costs, is a critical element of AM. Proactive AM will yield fewer service disruptions and lower life cycle costs than a reactive approach to repair and replacement. Having a clear picture of future cash flow requirements with time is invaluable for local governments working to implement sustainable service delivery practices.

C.6) Has your local government established a specific levy(s) for AM renewal/replacement of existing capital assets?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Other, please specify... _____

If you need additional space, provide your explanation for 'Other' here:

Reserve Funds

C.7) Select the option that best describes your local governments reserve fund:

- ○ Non-existent, there are no reserves in place.
- ○ Minimal reserves are in place, but are restricted to use.
- ○ Reserves in place to buffer short-term revenue fluctuations.
- ○ Moderate reserves are held, but are restricted to use.
- ○ Asset management reserve strategies are in place to build reserve levels established in accordance with a long-term financial plan.
- ○ Asset management reserves are held and replenished at levels established in accordance with a long-term financial plan.
- ○ Asset management reserve strategies under development.

Debt

C.8) Select the option that best describes your local governments debt level:

- ○ Debt levels are high with no plan in place to reduce debt.
- ○ Debt levels are high and a debt management strategy is being considered.
- ○ Debt levels are reasonable, but debt is trending upwards.
- ○ Debt levels are prudent and reasonable; Debt is a tool we use strategically and is in line with a long-term financial plan.
- ○ Other:

Revenue

C.9) Select the option that best describes your local governments revenue stream(s):

- ○ Revenues fluctuate year to year with no linkages between reserves and a long-term financial plan.
- ○ Revenues are sufficient and reliable to fund requirements for the next five years.
- ○ Revenues are sufficient and reliable to fund requirements for the next 10 years.
- ○ Revenues are sufficient, predicable, and stable to fund long term sustainable service delivery.
- ○ Major controllable revenues are sufficient, predictable and stable to fund long term sustainable service delivery.

Section 2: Assets

Asset Assessment

The assessment of individual asset categories is essential for developing a clear understanding of the current state of assets. An asset inventory is used to consolidate information on assets from diverse sources. Sources may include past assessments, studies, plans, records, reporting requirements such as the Public Sector Account Board (PSAB 3150), and staff knowledge.

Referring to the questions that follow, evaluate the current quality of AM data available to your local government for all asset categories as a whole. Each response option is described below:

Underdeveloped - Completeness and accuracy of data is unknown, availability of data is unknown, and generally work on this topic has not been confirmed.

Competent - Foundation of AM, data is not necessarily complete or fully accurate, information gaps exist, significant amount of missing data, but is sufficient for basic AM assessment.

Strong - Improved level of completeness and accuracy of data as compared to competent, detailed and accurate analysis, greater understanding of current and future situations.

Outstanding - High level of accuracy and completeness of data, continuous improvement practices in place, long term planning in effect.

Not developed – Work on this topic has not commenced.

A.1) Location of Assets

	Underdeveloped	Competent	Strong	Outstanding	Not Developed
Information on the location of assets are:	○	○	○	○	○

A.2) Condition of Assets

	Underdeveloped	Competent	Strong	Outstanding	Not Developed
Information on the age of assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Information on the installation dates for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Information on the remaining useful life of assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Information on the expected retirement of assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Information on the quality and suitability of assets are:	○	○	○	○	○

A.3) Level of Service

	Underdeveloped	Competent	Strong	Outstanding	Not Developed
Available information on customer level of service are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on technical level of service are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on existing asset capacity levels are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on existing asset demand are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on expected future demand are:	○	○	○	○	○

A.4) Risk

	Underdeveloped	Competent	Strong	Outstanding	Not Developed
Risk assessments have been completed for assets:	○	○	○	○	○
Information on potential risks that may impact sustainable service delivery are:	○	○	○	○	○
The criticality (perceived importance) regarding asset(s) failure is:	○	○	○	○	○
Assets have a risk register that accounts for the consequence of failure:	○	○	○	○	○
Assets have a risk register that accounts for the probability of failure:	○	○	○	○	○
Renewal, repair and/or replacement of assets is prioritized by risk or consequence of failure:	○	○	○	○	○

A.4.1) If risk assessments have been completed, when (date) and for which assets have they been completed for?

e.g. All potable and waste water pipes, 2011 or All recreation centres (including pools, ice rinks, and recreation buildings), 2014

A.5) Current Expenditures

	Underdeveloped	Competent	Strong	Outstanding	Not Developed
Available information on capital renewal costs for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on operational costs for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on planned maintenance costs for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on reactive maintenance costs for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on historical costs for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on current replacement costs for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on write-down and disposal costs for assets are:	○	○	○	○	○
Available information on expected dates for acquiring new assets are:	○	○	○	○	○

Section 3: Planning for Asset Management

The Framework recognizes there are many components to AM. This section focuses on planning activities, comprising policy and strategy development, creation of asset plan(s) for individual asset categories and integration of these components into long-term financial plans. The Framework is one of many formal AM planning or process styles that can be utilized by local governments. The questions found below focus on outcomes, some if not most of which, will already be built into your local government's existing AM planning process.

Asset Management Policy

An AM policy is a document approved by elected representatives that formalizes corporate commitments to sustainable service delivery. The policy broadly outlines principles and guides the development and implementation of AM across the organization, connecting it back to community objectives.

P.1) What best describes your local governments AM policy (Select all that apply):

- ☐ An AM policy does not exist.
- ☐ The policy establishes corporate commitments to AM.
- ☐ The policy has been integrated into corporate plans.
- ☐ The policy provides context for AM integration over all lines of business.
- ☐ The policy ensures that service levels meet community priorities.
- ☐ The policy ensures that service levels meet council/board priorities.
- ☐ The policy defines clear expectations for developing asset inventories.
- ☐ The policy defines clear expectations for the maintenance of asset inventories.
- ☐ The policy makes commitments for working towards improving service levels.
- ☐ The policy makes commitments for working towards extending the useful life of assets.
- ☐ The policy provides staff with direction for integrating AM plans into the Long Term Financial Plan.
- ☐ The policy sets clear expectations for monitoring assets.
- ☐ The policy sets clear expectations for reporting on the status of assets.
- ☐ The policy provides a commitment for staff to report regularly to the community on the status of the policy.
- ☐ The policy has been endorsed by council/board.
- ☐ The policy sets clear expectations for review, update and/or replacement.
- ☐ An AM policy exists, but none of these selections apply.

Section 3: Planning for Asset Management

Asset Management Strategy

An AM strategy is a corporate-level document that links policy and day-to-day implementation of AM to other corporate initiatives.

P.2) What best describes your local governments AM strategy (Select all that apply):

- ☐ An AM strategy does not exist.
- ☐ The strategy outlines AM practices.
- ☐ The strategy outlines connections to the AM policy.
- ☐ The strategy describes the current state of assets.
- ☐ The strategy identifies target levels of service.
- ☐ The strategy identifies a desired level of service for each asset.
- ☐ The strategy identifies service delivery risks to be managed.
- ☐ The strategy provides AM implementation guidelines for each asset category.
- ☐ The strategy establishes estimated timelines for improving each asset category.
- ☐ The strategy communicates how AM is linked to corporate plans.
- ☐ The strategy summarizes projected resource requirements for developing a AM plan(s).
- ☐ The strategy summarizes projected future resource requirements for AM.
- ☐ The strategy makes commitments for annual reporting on AM to the community.
- ☐ The strategy provides direction for improving capacity levels.
- ☐ The strategy is aligned with community priorities.
- ☐ The strategy sets clear expectations for AM updates.
- ☐ The strategy identifies an approach for updating the strategy.
- ☐ An AM strategy exists, but none of these selections apply.

Section 3: Planning for Asset Management

Asset Management Plans

An AM plan tells the story of the asset category it discusses. It is typical to have an AM plan for each asset category and/or a corporate AM plan that compiles information on individual assets categories into a single document.

P.3) What best describes your local governments status towards completing AM plans for all asset categories:

- ○ AM plans have not been developed for any asset categories.
- ○ Less than twenty-five percent (25%) of asset categories have AM plans.
- ○ Between twenty-five percent (25%) and fifty percent (50%) of asset categories have AM plans.
- ○ Between fifty percent (50%) and seventy-five percent (75%) of asset categories have AM plans.
- ○ Between seventy-five percent (75%) and ninety-nine percent (99%) of asset categories have AM plans.
- ○ All asset categories have AM plans.

P.4) What best describes your local governments AM plan(s) (Select all that apply):

- ☐ AM plan(s) do not exist.
- ☐ Plan(s) support the implementation of the AM policy and strategy.
- ☐ Plan(s) contain condition-based lifecycle adjustments.
- ☐ Plan(s) comprise information on asset condition.
- ☐ Plan(s) provide information on current level of service.
- ☐ Plan(s) provide information on desired level of service.
- ☐ Plan(s) describe gaps between current and desired levels of service.
- ☐ Plan(s) establish service goals.
- ☐ Plan(s) take community priorities into consideration.
- ☐ Plan(s) describe known risks.
- ☐ Plan(s) describe innovative practices.
- ☐ Plan(s) utilize a standardized approach when discussing assets.
- ☐ Plan(s) describe staff resources required to meet goals.
- ☐ Plan(s) provide a timeline for implementation.
- ☐ Plan(s) provide a timeline for plan reviews.
- ☐ Plan(s) provide criteria for plan review.
- ☐ AM plan(s) exist, but none of these selections apply.

Section 3: Planning for Asset Management

Integration of Long Term Financial Plans and Asset Management Plans

Integration of AM plans with Long Term Financial Plans (LTFP) is necessary for sustainable service delivery. Integrating services, assets, and financial resources leads to actionable plans that can stabilize costs over the long-term, allowing for realistic goals to be set. The LTFP identifies gaps between AM funding needs and the reality of available funding to support that need. Overall, the integration of the LTFP and AM plans creates a balance between service wants and funding realities.

Terminology

Capital asset renewal is the replacement of like for like assets that already exist.

Capital asset upgrade typically expands levels of service on existing assets.

New assets are not in the current level of service or are created to sustain the same level of service for all citizens when a local government experiences growth/development

P.5) Select the option that best describes your local governments LTFP:

- ○ Our local government does not have a LTFP.
- ○ Our local governments LTFP is based on less then a four year planning cycle.
- ○ Our local governments LTFP is based on a four year planning cycle.
- ○ Our local governments LTFP is based on a five to 10 year planning cycle.
- ○ Our local governments LTFP is based on a 11-20 year planning cycle.
- ○ Our local governments LTFP is based on more than a 20 year planning cycle.

P.6) What best describes the integration of your local governments AM & LTFP plans (Select all that apply):

- ☐ An LTFP does not exist.
- ☐ AM plan(s) do not exist.
- ☐ AM plan integration with the LTFP is in progress.
- ☐ The LTFP exists, but linkages between AM plan(s) and LTFP have not been made.
- ☐ The LTFP identifies gaps between AM long-term potential needs and available funding.
- ☐ The LTFP includes an overview of requirements for capital asset renewal (see above for description).
- ☐ The LTFP includes an overview of requirements for capital asset upgrades (see above for description).
- ☐ The LTFP includes an overview of requirements for new capital assets (see above for description).
- ☐ The LTFP includes an overview of requirements for asset operations.
- ☐ The LTFP includes an overview of requirements for asset maintenance.
- ☐ The LTFP identifies opportunities for reducing costs associated with assets.
- ☐ The LTFP identifies opportunities for increased funding to support assets.
- ☐ The LTFP provides a basis for developing AM strategies for service, asset and financial sustainability.

- ☐ The LTFP provides a basis for reviewing service sustainability.
- ☐ The LTFP provides a basis for reviewing asset sustainability.
- ☐ The LTFP provides a basis for reviewing financial sustainability.
- ☐ The LTFP provides a basis for updating AM plans with financial strategies for sustainability.
- ☐ The LTFP provides a basis for updating the AM strategy with financial strategies for sustainability.
- ☐ The LTFP includes performance measures to track moving toward financial sustainability.
- ☐ The LTFP provides criteria for AM plan review.

Section 4: Implementation of Asset Management

Implementing Asset Management Practices

AM objectives, plans, and practices are developed to be implemented. Much of the work related to implementation is focused on regular updating of asset information and improvement projects in order to manage risk and improve service delivery.

I.1) What best describes you local governments AM implementation practices (Select all that apply):

- ☐ AM implementation practices are not defined.
- ☐ Practices include updating asset inventories on a regular basis.
- ☐ Practices include updating asset replacement costs as needed.
- ☐ Practices include implementing risk management plans.
- ☐ Practices include implementing asset maintenance projects.
- ☐ Practices include implementing asset renewal projects.
- ☐ Practices include holding regular AM team meetings to review implementation progress.
- ☐ Practices include reviewing lifecycle analysis of assets.
- ☐ Practices include updating related corporate plans to reflect changes in AM practices.
- ☐ Practices include implementing appropriate AM systems to support the management of AM data.
- ☐ Practices include developing staff knowledge transfer and succession plans.
- ☐ Practices include updating and/or developing job descriptions to align with AM requirements.
- ☐ Practices include using AM data to guide decision making.
- ☐ Practices ensure that quality information on assets is available to staff who require it.
- ☐ AM implementation practices exist, but none of these selections apply.

Section 4: Implementation of Asset Management

Measuring Progress & Improvement

AM is a process of continuous improvement. Best practices in progress measurement use high-level, corporate-wide indicators expressed in financial terms. These indicators are tangible and measurable, used to highlight connections between cost and service tracking performance trends over time.

I.2) What best describes your local government's progress towards measuring AM activities (Select all that apply):

- ☐ AM activities are not measured.
- ☐ We measure progress toward sustainable service delivery using best practice, high level corporate wide indicators that track progress annually over long periods of time.
- ☐ We measure progress toward reducing infrastructure backlogs using best practice, high level corporate wide indicators that track progress annually over long periods of time.
- ☐ We measure high level cost of service, for each service, using measures our citizens can easily relate to and understand.
- ☐ Measuring AM activities has resulted in the development of strategies that reduce infrastructure backlogs.
- ☐ Measuring AM activities has resulted in the development of strategies for reaching desired service levels.
- ☐ Measuring AM activities is used to identify communication pieces to highlight for community education and outreach.
- ☐ Performance measures include tracking customer satisfaction.
- ☐ Performance measures include tracking technical levels of service.
- ☐ Measuring AM activities is used to identify efficient and effective cost recovery opportunities.
- ☐ The Asset Management BC Roadmap is used to measure AM activities.
- ☐ Other best practice tools are used to measure AM activities.
- ☐ AM activities are measured, but none of these selections apply.

I.2.1) If you selected this option above, based on your experience with the Asset Management BC Roadmap, choose the selection that best describes your local government's current level of AM:

- ○ Basic
- ○ Intermediate
- ○ Advanced
- ○ Our current level of AM is unknown
- ○ Other, please specify... _____

If you need additional space, provide your explanation for 'Other' here:

I.2.2) If you selected this option above, describe in further detail the other best practice tools that are used by your local government to measure AM activities:

I.3) Describe below your local governments approach for measuring financial benefits of AM:

This may include measuring operating surplus ratio, net financial liabilities ratio, asset sustainability ratio, asset consumption ratio, asset renewal funding ratio, funding gap analysis, etc.

I.4) Describe below your local governments approach for measuring social benefits of AM:

This may include measuring reduction in the number of complaints received, increase in service provision, increase in service levels, decrease in number of assets considered as poor/very poor quality, active living increases across demographics, increase in users at recreation facilities/programs, etc.

I.5) Describe below your local governments approach for measuring environmental benefits of AM:

This may include measuring demand management practices/programs, reduction in GHG emissions, increases in energy savings/recovery, reduction in number of waste water non-compliance days, increase in number of good/excellent air quality days, increase in number of good/excellent water quality days, increase in activities related to erosion control/mitigation, increase in activities related to flood control/mitigation, ecological benefits valued as asset classes, inclusion of natural capital within asset categories, etc.

Section 4: Implementation of Asset Management

Reporting on Asset Management Progress

Reporting on AM demonstrates measurable progress towards implementing AM commitments and achieving sustainable service delivery. Reporting on AM activities guides informed decision making and educates community members while demonstrating progress towards sustainable service delivery.

I.6) What best describes your local governments current AM reporting practices (Select all that apply):

- ☐ Reporting on AM implementation has not started.
- ☐ AM reports are easy to read.
- ☐ AM reporting utilizes asset condition and indicator data to tell the AM story.
- ☐ Reporting on AM includes debriefing staff.
- ☐ Reporting on AM includes debriefing council/board.
- ☐ AM reports are available for staff and council/board to review.
- ☐ AM reports are prepared in accordance with LTFP reviews.
- ☐ Reporting on AM is completed on an annual basis.
- ☐ AM reports are available for community members to review.
- ☐ Information related to AM (process/reporting) is easy to access (online, printed).
- ☐ Reporting on AM includes a public outreach component.
- ☐ Reporting on AM includes public education component.
- ☐ Reporting on AM is completed, but none of these selections apply.

Section 5: Formal Asset Management Planning Process

F.1) What best describes the AM activities your local government has undertaken to date (Select all that apply):

- ☐ Assessed the current state of assets.
- ☐ Developed an asset inventory for at least one asset category.
- ☐ Developed an AM policy.
- ☐ Developed an AM strategy.
- ☐ Developed AM plan(s) for renewal assets (existing assets).
- ☐ Developed AM plan(s) for upgrading assets and new assets.
- ☐ Integrated AM activities into a long term financial plan.
- ☐ Established AM implementation practices.
- ☐ Measured progress towards meeting AM goals.
- ☐ Reported to staff on the progress of AM.
- ☐ Reported to council/board members on the progress of AM.
- ☐ Reported to public on the progress of AM.
- ☐ Reviewed AM practices.
- ☐ Updated a portion of AM inventories.
- ☐ Updated all AM inventories.
- ☐ AM activities are being developed, but none of these selections currently apply.
- ☐ To date no AM management activities have been undertaken.

This concludes Part 1 of the Asset Management Assessment Form.

Press the "Next" button to continue to Part 2 of this form.

Part 2 - Condition, Replacement & Renewal for Asset Categories

Where Part 1 of the Asset Management Assessment Form focused on AM from a comprehensive, high level process perspective, Part 2 is dedicated to specific asset categories and associated asset components. Part 2 is modeled after components found in the Canadian Infrastructure Report Card form.

Part 2 of this form is comprised of six sections. Each section is broken up into four subsections: condition status, estimated replacement value, annual renewal budget, and replacement value/historical cost ratio.

The sections are as follows:

Section 6: Roads & Bridges

Section 7: Potable Water

Section 8: Stormwater

Section 9: Wastewater

Section 10: Sports & Recreation Facilities (including parks, trails, wharves, airports, and harbors)

Section 11: Other Building & Facilities

Recognizing that within your local government there will be a range in values, for the purposes of the form, you are providing cumulative or average score within each asset category/sub category.

The form coordinator, if not able to complete the form independently, can consider delegating the completion of these sections to an appropriate department and/or division that works directly with the asset category in question.

Section 6: Roads & Bridges

Asset Condition Assessment

The assessment of individual asset categories is essential for developing a clear understanding on the current state of assets. An asset inventory is used to consolidate information on assets from diverse sources. Sources may include past assessments, studies, plans, records, reporting requirements such as the Public Sector Account Board (PSAB 3150), and staff knowledge.

6.1) For the following asset components, describe the status of the asset:

Highways	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Arterial	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Collectors	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Locals	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Lanes & Alleys	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Sidewalks	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Bridges	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Culverts >3 m	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.
Footbridges	○	Asset is owned by the local government.
	○	Asset is not owned by the local government.

6.1.2) Referring to the asset categories provided, for each physical condition option enter a percentage for each category listed under the road & bridge network owned by your organization.

Each response option is described below:

Very poor/Critical: <20% of estimated service level remaining. Near or beyond expected service life, widespread signs of advanced deterioration, some assets may be unusable.

Poor: 20-39% of estimated service level remaining. Approaching end of service life, condition below standard, large portion of system exhibits significant deterioration.

Fair: 40-59% of estimated service level remaining. Signs of deterioration, some elements exhibit deficiencies.

Good: 60-79% of estimated service level remaining. Acceptable, generally approaching mid stage of expected service life.

Very Good: 80-100% of estimated service level remaining. Well maintained, good condition, new or recently rehabilitated.

No Information:

The asset is owned by the local government, but data on the asset is not available; or

The asset is not owned by the local government.

Each owned asset must equal 100%.

Scroll Right --->	No Information	Very poor/Critical	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Highways	☐					
Arterials	☐					
Collectors	☐					
Locals	☐					
Lanes & Alleys	☐					
Sidewalks	☐					
Bridges	☐					
Culverts >3 m	☐					
Footbridges	☐					

Section 6: Roads & Bridges

Estimated Replacement Costs and Annual Renewal Budgets

Accurate replacement costs are based on the condition assessment of an asset. This condition assessment defines an assets remaining life. The historical cost adjusted for inflation, to an assets projected end of life (based on condition) is a sensible first improvement over PSAB 3150 accumulated amortization. The actual cost of present-day, like-for-like renewal or contributed assets (either a local or geographically near example) projected to its end of life (based on condition) is by far the best.

Estimated replacement values refers to the approximate cost at the present time required to replace an asset, including demolition costs. Do not include land costs or overhead such as administration.

Annual renewal budget refers to information on the rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement of infrastructure.

The historical value for this question should conform with the PSAB 3150 standards.

6.2) In 2014, what was the historical value for the road & bridge network components owned by your organization? What was the estimated replacement value for the entire road & bridge network components owned by your organization? What was the annual renewal budget for the entire road & bridge network components owned by your organization?

Include the value of all associated assets such as signs, guardrails, lighting, on-road cycle lanes/paved shoulder bikeways, sidewalks, and fences. In the event that the cumulative value for roads & bridges is not separated by asset component (highway, arterial, etc.) an option allows you to enter the cumulative value the bottom of this page.

IF INDIVIDUAL ASSET COMPONENT VALUES ARE UNKNOWN, LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0" AND ONLY SUBMIT THE CUMULATIVE VALUE.

IF THERE IS NO DATA TO PROVIDE or YOUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT OWN THE ASSET LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0".

	Historical Value (from PSAB 3150)	Estimated Replacement Value	Annual Renewal Budget
Highway			
Arterial			
Collector			
Local			
Lanes & Alleys			
Sidewalks			
Bridges			
Culverts >3 m			

Footbridges			
Cumulative Value for Road & Bridge Assets			

Section 7: Potable Water

Asset Condition Assessment

The assessment of individual asset categories is essential for developing a clear understanding on the current state of assets. An asset inventory is used to consolidate information on assets from diverse sources. Sources may include past assessments, studies, plans, records, reporting requirements such as the Public Sector Account Board (PSAB 3150), and staff knowledge.

7.1) For the following asset components, describe the status of the asset:

Local (dia. <416 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Transmission (dia. >416 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Water Treatment Plants (incl. Wells)	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Water Pump Stations	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Water reservoirs	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.

7.1.2) Referring to the asset categories provided, for each physical condition option enter a percentage for each category listed under the potable water network owned by your organization.

Each response option is described below:

Very poor/Critical: <20% of estimated service level remaining. Near or beyond expected service life, widespread signs of advanced deterioration, some assets may be unusable.

Poor: 20-39% of estimated service level remaining. Approaching end of service life, condition below standard, large portion of system exhibits significant deterioration.

Fair: 40-59% of estimated service level remaining. Signs of deterioration, some elements exhibit deficiencies.

Good: 60-79% of estimated service level remaining. Acceptable, generally approaching mid stage of expected service life.

Very Good: 80-100% of estimated service level remaining. Well maintained, good condition, new or recently rehabilitated.

No Information:

The asset is owned by the local government, but data on the asset is not available; or

The asset is not owned by the local government.

Each owned asset must equal 100%.

Scroll Right --->	No Information	Very poor/Critical	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Local (dia. <416 mm)	☐					
Transmission (dia. >416 mm)	☐					
Water Treatment Plants (incl. Wells)	☐					
Water Pump Stations	☐					
Water Reservoirs	☐					

Section 7: Potable Water

Estimated Replacement Costs and Annual Renewal Budgets

Accurate replacement costs are based on the condition assessment of an asset. This condition assessment defines an assets remaining life. The historical cost adjusted for inflation, to an assets projected end of life (based on condition) is a sensible first improvement over PSAB 3150 accumulated amortization. The actual cost of present-day, like-for-like renewal or contributed assets (either a local or geographically near example) projected to its end of life (based on condition) is by far the best.

Estimated replacement values refers to the approximate cost at the present time required to replace an asset, including demolition costs. Do not include land costs or overhead such as administration.

Annual renewal budget refers to information on the rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement of infrastructure.

The historical value for this question should conform with the PSAB 3150 standards.

7.2) In 2014, what was the historical value for the potable water network components owned by your organization? What was the estimated replacement value for the entire potable water network components owned by your organization? What was the annual renewal budget for the entire potable water network components owned by your organization?

IF INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT VALUES ARE UNKNOWN, LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0" AND ONLY SUBMIT THE CUMULATIVE VALUE.

IF THERE IS NO DATA TO PROVIDE or YOUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT OWN THE ASSET LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0".

	Historical Value (from PSAB 3150)	Estimated Replacement Value	Annual Renewal Budget
Local (dia. >416 mm)			
Transmission (dia. <416 mm)			
Water Treatment Plants (incl. Wells)			
Water Pump Stations			
Water Reserviors			
Cumulative Value for Potable Water Assets			

Section 8: Stormwater

Asset Condition Assessment

The assessment of individual asset categories is essential for developing a clear understanding on the current state of assets. An asset inventory is used to consolidate information on assets from diverse sources. Sources may include past assessments, studies, plans, records, reporting requirements such as the Public Sector Account Board (PSAB 3150), and staff knowledge.

8.1) For the following asset components, describe the status of the asset:

Culverts (dia. <3 m)	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Stormwater Pipes (dia. <450 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Stormwater Pipes (dia. 450-1500 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Stormwater Pipes (dia. >1500 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Drainage Pump Stations	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Stormwater Management Facilities	○ Asset is owned by the local government.
	○ Asset is not owned by the local government.

8.1.2) Referring to the asset categories provided, for each physical condition option enter a percentage for each category listed under the stormwater network owned by your organization.

Each response option is described below:

Very poor/Critical: <20% of estimated service level remaining. Near or beyond expected service life, widespread signs of advanced deterioration, some assets may be unusable.

Poor: 20-39% of estimated service level remaining. Approaching end of service life, condition below standard, large portion of system exhibits significant deterioration.

Fair: 40-59% of estimated service level remaining. Signs of deterioration, some elements exhibit deficiencies.

Good: 60-79% of estimated service level remaining. Acceptable, generally approaching mid stage of expected service life.

Very Good: 80-100% of estimated service level remaining. Well maintained, good condition, new or recently rehabilitated.

No Information:

The asset is owned by the local government, but data on the asset is not available; or

The asset is not owned by the local government.

Scroll Right --->	No Information	Very poor/Critical	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Culverts (dia. <3 m)	☐					
Stormwater Pipes (dia. <450 mm)	☐					
Stormwater Pipes (dia. 450-1500 mm)	☐					
Stormwater Pipes (dia. >1500 mm)	☐					
Drainage Pump Stations	☐					
Stormwater Management Facilities	☐					

Section 8: Stormwater

Estimated Replacement Costs and Annual Renewal Budgets

Accurate replacement costs are based on the condition assessment of an asset. This condition assessment defines an assets remaining life. The historical cost adjusted for inflation, to an assets projected end of life (based on condition) is a sensible first improvement over PSAB 3150 accumulated amortization. The actual cost of present-day, like-for-like renewal or contributed assets (either a local or geographically near example) projected to its end of life (based on condition) is by far the best.

Estimated replacement values refers to the approximate cost at the present time required to replace an asset, including demolition costs. Do not include land costs or overhead such as administration.

Annual renewal budget refers to information on the rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement of infrastructure.

The historical value for this question should conform with the PSAB 3150 standards.

8.2) In 2014, what was the historical value for the stormwater network components owned by your organization? What was the estimated replacement value for the entire stormwater network components owned by your organization? What was the annual renewal budget for the entire stormwater network components owned by your organization?

IF INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT VALUES ARE UNKNOWN, LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0" AND ONLY SUBMIT THE CUMULATIVE VALUE.

IF THERE IS NO DATA TO PROVIDE or YOUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT OWN THE ASSET LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0".

	Historical Value (from PSAB 3150)	Estimated Replacement Value	Annual Renewal Budget
Culverts (dia. <3 m)			
Stormwater Pipes (dia. <450 mm)			
Stormwater Pipes (dia. 450-1500 mm)			
Stormwater Pipes (dia. >1500 mm)			
Drainage Pump Stations			
Stormwater Management Facilities			
Cumulative Value for Stormwater Assets			

Section 9: Wastewater

Asset Condition Assessment

The assessment of individual asset categories is essential for developing a clear understanding on the current state of assets. An asset inventory is used to consolidate information on assets from diverse sources. Sources may include past assessments, studies, plans, records, reporting requirements such as the Public Sector Account Board (PSAB 3150), and staff knowledge.

9.1) For the following asset components, describe the status of the asset:

Forcemains	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wastewater Pipes (dia. <450 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wastewater Pipes (dia. 450-1500 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wastewater Pipes (dia. >1500 mm)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wastewater Treatment Plants	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Lagoon Systems	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wastewater Pump Stations	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wastewater Storage Tanks/Pipes	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.

9.1.2) Referring to the asset categories provided, for each physical condition option enter a percentage for each category listed under the wastewater network owned by your organization.

Each response option is described below:

Very poor/Critical: <20% of estimated service level remaining. Near or beyond expected service life, widespread signs of advanced deterioration, some assets may be unusable.

Poor: 20-39% of estimated service level remaining. Approaching end of service life, condition below standard, large portion of system exhibits significant deterioration.

Fair: 40-59% of estimated service level remaining. Signs of deterioration, some elements exhibit deficiencies.

Good: 60-79% of estimated service level remaining. Acceptable, generally approaching mid stage of expected service life.

Very Good: 80-100% of estimated service level remaining. Well maintained, good condition, new or recently rehabilitated.

No Information:

The asset is owned by the local government, but data on the asset is not available; or

The asset is not owned by the local government.

Scroll Right --->	No Information	Very poor/Critical	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Forcemains	☐					
Wastewater Pipes (dia. <450 mm)	☐					
Wastewater Pipes (dia. 450-1500 mm)	☐					
Wastewater Pipes (dia. >1500 mm)	☐					
Wastewater Treatment Plants	☐					
Lagoon Systems	☐					
Wastewater Pump Stations	☐					
Wastewater Storage Tanks/Pipes	☐					

Section 9: Wastewater

Estimated Replacement Costs and Annual Renewal Budgets

Accurate replacement costs are based on the condition assessment of an asset. This condition assessment defines an assets remaining life. The historical cost adjusted for inflation, to an assets projected end of life (based on condition) is a sensible first improvement over PSAB 3150 accumulated amortization. The actual cost of present-day, like-for-like renewal or contributed assets (either a local or geographically near example) projected to its end of life (based on condition) is by far the best.

Estimated replacement values refers to the approximate cost at the present time required to replace an asset, including demolition costs. Do not include land costs or overhead such as administration.

Annual renewal budget refers to information on the rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement of infrastructure.

The historical value for this question should conform with the PSAB 3150 standards.

9.2) In 2014, what was the historical value for the wastewater network components owned by your organization? What was the estimated replacement value for the entire wastewater network components owned by your organization? What was the annual renewal budget for the entire wastewater network components owned by your organization?

IF INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT VALUES ARE UNKNOWN, LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0" AND ONLY SUBMIT THE CUMULATIVE VALUE.

IF THERE IS NO DATA TO PROVIDE or YOUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT OWN THE ASSET LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0".

	Historical Value (from PSAB 3150)	Estimated Replacement Value	Annual Renewal Budget
Forcemains			
Wastewater Pipes (dia. <450 mm)			
Wastewater Pipes (dia. 450-1500 mm)			
Wastewater Pipes (dia. >1500 mm)			
Wastewater Treatment Plants			
Lagoon Systems			
Wastewater Pump Stations			
Wastewater Storage Tanks/Pipes			
Cumulative Value for Wastewater Assets			

Section 10: Sports & Recreation Facilities

Asset Condition Assessment

The assessment of individual asset categories is essential for developing a clear understanding on the current state of assets. An asset inventory is used to consolidate information on assets from diverse sources. Sources may include past assessments, studies, plans, records, reporting requirements such as the Public Sector Account Board (PSAB 3150), and staff knowledge.

10.1) For the following asset components, describe the status of the asset:

Indoor Rinks: Single pad	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Indoor Rinks: 2-3 pads	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Indoor Rinks: 4 pads (quad)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Indoor Rinks: 5+ pads	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Outdoor Rinks	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Indoor Pool: 25 m	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Indoor Pool: 50 m or longer	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Indoor Pool: Leisure pools	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Outdoor Pool	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wading Pool	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Splash Pool	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Skateparks (indoor/outdoor)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Indoor Curling Rinks	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Stadiums (indoor/outdoor)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.

Tennis Courts (indoor/outdoor)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Sports Fields (indoor/outdoor)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Ski hills	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Parks	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Trails	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Airports	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Wharves	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Harbours	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Community Recreation Centres/ Multiplexes	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Seniors Centres	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Youth Centres	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.

10.1.2) Referring to the asset categories provided, for each physical condition option enter a percentage for each category listed under sports and recreation facilities owned by your organization.

Each response option is described below:

Very poor/Critical: <20% of estimated service level remaining. Near or beyond expected service life, widespread signs of advanced deterioration, some assets may be unusable.

Poor: 20-39% of estimated service level remaining. Approaching end of service life, condition below standard, large portion of system exhibits significant deterioration.

Fair: 40-59% of estimated service level remaining. Signs of deterioration, some elements exhibit deficiencies.

Good: 60-79% of estimated service level remaining. Acceptable, generally approaching mid stage of expected service life.

Very Good: 80-100% of estimated service level remaining. Well maintained, good condition, new or recently rehabilitated.

No Information:

The asset is owned by the local government, but data on the asset is not available; or

The asset is not owned by the local government.

	No Information	Very poor/Critical	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Indoor Rinks: Single pad	☐					
Indoor Rinks: 2-3 pads	☐					
Indoor Rinks: 4 pads (quad)	☐					
Indoor Rinks: 5+ pads	☐					
Outdoor Rinks	☐					
Indoor Pool: 25 m	☐					
Indoor Pool: 50 m or longer	☐					
Indoor Pool: Leisure pools	☐					
Outdoor Pool	☐					
Wading Pool	☐					
Splash Pool	☐					
Skateparks (indoor/outdoor)	☐					
Indoor	☐					

Curling Rinks					
Stadiums (indoor/out door)	☐				
Tennis Courts (indoor/out door)	☐				
Sports Fields (indoor/out door)	☐				
Ski hills	☐				
Parks	☐				
Trails	☐				
Airports	☐				
Wharves	☐				
Harbors	☐				
Community Recreation Centres/ Multiplexes	☐				
Seniors Centres	☐				
Youth Centres	☐				

Section 10: Sports & Recreation Facilities

Estimated Replacement Costs and Annual Renewal Budgets

Accurate replacement costs are based on the condition assessment of an asset. This condition assessment defines an assets remaining life. The historical cost adjusted for inflation, to an assets projected end of life (based on condition) is a sensible first improvement over PSAB 3150 accumulated amortization. The actual cost of present-day, like-for-like renewal or contributed assets (either a local or geographically near example) projected to its end of life (based on condition) is by far the best.

Estimated replacement values refers to the approximate cost at the present time required to replace an asset, including demolition costs. Do not include land costs or overhead such as administration.

Annual renewal budget refers to information on the rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement of infrastructure.

The historical value for this question should conform with the PSAB 3150 standards.

10.2) In 2014, what was the historical value for sports and recreation facilities owned by your organization? What was the estimated replacement value for sports and recreation facilities owned by your organization? What was the annual renewal budget for sports and recreation facilities owned by your organization?

IF INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT VALUES ARE UNKNOWN, LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0" AND ONLY SUBMIT THE CUMULATIVE VALUE.

IF THERE IS NO DATA TO PROVIDE or YOUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT OWN THE ASSET LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0".

	Historical Value (from PSAB 3150)	Estimated Replacement Value	Annual Renewal Budget
Indoor Rinks: Single pad			
Indoor Rinks: 2-3 pads			
Indoor Rinks: 4 pads (quad)			
Indoor Rinks: 5+ pads			
Outdoor Rinks			
Indoor Pool: 25 m			
Indoor Pool: 50 m or longer			
Indoor Pool: Leisure pools			
Outdoor Pool			
Wading Pool			

Splash Pool			
Skateparks (indoor/outdoor)			
Indoor Curling Rinks			
Stadiums (indoor/outdoor)			
Tennis Courts (indoor/outdoor)			
Sports Fields (indoor/outdoor)			
Ski hills			
Parks			
Trails			
Airports			
Wharves			
Harbours			
Community Recreation Centres/ Multiplexes			
Seniors Centres			
Youth Centres			
Cumulative Value for Sports and Recreation Facilities			

Section 11: Other Buildings and Facilities

Asset Condition Assessment

The assessment of individual asset categories is essential for developing a clear understanding on the current state of assets. An asset inventory is used to consolidate information on assets from diverse sources. Sources may include past assessments, studies, plans, records, reporting requirements such as the Public Sector Account Board (PSAB 3150), and staff knowledge.

11.1) For the following asset components, describe the status of the asset:

Police Stations	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Fire Stations	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Paramedic Stations	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Administrative Buildings, Service Centres, Work Yards	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Shelters (e.g. youth, womens, homeless)	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Libraries	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Childcare/ Daycare Centres	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Community Centres and Cultural Facilities	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Health Care Facilities	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.
Long-term Care Centres	○ Asset is owned by the local government. ○ Asset is not owned by the local government.

11.1.2) Referring to the asset categories provided, for each physical condition option enter a percentage for each category listed under other buildings and facilities owned by your organization.

Each response option is described below:

Very poor/Critical: <20% of estimated service level remaining. Near or beyond expected service life, widespread signs of advanced deterioration, some assets may be unusable.

Poor: 20-39% of estimated service level remaining. Approaching end of service life, condition below standard, large portion of system exhibits significant deterioration.

Fair: 40-59% of estimated service level remaining. Signs of deterioration, some elements exhibit deficiencies.

Good: 60-79% of estimated service level remaining. Acceptable, generally approaching mid stage of expected service life.

Very Good: 80-100% of estimated service level remaining. Well maintained, good condition, new or recently rehabilitated.

No Information:

The asset is owned by the local government, but data on the asset is not available; or

The asset is not owned by the local government.

Scroll Right --->	No Information	Very poor/Critical	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
Police Stations	☐					
Fire Stations	☐					
Paramedic Stations	☐					
Administrative Buildings, Service Centres, Work Yards	☐					
Shelters (e.g. youth, womens, homeless)	☐					
Libraries	☐					
Childcare/ Daycare Centres	☐					
Community Centres and Cultural	☐					

Facilities					
Health Care Facilities	☐				
Long-term Care Centres	☐				

Section 11: Other Buildings & Facilities

Estimated Replacement Costs and Annual Renewal Budgets

Accurate replacement costs are based on the condition assessment of an asset. This condition assessment defines an assets remaining life. The historical cost adjusted for inflation, to an assets projected end of life (based on condition) is a sensible first improvement over PSAB 3150 accumulated amortization. The actual cost of present-day, like-for-like renewal or contributed assets (either a local or geographically near example) projected to its end of life (based on condition) is by far the best.

Estimated replacement values refers to the approximate cost at the present time required to replace an asset, including demolition costs. Do not include land costs or overhead such as administration.

Annual renewal budget refers to information on the rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement of infrastructure.

The historical value for this question should conform with the PSAB 3150 standards.

11.2) In 2014, what was the historical value for other buildings and facilities owned by your organization? What was the estimated replacement value for other buildings and facilitiess owned by your organization? What was the annual renewal budget for other buildings and facilities owned by your organization?

IF INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT VALUES ARE UNKNOWN, LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0" AND ONLY SUBMIT THE CUMULATIVE VALUE.IF THERE IS NO DATA TO PROVIDE or YOUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT OWN THE ASSET LEAVE THE FIELD AS "0".

	Historical Value (from PSAB 3150)	Estimated Replacement Value	Annual Renewal Budget
Police Stations			
Fire Stations			
Paramedic Stations			
Administrative Buildings, Service Centres, Work Yards			
Shelters (e.g. youth, womens, homeless)			

Libraries			
Childcare/ Daycare Centres			
Community Centres and Cultural Facilities			
Health Care Facilities			
Long-term Care Centres			
Cumulative Value for Other Buildings and Facilities Assets			

Submitting Your Completed Form

Congratulations! You have completed the Asset Management Assessment Form. The answers provided will be put towards meeting asset management commitments found in your Community Works Fund Agreement. Thank you for taking the time and effort to respond to this important assessment on asset management.

Once the submission of this form has been received by UBCM, staff will follow-up with the local government CAO by email. At that time the data you have submitted will be shared back with you. This information can then be used towards the development of an asset management improvement plan for your local government. Gas Tax reporting requirements for 2017 include reporting on asset management improvements. Further details on 2017 asset management reporting requirements will be available later this year.

What to share more? Provide any comments, suggestions for improvement or feedback below: