Results from the Asset Management Assessment Form

Based on data received in July 2016
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 & glossary provided for instructions on how to contribute your local government's responses and terminology explanations.
Assessment Development Partners

• UBCM
• AMBC
• MCSCD
• BC local governments
Methodology

Hybrid style assessment drawing on the “Framework” and the Canadian Infrastructure Report Card
Methodology

• Mandatory requirement

• 189 local governments were contacted

• Self-reported results
Methodology

• Over 50 detailed questions asked

• Includes data on
  Roads and Bridges, Potable, Storm, and Waste Water, Sports and Recreation, and Other Buildings and Facilities

• Not inclusive of all infrastructure assets
Methodology

• Part 1 data based on existing practices
  – Based on 154 responses
  – 24 Regional Districts
  – 130 Cities, Districts, Towns, etc...

• Part 2 data as of December 31, 2014
  – Condition data ranges from averages of 94–40 responses
  – Financial data is incomplete
# Methodology

## Condition Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practices Scale</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of Response Selections</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work on this topic has not commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdeveloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completeness and accuracy of data is unknown, availability of data is unknown, and generally work on this topic has not been confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved level of completeness and accuracy of data as compared to competent, detailed and accurate analysis, greater understanding of current and future situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High level of accuracy and completeness of data, continuous improvement practices in place, long term planning in effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Best Practices Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of Response Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not developed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdeveloped</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Interpretation Cautions

• Community size, management style, local government capacity, number of assets, experience with asset management all affect how data is reported.

• Limitations also include software or platform used to survey.

• The Assessment is not designed to produce exact numbers, but rather to provide a baseline from where local governments can strengthen asset management practices.
Part 1
Leadership

Local Government Leadership Approaches for Asset Management Activities

- A single individual (consultant) is hired to lead AM.
- AM is led by individual staff following a bottom-up approach.
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Approach</th>
<th>Individual Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single individual (consultant) is hired to lead AM.</td>
<td>Overall: 20, Municipal Government: 15, Regional Government: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM is led by individual staff following a bottom-up approach.</td>
<td>Overall: 40, Municipal Government: 30, Regional Government: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of staff and council/board members lead AM following an integrated approach.</td>
<td>Overall: 30, Municipal Government: 20, Regional Government: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM is led by CAO/CFO following a corporate, top-down approach.</td>
<td>Overall: 50, Municipal Government: 45, Regional Government: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An AM department leads AM activities.</td>
<td>Overall: 5, Municipal Government: 10, Regional Government: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication and Information

Local Government Staff Communication and Understanding of Asset Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some staff understand the need for Asset Management.</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff understand the benefits of Asset Management.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff understand the need for continuous learning to develop their knowledge, experience and capacity</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff understand the need for Asset Management.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff work plans include time for Asset Management activities.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff understand their role in Asset Management.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Asset Management practices across departments/divisions is commonplace.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication and Information Sharing Between Local Government Staff and Elected Officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials understand the need for Asset Management.</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials understand the benefits of Asset Management.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress regarding Asset Management implementation is shared with elected officials.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials endorse Asset Management practices.</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials have championed Asset Management activities as a special interest.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials understand the need for continuous learning to develop their knowledge, experience and capacity for Asset Management.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finances - Overview

The way local governments look at tools like renewal funds, debt, and revenue can be used to describe the pathways and strategies available for own-source funding and the creative solutions (levy’s/fees/etc...) employed in order to move towards meeting the investment needs of existing and future infrastructure.

At no point should this data be used to describe a local governments financial position or tie a local government exclusively to the perspective that is described.
**Finances - Reserve Funds**

### Description of Reserve Funds as Selected by Local Governments

- **28%**: Moderate reserves are held, but are restricted to use.
- **21%**: Asset management reserve strategies are in place to build reserve levels established in accordance with a long-term financial plan.
- **12%**: Asset management reserve strategies are under development.
- **11%**: Minimal reserves are in place, but are restricted to use.
- **9%**: Reserves in place to buffer short-term revenue fluctuations.
- **8%**: Asset management reserves are held and replenished at levels established in accordance with a long-term financial plan.
- **1%**: Non-existent, there are no reserves in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate reserves are held, but are restricted to use.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management reserve strategies are in place to build reserve levels established in accordance with a long-term financial plan.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management reserve strategies are under development.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal reserves are in place, but are restricted to use.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves in place to buffer short-term revenue fluctuations.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management reserves are held and replenished at levels established in accordance with a long-term financial plan.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-existent, there are no reserves in place.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finances - Debt

Description of Debt (Use and Availability) as Selected by Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt levels are prudent and reasonable; Debt is a tool we use strategically and is in line with a long-term financial plan.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt levels are reasonable, but debt is trending upwards.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt levels are high and a debt management strategy is being considered.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt levels are high with no plan in place to reduce debt.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other selection includes no debt (10), low debt (9), no long term debt (5), undisclosed (7)
Finances – Revenue Sources

Description of Incoming Revenue as Selected by Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues are sufficient and reliable to fund requirements for the next five years.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues fluctuate year to year with no linkages between reserves and a long-term financial plan.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues are sufficient and reliable to fund requirements for the next 10 years.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues are sufficient, predictable, and stable to fund long term sustainable service delivery.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major controllable revenues are sufficient, predictable and stable to fund long term sustainable service delivery.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Governments with Established Levy(s) for the Replacement or Renewal of Existing Assets

- Yes: 29%
- No: 50%
- Other: 21%

Local Government described Other for Funding the Replacement or Renewal of Existing Assets

- Increase taxes
- New revenues (leases, royalties)
- Parcel taxes
- % of the annual tax levy dedicated to capital assets
- Capital reserve
- Reductions in debt servicing
- Increase utility fees
- General infrastructure fund
- Levy’s for some assets, not all
- 1% of the assets budget aside for asset renewal
- Service area tax paid into reserves
- User fees
- Property tax levy
- Frontage tax
- Reserve funds
- General tax levy

UBCM
Assessment

Assessment of Available Data for Existing Assets Location, Condition, Level of Service, Risk, and Expenditures

- Expenditures: Not Developed
- Risk: Not Developed
- Level of Service: Not Developed
- Location of Assets: Not Developed
- Condition of Assets: Not Developed

(UBCM logo)
Location and Condition

Assessment of Information Related to Existing Asset Location and Condition

- Information on the location of assets is
- Information on the age of assets is
- Information on the installation dates for assets is
- 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

Individual Responses

- Not Developed
- Underdeveloped
- Competent
- Strong
- Outstanding
Risk assessments have been completed for existing assets. Information on risks that could impact sustainable service delivery are available. The criticality (perceived importance) regarding asset(s) failure is determined. Assets have a risk register that accounts for the probability of failure. Assets have a risk register that accounts for the consequence of failure. Renewal, repair and/or replacement of assets is prioritized by risk or consequence of failure.
Available information on customer level of service is...

Available information on technical level of service is...

Available information on existing asset capacity levels are...

Available information on existing asset demand is...

Available information on expected future demand is...
Available information on operational costs for existing assets are
Available information on the estimated cost for existing asset renewal is
Available information on planned maintenance costs for existing assets are
Available information on reactive maintenance costs for existing assets are
Available information on historical costs for existing assets are
Available information on replacement costs for existing assets are
Available information on write-down and disposal costs for existing assets are

Assessment of Information Related to Asset Expenditures

- Competent
- Underdeveloped
- Not Developed
- Strong
Methodology

Best Practices Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of Response Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not developed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdeveloped</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning

Policy Development

- Not Developed: 69%
- Underdeveloped: 10%
- Competent: 6%
- Strong: 9%
- Outstanding: 6%

Strategy Development

- Not Developed: 71%
- Underdeveloped: 14%
- Competent: 8%
- Strong: 3%
- Outstanding: 4%
Planning

Existing Asset Plan Development

- Not Developed: 60%
- Underdeveloped: 20%
- Competent: 8%
- Strong: 5%
- Outstanding: 7%

Number of Asset Management Plans Completed by Local Governments in BC

- No plans: 81
- < 25%: 29
- 25-50%: 16
- 50-75%: 11
- 75-99%: 13
- All assets have plans: 4
Integration of Asset Management and Long Term Financial Planning

- Not Developed: 55%
- Underdeveloped: 18%
- Competent: 12%
- Strong: 8%
- Outstanding: 7%
Implementation

Local Government Implementation Practices

- Not Developed: 57%
- Underdeveloped: 11%
- Competent: 13%
- Strong: 10%
- Outstanding: 9%
Implementation

Local Governments Reporting on Asset Management

- Reporting: 31%
- Not reporting: 69%

Local Government Reporting Practices

- Not Developed: 67%
- Underdeveloped: 23%
- Competent: 7%
- Strong: 3%
Implement and Reporting:

Asset Management Implementation Reporting Practices for 48 Local Governments in British Columbia

- Reporting on AM is completed on an annual basis
- AM reports are available for staff and council/board to review
- Reporting on AM includes debriefing staff/council and board
- AM reports are easy to read
- AM reporting utilizes asset condition and indicator data to tell the AM story
Added Value: Measuring Social, Environmental, and Economic Benefits

**Environmental**
- Climate Action: 11
- Existing regulations: 21
- Energy Efficiency: 20
- CARIP: 15
- GHG: 46
- Not Measuring: 80

**Social**
- Condition: 8
- Performance Indicators: 9
- Users: 15
- Service Levels: 25
- Complaints: 21
- Not Measuring: 95

**Financial**
- Reserve Fund Tracking: 3
- Net Financial Assets Ratio: 4
- Renewal Funding Ratio: 16
- Funding Gap Analysis: 30
- Not Measuring: 97
PART 2

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 survey.
### Overall Condition Rating of Asset

- **Very Poor**: 13%
- **Poor**: 13%
- **Fair**: 36%
- **Good**: 33%
- **Very Good**: 5%

### Local Governments Reporting Owning Asset

- **Arterial**: 71
- **Highways**: 9
- **Collectors**: 77
- **Local Lane & Alleys**: 95
- **Sidewalks**: 64
- **Bridges**: 80
- **Culverts**: 65
- **Footbridge**: 31
- **Miscellaneous**: 55

---

**UBCM**

---
# Roads & Bridges

## Historical, Replacement and Renewal Values Reported by Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes &amp; Alleys</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culverts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footbridge</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potable Water

Overall Condition Rating of Asset

- Very Poor: 4%
- Poor: 10%
- Fair: 27%
- Good: 39%
- Very Good: 20%

Local Government Reporting Owning Asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local &lt;416 mm</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &gt;416 mm</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water treatment</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pump stations</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potable Water

### Historical, Replacement and Renewal Values Reported by Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local &lt;416 mm</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &gt;416 mm</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Treatment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Pump Stations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Storm Water

Overall Condition Rating of Asset

- Very Poor: 4%
- Poor: 19%
- Fair: 27%
- Good: 30%
- Very Good: 20%

Local Government Reporting Owning Asset

- Culverts <3 m: 56
- Pipes <450 mm: 69
- Pipes 450-1500 mm: 52
- Pipes >1500 mm: 21
- Drainage pump station: 17
- Management Facilities: 23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culverts &lt;3 m</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes &lt;450 mm</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes 450-1500 mm</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes &lt;1500 mm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Pump Stations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waste Water

Overall Condition Rating of Asset

- Very Poor: 4%
- Poor: 14%
- Fair: 33%
- Good: 14%
- Very Good: 35%

Local Government Reporting Owning Asset

- Forcemains
  - Very Poor: 85
  - Poor: 88
- Pipes 450-1500 mm
  - Very Poor: 43
- Pipes <1500 mm
  - Very Poor: 9
- Treatment
  - Very Poor: 61
- Lagoons
  - Very Poor: 45
- Pump stations
  - Very Poor: 85
- Storage
  - Very Poor: 16
## Waste Water

### Historical, Replacement and Renewal Values Reported by Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forcemains</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes &lt;450 mm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes 450-1500 mm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes &lt;1500 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoons</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Stations</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sports and Recreation

Overall Condition Rating of Asset

- Very Poor: 4%
- Poor: 10%
- Fair: 33%
- Good: 38%
- Very Good: 15%

Local Government Reporting Owning Asset

- Ice Rinks
- Pools
- Skateparks
- Curling rink
- Stadium
- Tennis
- Sports fields
- Ski hills
- Parks
- Trails
- Community rec centre
- Seniors centre
- Youth centre

UBCM
## Sports and Recreation

### Historical, Replacement and Renewal Values Reported by Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rinks</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pools</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateparks</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling Rink</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports fields</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski hills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rec. Centre</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Centre</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Buildings and Facilities

Overall Condition Rating of Asset

- Very Poor: 7%
- Poor: 17%
- Fair: 30%
- Good: 27%
- Very Good: 19%

Local Government Reporting Owning Asset

- Police Stations
- Fire Stations
- Paramedic Stations
- Administration
- Shelters
- Libraries
- Childcare
- Health Care Centre
- Long Term Care Centre
- Airports
- Wharves
- Harbours

UBCM
## Other Buildings and Facilities

### Historical, Replacement and Renewal Values Reported by Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Replacement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Stations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic Stations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Cultural Center</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Care Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharves</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving Forward with Continuous Improvement

Continuous Quality Improvement - Review and Update of Existing Asset Management Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed AM practices</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated a portion of AM inventories</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated all AM inventories</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Local Governments with Formalized Asset Management Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>In-progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• 154 responses as of July 2015 (as of Oct 28 - 173)

• Baseline self assessment results indicate that local governments across BC consider the condition of their owned assets as competent

• All survey respondents identified that they are moving forward with asset management
Summary

BC local governments are aware of asset management and its importance. However, the survey highlighted the following as areas needing attention:

– Formalized AM Planning – policy, strategy, plans, LTFP
– Assessment – Risk, LoS, Condition, Replacement Value
– Measuring progress and communication/reporting out
Summary

Next Steps

– Individual local governments develop AM implementation plans
– UBCM/Gas Tax Fund will measure progress
– AMBC, Province, UBCM and other stakeholders provide tools & resources to address gaps and support local governments

Moving forward there is significant work to be done, but there is also significant momentum that has been created.
Questions?

Glen Brown
General Manager – Victoria Operations, UBCM
gbrown@ubcm.ca

Christina Ross, Gas Tax Program Analyst, UBCM
cross@ubcm.ca