

The Ministry of Infrastructure Municipal Asset Management Planning Regulation (O. Reg. 588/17)

September 19, 2018

Overview

In December 2017, the province approved a regulation on municipal asset management planning.

This presentation provides an overview of:

- municipal asset management planning in Ontario;
- development of the regulation, including incorporation of municipal feedback;
- regulatory requirements; and,
- tools and supports to help municipalities comply with the regulation.



Context



- Municipalities deliver many of the services that are critical to the people of Ontario, and these services rely on well-planned and wellmaintained infrastructure.
- Population change, aging assets and the impacts of a changing climate are putting increased pressure on the ability of many municipalities to ensure the long-term sustainability of their infrastructure.
- While many municipalities have asset management plans, significant differences exist between the completeness, detail, methodology and assumptions municipalities use to develop their current plans.



What is Asset Management Planning?

When done well, asset management planning is part of a strategic planning process that is integrated with budgeting processes and long-term financial planning.

Good asset management planning helps municipalities make well-informed and evidence-based decisions about their infrastructure assets.

There are four key components of an asset management plan:

- 1. Asset inventory
- 2. Levels of service
- 3. Asset management strategy
- 4. Financial strategy





Progress on Asset Management

- Ontario has focused on municipal asset management planning since 2012 when it introduced Building Together: Guide for Municipal Asset Management Plans.
- Ontario requires any municipality seeking provincial capital funding to prepare a detailed asset management plan and show how its proposed project fits within its plan.
- Ontario introduced an asset management regulation in December 2017 that requires that all municipalities have a comprehensive asset management plan in place by July 1, 2024.





Consultations with Municipal Sector

February - May 2016

Association of Municipalities of Ontario "Memorandum of Understanding Table"

July - August 2016

Online summary report posted to Ontario.ca on feedback received during summer 2016 consultations.

May - July 2017

Revisit Association of Municipalities of Ontario "Memorandum of Understanding Table<u>"</u>

December 2017

Formed a group of technical experts from the municipal sector to help draft regional consultation material.

June 2016

Online and regional consultations held throughout Ontario – 330+ people from 220 municipalities/other organizations attended.

December 2016

Revised regulatory proposal posted to Ontario Environmental/Regulatory Registries for comment; webinars held on proposal.

September 2017

Regulation is approved, incorporating critical feedback from two years of consultations with municipalities.



Regulation Overview

Strategic Asset Management Policy (by July 1, 2019)

Requires municipalities to outline commitments to best practices and continuous improvement

Asset Management Plan: Phase 2 (by July 1, 2023)

Builds out the Phase 1 plan to include all assets

Additional Information

- Municipalities under 25,000 are not required to discuss detailed risk analysis and growth.
- Plans must be updated every five years; annual progress reviewed by municipalities.

Asset Management Plan: Phase 1 (by July 1, 2021)

For core assets*:

- Inventory of assets
- Current levels of service measured by standard metrics
- Costs to maintain levels of service

Asset Management Plan: Phase 3 (by July 1, 2024)

Builds on Phase 1 and 2 by adding:

- Proposed levels of service
- Lifecycle management and Financial strategy

*Core assets are municipal roads, bridges water, wastewater and stormwater assets



Strategic Asset Management Policy

• The regulation requires all municipalities to develop and adopt a strategic asset management policy by July 1, 2019. The policy must include:





Inventory Requirements

- The regulation requires municipalities to provide summary-level information on each asset category, including:
 - What assets are in the category;
 - The total replacement cost value;
 - The average age, condition; and
 - How condition information is gathered.
- While the regulation requires municipalities to discuss how the supporting information will be made available to the public, the detailed, asset-by-asset information is not required in the asset management plan.





Level of Service Approach

- The regulation requires a description of levels of service for core infrastructure assets, in accordance with the metrics provided in the regulation:
 - <u>Community (customer) level</u> images and/or descriptions of what the end-user experiences
 - <u>Technical level</u> using metrics that describe what the organization provides

Exam	ple:	Bridges	

Service attribute	Community levels of service	Technical levels of service
Scope	• Description of the traffic that is supported by municipal bridges (e.g., heavy transport vehicles, motor vehicles, emergency vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists).	 % of bridges in the municipality with loading or dimensional restrictions



Success Stories



 The Town eliminated the need for an estimated \$30 million expansion of their wastewater treatment plant through process optimization resulting from a careful examination of service levels.



Burlington introduced a temporary dedicated infrastructure levy designed to eliminate the unfunded renewal need over a 60-year period, thereby allowing the City to maintain an adequate level of service and prevent overwhelming future funding needs.



Success Stories



The Town sought out other like-minded municipalities that recognized that by working together they could leverage each other's asset management planning learnings, strengths and experiences.



Wawa, in partnership with the Townships of Dubreuilville, Hornepayne and White River, have jointly hired an Asset Management Coordinator. All four communities have applied for FCM funding for this purpose.



Data Collection

- One of the primary goals of the regulation is to gain a better understanding of the infrastructure challenges municipalities face.
- Improving the standardization and consistency of asset management planning information will help the province and municipalities achieve this objective.
- The province is considering the possibility of leveraging the Financial Information Return process to collect asset management planning information to gather a more complete picture of municipal infrastructure needs.
- The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is currently in the process of conducting a pilot project to test the collection of municipal asset management planning information.
- The purpose of this pilot is to seek input from local governments on how to collect key information on municipal asset management and to foster discussions around long term financial sustainability.





Tools and Supports

- During extensive consultations in support of the development of the regulation, the province heard from many municipalities about the need for support to help them comply with the new regulatory requirements.
- In response, the province committed to delivering tools and supports that will help increase the capacity of municipalities to undertake this work, and encourage local ownership of asset management practices.

Partner	Initiative	Timeline		
	Summer 2018 – Spring 2020			
	This initiative has made a toolkit available to all municipalities to help them develop a regulation compliant strategic asset management policy.	Summer 2018		
FOA	This initiative will provide small municipalities with in- person expert asset management plan assessments and expert advice that is tailored to the needs of the individual municipality.	Fall 2018 – Spring 2021		



Current Status of Capital Funding Programs

- The Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund helps build and repair roads, bridges, water and wastewater systems in small, rural and northern communities.
 - The Fund is providing \$300-million in 2018-19, including \$200-million in formula-based funding and \$100-million in top-up application funding.
 - The 2018 top-up application intake closed in August and funding decisions are expected by early 2019.
 - On March 14, 2018, Ontario signed an integrated Bilateral Agreement with the Federal government for \$11.8 billion in federal funding.
 - The Ministry of Infrastructure is currently designing the program streams and developing the administrative processes for implementing this funding. Further information will be shared later this year.



OCIF Formula Recipients





Questions?

Anthony Boland

Manager, Municipal Infrastructure Policy Unit Ministry of Infrastructure 647 629-7049 anthony.boland@ontario.ca



ASSET MANAGEMENT

2018 MFOA CONFERENCE



Wednesday September 19th 2018.







Learning Objectives

In this presentation, you will learn about:

- New regulatory environment surrounding asset management
- Key items of the regulation which municipalities should implement immediately
- Leading AM approaches



Placeholder for MOI Slides



Asset Management Context



HEMSON

1. The Asset Register

- Increase, or maintain, the accuracy of the asset register
 - Inclusion of full range of assets
- Areas of Focus:
 - Valuation (Replacement Cost)
 - Level of Detail (components/segments)
 - Remaining Service Life (RSL):
 - Recording transactions (i.e. betterments)
 - Condition assessments



1. The Asset Register (cont'd)

Levels of Service

- Technical
- Strategic
- Operational
- Component Replacement Value
- Component Useful Life
- Lifecycle Profile
- Asset List
- Condition Assessment
- Maintenance Management
- Performance Rating
- Risk & Criticality
- PSAB 3150
- Budge[.]



2. Refining the Asset Data



3. Replacement Values

• Key input and backbone to overall success of your asset management plan

• Formal and consistent approach

 Municipalities should look to move away from using inflationary approaches



3. Replacement Values (Continued)

Methodology	Description		Reliability
Recent Tenders	 Recent tenders in neighbouring municipalities and surrounding areas – cost to construct certain buildings, the acquisition cost of a new truck, vehicle or heavy equipment, cost to rehabilitate/replace roads and bridges. 	•	Most Reliable
Local Price Index	 Using local price indices for recently built or acquired assets to adjust to current value. 	•	Reliable
Insurance Values	 Insurance values, although often low, are a good benchmark or reasonability test. 	•	Somewhat Reliable
Inflated Historical Costs	• Historical cost inflated to current dollars. This approach is best used for assets recently acquired or for low value assets which represent a small share of a local government's total replacement value. A local government should look to move away from this approach and generate replacement cost based on the first two more credible methodologies.	•	Least Reliable



3. What Costs Should your Asset Include?

- Costs directly associated with preparing a tangible capital asset for its intended use can be included as part of the cost (but excludes overhead)
 - Original cost to purchase/construct
 - Installation and assembly
 - Initial delivery
 - Site preparation
 - Testing
 - Professional fees
 - Internal design and inspection fees



4. True Condition of Assets

- Perform inspections, condition assessments etc.
- Age is not always an appropriate proxy for condition
- 5-Tier rating system







Condition

G

F

P

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Very Poor

4. Condition Assessment Parameters

Rating	Condition	Condition Assessment Definition	Age Based Condition	Probability of Failure
1	Very Good	Well maintained, good condition, new or recently rehabilitated.	Greater than 80% of asset useful life remaining.	Improbable
2	Good	Good condition, few elements exhibit existing deficiencies.	60% - 79.9% of asset useful life remaining.	Not likely
3	Fair	Some elements exhibit significant deficiencies. Asset requires attention.	40% - 59.9% of asset useful life remaining.	Possible
4	Poor	A large portion of the system exhibits significant deficiencies. Asset mostly below standard and approaching end of service life.	20% - 39.9% of asset useful life remaining.	Likely
5	Very Poor	Widespread signs of deterioration, some assets may be unusable. Service is affected.	Less than 20% of asset useful life remaining.	Very Probable



5. What Service does your Community Expect?

- Determine public perception on state of the assets and service delivery
- Consider questionnaire and supporting statements
- State of the Local Infrastructure Report Cards

 Coincide with annual budgets
- In order to be effective, local governments need to provide education first
 - Both Council and Public



5. Sample State of the Local Infrastructure Report Card



Replacement Value by Asset Category

5. Sample Questions to Consider

- 1. The Municipality's current spending on infrastructure renewal and construction is \$xx million. (Strongly Support, Somewhat Support, Somewhat Oppose, Strongly Oppose).
- 2. The Municipality increasing property taxes to fund infrastructure renewal and construction. (Strongly Support, Somewhat Support, Somewhat Oppose, Strongly Oppose).
- 3. How do you perceive the amount of information provided by the Municipality on asset management matters, including reporting and capital budget information? (Too much, Right amount, Not enough).
- 4. How informed/aware are you in regards to new capital renewal or construction projects in the Municipality? (Very aware, Somewhat aware, Not very aware, Not at all aware).
- 5. Which capital infrastructure asset group in the Municipality's portfolio do you feel requires the <u>most</u> attention? (Pick from services i.e. roads, recreation facility, library, etc.).



6. Level of Service: Understanding Community Expectations

- Given the choice, a community expects the highest level of service
- These expectations evolve when the costs associated with the level of service is understood
- Important to first understand existing Levels of Service and costs



6. Sample LOS Tracking and Targets

Key Indicators	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	5 Year Average	Qualitative Measure	TARGET LOS
Number of paved lane kilometers where the condition is rated as good to very good	42%	43%	43.3%	43.7%	56.7%	46%		60%
Number of water main breaks per 100 km of water distribution/transmission pipe in a year	2.0	2.5	2.5	1.7	5.0	2.9		1.0
Unaccounted for Water (water loss after distribution)	31.0%	29.1%	29.9%	30.3%	31.4%	30.4%		20%
Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment	0.005%	0.006%	0.007%	0.007%	0.008%	0.0066%		0.005%

Legend:

Performing in the right direction — Performing in the wrong direction — Yearly difference in performance is minimal



6. Developing a LOS Target

- Analyse current performance and historical trends
 to help identify appropriate goals
 - Have service levels been increasing/decreasing over time with population growth, etc.
- Targets should consider risk, safety and cost
- Important to establish short and long-term targets
 Desired LOS will not be achieved immediately
- Industry standards and municipal benchmarking
- Community input

6. Identifying Cost of Level of Service Targets

Services	Technical Level of Service	Current Level of Service	Target Level of Service	Costs of Targets
Recreation Facilities	 Utilization percentage of facilities 	• 90% utilization	 Utilization percentage of all facilities between 80% and 100%. 	 Additional GFA needed to maintain utilization between 80% and 100% (\$350 per sq.ft. plus \$10 sq.ft to maintain)
	• All facilities meet accessibility requirements	 1 facility remains that does not meet accessibility requirements 	• All facilities meet accessibility requirements	 \$350,000 required to bring remaining facility to minimum accessibility standards



6. Identifying Cost of Level of Service Targets

Services	s Technical Level of Service		Current Level of Service		Target Level of Service			Costs of Targets		
Roads and Related	•	Average condition rating of roads: local, collector, arterial	•	Current Average Condition Rating of all Roads = 65/100	•	Average Condition Rating of all Roads = 70/100	•	Current Annual maintenance budget = \$1 Million. 5% increase in costs to achieve target		
Transit	•	Number of preventative inspections and maintenance on vehicles per month	•	Preventative inspections and maintenance per vehicle per month = 1	•	Preventative inspections and maintenance per vehicle per month = 1	•	Annual preventative maintenance costs \$500,000		
	•	Number of unexpected breakdowns per year	•	Unexpected breakdowns last year = 7	•	Target unexpected breakdowns = 5	•	Annual maintenance costs would need to increase by xx% to reduce the number of breakdowns		


6. Establishing Service Level Indicators Group Session

- Break out into groups and brainstorm a variety of level of service measures:
 - Community expectation (qualitative)
 - Technical level of service
- Consider service levels for asset categories other than core infrastructure
- 10-15 minutes and we can review results as a team



6. Existing Level of Service Measures: Example

Service Category/ Attribute	Community LOS (Qualitative Description)	Technical LOS (numerical/statistical reference)
Water / Reliability	Clean Water Taste/Odour/Colour	# of boil water advisory notices per year.
Bridges / Scope	Use by local vehicles Minimal trucks Pedestrian friendly Use by agricultural vehicles	% of bridges with loading or dimensional restrictions
Facilities / Quality	Ramp access Elevator access	# of facilities that do not comply with AODA requirements
Recreation / Scope	Available hours of operations Clean spaces Ice Rink for public use	# of hours of programming Ice Time Utilization

6. Level of Service Measures

Service Category/ Attribute	Community LOS (Qualitative Description)	Technical LOS (numerical/statistical reference)

7. Risk Based Approach to Asset Management

- Municipalities should take a risk based approach to asset management
- Important to assess the risks associated to each asset
 - If an asset fails what are the
 - consequences?
 - What is the likelihood of asset failure?
- Consequence X Likelihood = Risk



7. Risk Matrix

- Probability of Failure level 5 (Very Poor Asset) multiplied by Consequence of Failure level 5 = Risk Score of 25.
- This would illustrate that the particular asset should be prioritized for replacement immediately as it would have the highest risk.

Risk Matrix and Rating						
Evaluc	ation	Probability				
Ratiı	ng	1	2	3	4	5
0	1	1	2	3	4	5
enc	2	2	4	6	8	10
nbə	3	3	6	9	12	15
suc	4	4	8	12	16	20
ŭ	5	5	10	15	20	25



7. Likelihood of Failure

- Likelihood of a failure can be defined in different ways but often linked to asset condition
- Descriptions and details will depend on municipal context and asset category

Rating	Probability	Description	Occurrence
1	Improbable	May occur only in exceptional circumstances	More than 20 years
2	Not likely	Could occur at some time	Within 10-20 years
3	Possible	Might occur at some time	Within 3-5 years
4	Likely	Will probably occur in most circumstances	Within 2 years
5	Very Probable	Expected to occur in most circumstances	Within 1 year



7. Consequence of Failure

- Consequence of a failure can consider a range of factors
- Municipalities may establish weighting criteria for each category

Rating	Injury	Service Interruption	Environment Damage	Finance	Reputation Damage
1	None	< 4 hours	None	<\$20k	None
2	First Aid	Up to 1 day	Minor	\$20k - \$100k	Minor Media
3	Medical Treatment	1 day – 1 week	Short Term	\$100k - \$500k	Moderate Media
4	Disability/ Fatality	1 week – 1 month	Long Term	\$500k - \$1M	High Media
5	Fatality	> 1 month	Irreversible	>\$1M	Censure/ Inquiry
HEMSON					

7. Example: Asset Risk Assessment

- Municipalities should develop an asset risk registry to identify risk for each asset/class over time
- Risk registry can be developed by asset category

Failure Event	Likelihood Of Failure	Consequence of Failure Categories	Overall Consequence	Risk Rating	
Bridge Collapse	Improbable (Condition = Very Good 1)	<pre>Injury = Fatality (5 Rating) Service Interruption = > 1 month (5 Rating) Environmental Damage = Minor (2 Rating) Finance = >\$1 million (5 Rating) Reputation Damage = High Media (4 Rating)</pre>	Rating 4	Low to Moderate Risk (4)	
HEMSON					

8. Annual Costs Broken Down by Key Category

Name	Description	Approach	Example
Maintenance	Servicing assets on a regular basis in order to fully realize the original service potential.	Base maintenance spending on prior years' operating budgets, apply inflationary increase, and consider	Crack sealing Roof repair
	Maintenance will not necessarily extend the life of an asset or add to its value.	necessary adjustments for additional costs.	Component renewal of a building system.
	Not performing regular maintenance may reduce an asset's useful life.	consider risk levels and desired levels of service.	
Renewal/ Rehabilitation Solutions	Enhancements that improve the service potential of an asset. Allows an asset to reach its target functional condition and to meet regulations.	Based on historical practices and incorporate any necessary adjustments for unexpected events. Utilize condition of assets, consider risk levels and	Transit vehicles receiving a midlife refurbishment, which may include a new reconditioned engine and transmission.
		desired levels of service.	



8. Annual Costs Broken Down by Key Category

Name	Description	Approach	Example
Replacement	Allows an asset to reach its target functional condition and to meet regulations by completely replacing or reconstructing the asset.	Utilize condition of assets, consider risk levels and desired levels of service.	Buses near the end of their useful life require full replacement as technology may be obsolete and additional rehabilitation will not achieve cost efficiencies.
Disposal	Some assets will require costs of disposal or demolition.	Legislative or safety related costs should be considered. For assets that require perpetual maintenance calculate the present value of annual maintenance costs.	Landfills or contaminated sites will require annual perpetual costs to retire and maintain.
Expansion Activities	Acquiring assets or expanding the capacity of current assets. Projected demands exceed current capacity or if a new service is introduced.	Costs associated to growth will include fixed costs of expansion and additional costs of maintenance. Consider economies of scale for asset expansions (engineered services such as roads, water, sewer and storm)	Expanding water infrastructure is mostly related to demand from new development, however efficiencies can be achieved if timing of new infrastructure also coincides with addressing existing deficiencies in the system.

HEMSON

8. Full Asset Lifecycle Model





8. Group Discussion: Risk Assessment

- Consider a recreation building
- What failure events or service interruptions can occur?
- What is the consequence of such an event?

Event	Possible Consequence		
Roof Failure	Injury: Service Interruption: Reputation Damage: Financial: Environmental Damage: <i>Total Possible Consequence</i>	Rating 1 (None) Rating 3 (1 day – 1 week) Rating 2 (Minor Media) Rating 3 (\$100k - \$500k) Rating 1 (None)	

9. Continuous Improvement

- Most asset managers recognize that they will not have perfect asset management processes and data
- Commitment to continuous improvement is key to success
- Considered in the context of evolving asset management program
 - Incorporate into Strategic Asset Management Policy



9. Continuous Improvement: Evaluation of Existing Practices

HEMSON



ISO 5500 Framework

- Evaluated against a scale of 0 - 5
- 39 focus areas

 questions to
 determine
 how the
 organization
 responds to
 AM

9. Continuous Improvement: Data Quality Confidence

Co	onfidence Grade		Description
5 Highly Reliable		•	Data based on sound records, procedure, investigations and analysis, documented properly and recognized as the best method of assessment.
		•	Dataset is complete and estimated to be accurate +/- 2%.
4	Reliable Data	•	Data based on sound records, procedures, investigations and analysis, documented properly but has minor shortcomings, for example some data is old, some documentation is missing and/or reliance is placed on unconfirmed reports or some extrapolation.
		•	Dataset is complete and estimated to be accurate +/- 10%.
3 Uncertain		•	Data based on sound records, procedures, investigations and analysis which is incomplete or unsupported, or extrapolated from a limited sample for which grade 4 or 5 data is available.
		•	Dataset is substantially complete but up to 50% is extrapolated data and accuracy estimated +/- 25%.
2	Very Uncertain	•	Data based on unconfirmed verbal reports and/or cursory inspection and analysis.
		•	Dataset may not be fully complete and most data is estimated or extrapolated. Accuracy +/- 40%.
1	Unknown	•	None or very little data held
			HEMSON

9. Continuous Improvement: Asset Management Policies

- More Stringent fiscal policies
 - Reserve fund management
 - Debt Management (inclusive of retired debt)
 - Use of alternative revenue sources
 - Lifecycle costs are built into the approval of new capital projects
 - Requirement for annual capital contributions to be at least equal to annual depreciation
- Council approved Capital Prioritization Model to aid decision making
- Approved Risk/Criticality Model



Asset Management Resources

Colin Macdonald Manager of Policy (Acting) September 19, 2018



Overview

- AMP IT UP 1.0 (2016 2018)
 - Self assessment tool (SAT)
 - Select observations from data
- AMP IT UP 2.0 (2018 2021)
 - SAT 2.0
- Strategic Asset Management Policies Toolkit
- Asset Management Community of Practice Guide and Case Studies

Each of these projects and programs was/are funded in part by the Province of Ontario



AMP IT UP 1.0





Municipal Participants

- 93 participants with a population less than 20,000
- 12% in Central; 30% in Eastern; 25% in Western; 23% in North Eastern; 10% in North Western



Self-Assessment Tool

- Extensive questionnaire
 - Between 84 606 questions
- 12 Sections
 - (Aligned with Building together Guide for municipal asset management plans)
 - 10 asset classes
- Linked to a Maturity Framework to provide in depth explanation of each question



Overall Score by Population Group





Average AMP Score by MSO Region





Section Scores Ranked (Worst to Best)

Rank	AMP SAT Section	Average Score
1	Levels of Service (LOS)	35.7%
2	Asset Management Policies & Procedures	36.6%
3	Public Engagement and Communication	37.0%
4	Lifecycle Strategy	39.6%
5	Financing Strategy	40.1%
6	Making Asset Management Operational	41.0%
7	Continuous Improvements and Updates	44.5%
8	Asset Management Tools	45.5%
9	State of Local Infrastructure	46.0%
10	Internal Governance and Ownership	53.6%
11	Council Approval and Support	67.3%
12	Introduction (Benefits of Asset Management)	69.5%



Ranked by Asset Class (Best to Worst)

(includes SOLI, LOS, Lifecycle Strategy and Financing Strategy only)

Rank	Asset Class	Average Score
1	Water	48.5%
2	Wastewater	46.5%
3	Bridges and Culverts	45.4%
4	Roads	43.6%
5	Vehicles and Equipment	39.4%
6	Other	39.4%
7	Stormwater	39.2%
8	Solid Waste	38.0%
9	Facilities	36.7%
10	Improvement to Land	33.5%



Select observations from analysis

- Internal governance and ownership is a foundational element of an asset management system
- On aggregate, municipalities with populations below 5,000 struggle most with asset management



AMP It Up 2.0

Eligibility

- Available to municipalities with populations less than 25,000 that did not participate in AMP 1.0
- Eligible municipalities will receive invite to participate in phased approach (based on population size)

Timelines







Sep '18 – Feb '19 March – Nov '19 Nov '19



Expert Consultants







PUBLIC SECTOR DIGEST INTELLIGENCE FOR THE PUBLIC SECTOR. ®



SAT 2.0 and Maturity Framework

UNDER CONSTRUCTION

- SAT 444 will be accessible to all municipalities soon
- MFOA's asset management maturity framework is available as a single document or chapter by chapter
- Available at www.mfoaamp.ca





Maturity Framework





Strategic AM Policy (SAMP) Toolkit

- Available NOW
- MFOA worked with KPMG to develop a Strategic AM Policy Toolkit to support municipalities in developing this foundational document and implementing it within their organizations.
- Easy to understand guidance covering policy planning, preparation and implementation, from needs assessment and information gathering, to policy development and socialization, to roll-out and implementation
- Structured Case Studies highlighting the experience and lessons learned by a dozen Pilot Municipalities who have worked with and informed the toolkit development process
- Sample text for drafting each section of the policy



SAMP Overview

INTRODUCTION

WHY DOES ASSET MANAGEMENT MATTER	05
BENEFITS OF ASSET MANAGEMENT	06
THE CHALLENGE OF ASSET MANAGEMENT	07
BACKGROUND ON THE REGULATION	09
REGULATION TIMELINE	10
WHY STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICIES	11
PREPARING FOR SUCCESS	12

POLICY PLANNING

IDENTIFYING THE CHAMPION	16
REVIEWING THE EXISTING POLICY	18
IDENTIFYING STAKEHOLDERS	19
BUILDING COMMITMENT	21

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

POLICY DEVELOPMENT TOOLS	23
PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A POLICY	24
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT	26
GUIDING PRINCIPLES	28
CAPITALISATION THRESHOLDS	32
GOVERNANCE & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	34
BUDGETING	36
COMMUNITY PLANNING	39
CLIMATE CHANGE	41
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	43

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

PUBLISHING THE POLICY	45
ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING	46
ANNUAL BUDGETING	47
GOVERNANCE	48
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	49
ONGOING ENGAGEMENT	50

APPENDIX

PERSPECTIVES	51
WORKSHEETS	57
CASE STUDIES	66



Full day SAMP Workshops

Interactive Workshops

- Kanata- October 16, 2018
- Brampton October 23, 2018
- Livestream October 23, 2018
- London October 25, 2018
- **Trenton** October 30, 2018
- Sudbury November 6, 2018
- Thunder Bay November 20, 2018



Community of Practice Guide and Case Studies

- Guide to AM Communities of Practice
 - Provides practical recommendations and strategies for the development of AM Communities of Practice
- Case studies
 - Showcasing examples of AM communities of practice in Ontario
 - 1. Perth Community of Practice
 - 2. AMOntario



Benefits of an Asset Management Community of Practice

Communities of practice can be useful at all stages of the asset management planning process. Potential benefits include:

- Sharing of stories, problems, and solutions
- Development of local best practices
- Collective problem solving
- Sharing of expenses associated with third party expertise
- Reducing barriers to the development of robust asset management plans
- Developing a repertoire of resources


Questions?

Colin Macdonald

Manager of Policy colin@mfoa.on.ca

416-362-9001 x 232

