

Administrative Response – Current Status, Next Steps and Timelines

Recommendation		Response	Implementation Date
1	IA recommends that when the City develops its asset management and capital planning policies (including a master AMP), it incorporate fundamental aspects of asset management planning as outlined above and take into account leading practices from municipalities such as Ottawa, Windsor, Calgary and Waterloo, which have recently undergone such initiatives.	Agreed. Changes to Council Policy No. C03-001 are anticipated in late 2017.	June 30, 2018
2	IA recommends the incorporation of formal risk-based decision making criteria be incorporated to allow for a more structured process for capital project prioritization and the allocation of limited resources. These criteria would primarily be applicable to major capital projects that are funded outside of the Capital Reserve Bylaw. We recommend the City take into account leading practices from municipalities such as Edmonton, Ottawa and Waterloo as referenced and illustrated in this report.	Agreed. The process to prioritize projects funded from specific reserves are established by departments based on various criteria. The recommendation to implement the Auditor's suggested process would work where there are multiple projects competing for funds that are not dedicated by reserve bylaw or policy.	Dec. 31, 2017
3	IA recommends that formalized criteria be developed to set out the roles and responsibilities that Asset & Financial Management will play in ongoing asset management compared to the roles and responsibilities of the individual stakeholder divisions. The aim of these criteria would be to yield a consistent level of integration between Asset & Financial Management and the various stakeholder divisions, which ultimately will assist in ensuring that long-term asset performance can be sustained and funded at a level that meets the level of service articulated to the stakeholders and citizens. It will also drive an increase in accountability between the stakeholder divisions and Asset & Financial Management with respect to the asset management planning process.	Agreed.	June 30, 2018
4	IA recommends that Administration incorporate strict guidance for capital project submissions to the budget regarding the incorporation of asset life cycle costs and operating cost impacts.	Agreed.	Dec. 31, 2018
5	IA recommends that for all capital projects where there is an absence of operating cost impacts and life cycle costs, an explanation be provided or	Agreed.	Dec. 31, 2019

	that a direct reference be included in the capital project description of where these costs are included.		
6	IA recommends that the City incorporate categorization of capital expenditures into its capital projects in order to more clearly link life cycle costs to AMP's and to distinguish between the different types of capital spend being incurred.	Agreed.	Dec. 31, 2017
7	IA recommends the development of performance measures to illustrate the traction of asset management planning in the City.	Agreed.	Dec. 31, 2018
8	IA recommends that at least every four years, to coincide with the proposed multi-year budgeting cycle currently being contemplated, Administration should provide a "plain language" report on capital assets to the SPC on Finance and City Council.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Administration has been providing this information on a regular basis regarding the Building Better Roads Program.</p> <p>As more asset management plans are adopted and implemented, the Administration will provide regular updates on progress and any issues or opportunities.</p>	<p>Early 2019</p> <p>Upon approval of the Corporate Asset Management Plan, Administration will develop a reporting schedule/mechanism for City Council approval.</p>