Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Council Meeting - Workshop
Agenda

Date: Thursday, May 2, 2024, 5:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers

Additional materials may be distributed at the workshop. Alternative formats and communication supports are available upon request.

Closed Session will occur at 4 p.m.

Note: This meeting is a Council Workshop and no delegations will be registered; only directions to staff will be permitted.

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest
3. Closed Session
   That in accordance with section 239 (2)(b) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council to convene in Closed Session to consider the following subject matters:
   
   (b) personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees (Confidential Verbal update re: Human Resources Matter).
4. Presentations
   4.1 Asset Management Policy and Plan Presentation
   GEI Consultants will provide a presentation on Asset Management
   4.2 Parks Master Plan Levels of Service
   Staff will provide a presentation on the Parks Master Plan
5. Motion to Receive
6. Adjournment
Project Steering Committee Members

- Yogesh Shah: DCM Infrastructure Services*
- Mike Hausser: Director Operations*
- Mike Parsons: Director Environmental Services*
- Olu Ojikutu: Director Risk & Facilities*
- Mohammad Mamun: Chief Information Officer*
- Leah Walter: Director Engineering *
- Rob Martin: Fire Chief*
- Sheryl Ayres: Chief Financial Officer*
- Johan Krijnen: Manager Asset Management*
- Lesley Head: Director Recreation & Culture
- Jenna Brown-Jowett: Director Corporate Strategy

* These members are also member of permanent Asset Management Steering Committee
Agenda

Introductions
- Company Update
- Meeting Objectives and Key Outcomes

Asset Management Policy
- Requirements Under O.Reg.588/17
- Purpose of Asset Management Policy
- Policy Update Procedure

Asset Management Overview & Approach
- O.Reg.588/17
- Asset Management & Key Principles

Asset Management and LTF Plan
- Asset Management Plan Approach
GM BluePlan Engineering

- Full infrastructure lifecycle consulting firm
- Employee Owned, 7 offices throughout Ontario, 250+ staff
- Focused Asset Management & Infrastructure Planning Team (70+ staff)
  - Asset Management
  - Decision Support Systems
  - Maintenance Management Systems
  - Wet Weather & Climate Change
  - Data Analytics/Management & Technology
- Joined GEI on May 1, 2023
Meeting Objectives

• Meeting Purpose
  o To provide an overview of the Asset Management Policy, Plan and Long-term Financial Plan project.

• Key Outcomes
  o Familiarity with the project team and stakeholders.
  o Clear understanding of scope and objectives.
  o Understanding the big picture and timelines.
Our Key Objectives for this Project

- Develop 2024 interim and 2025 AMP compliant O.Reg. 588/17
- Continue to upon City of Cambridge's 2019 AM and update gaps for 2024 interim AMP
- Incorporate growth and climate into the 2025 AMP for all assets
- Prepare a engagement and work plan
- Complete a comprehensive financial plan both core and non-core
- Transfer of knowledge for AMP
Regulation comes into force

**January 1st, 2018**

Regulation comes into force

**July 1st, 2019**

**LOS Core Assets**

The AMP will be required to document the current levels of service and the costs to sustain the current levels of service provided by the municipality’s water, wastewater, stormwater, road and bridges infrastructure systems (i.e. ‘core’ assets per O.Reg. 588/17).

An AM policy is required to articulate specific principles and commitments that will guide decisions around when, why and how money is spent on the municipality’s infrastructure systems. The Policy is required by July 1, 2019.

Required to be updated every 5 years.

**July 1st, 2022**

**LOS All Assets**

The AMP will be required to document the current levels of service and the costs to sustain the current levels of service provided by all infrastructure systems in the municipality.

**July 1st, 2024**

**Proposed LOS**

The AMP will be required to document the current levels of service, the costs to sustain the current levels of service, the desired levels of service, the costs to achieve the desired levels of service, and the financial strategy to fund the expenditures necessary to achieve the desired levels of service for all infrastructure systems in the municipality.

Required to be updated every 5 years.

City of Cambridge’s O.Reg 588/17 Journey

- Strategic Asset Management Policy (2019)
- Asset Management Plan – Core & Non-Core Assets (2019)
- Interim Asset Management Plan (2024)
- Asset Management Plan (2025)
2002 – Safe Drinking Water Act
Full Cost Accounting and Quality Management (DWQMS).

2009 – Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) 3150
Include Tangible Capital assets (TCA) in their financial reports.

2012 – Municipal Infrastructure Investment Initiative (MIII)
Detailed asset management plans required for Provincial grant funding.

2014 – AMO Federal Gas Tax Fund Administrative Agreements
Required to complete Asset Management Plans by December 31, 2016.
Municipal Asset Management in Ontario

- Aligning public assets with community needs
- Mitigating risks
- Maintaining asset performance
- Optimizing asset use
- Ensuring financial
- Engaging with the public to transparency and accountability

Making the Best Possible Decisions About Assets

- COST
  - Willingness to pay
- LOS
  - Desired performance/service outcomes
- RISK
  - Appetite for risk

Tradeoff
A Key Challenge

The graph shows the cumulative capital expenditure ($ billions) from 2019 to 2043.

- **Needs** line: Steeply increasing, indicating a growing gap between needs and funding.
- **Funding** line: Gradually increasing, showing modest growth.

The graph illustrates the challenge of meeting the increasing capital expenditure needs over time.
• The City’s Asset Management Policy and Strategy was approved in 2019
• Asset Management Plan completed in 2019
  – This AMP met all 2022 O.Reg. 588/17 requirements met the majority of the 2024 O.Reg requirements
• 2024 – Established the “Infrastructure Renewal Fund” with an annual 1% Infrastructure Levy
• This Project will include the update to the Policy and an interim 2024 Plan followed by the 2025 AMP requirements with a Long-Range Financial Plan.
O.Reg. 588/17 Milestones

January 1st, 2018
Regulation comes into force

July 1st, 2018

LOS Core Assets
The AMP will be required to document the current levels of service and the costs to sustain the current levels of service provided by the municipality’s water, wastewater, stormwater, road and bridges infrastructure systems (i.e. ‘core’ assets per O.Reg. 588/17).

July 1st, 2019
Policy
An AM policy is required to articulate specific principles and commitments that will guide decisions around when, why and how money is spent on the municipality’s infrastructure systems. The Policy is required by July 1, 2019. Required to be updated every 5 years.

July 1st, 2019

July 1st, 2022
LOS Core Assets

Policy

LOS All Assets
The AMP will be required to document the current levels of service and the costs to sustain the current levels of service provided by all infrastructure systems in the municipality.

July 1st, 2024

LOS All Assets
The AMP will be required to document the current levels of service, the costs to sustain the current levels of service, the desired levels of service, the costs to achieve the desired levels of service, and the financial strategy to fund the expenditures necessary to achieve the desired levels of service for all infrastructure systems in the municipality. Required to be updated every 5 years.

July 1st, 2025
Proposed LOS

City of Cambridge’s O.Reg 588/17 Journey
Strategic Asset Management Policy (2019)
Asset Management Plan – Core & Non-Core Assets (2019)
Interim Asset Management Plan (2024)
Asset Management Plan (2025)
Purpose: The Strategic AM policy aims to:
- Support the implementation of AM
- Provide transparency and accountability
- Communicate to stakeholders involved
- Provide a framework for implementing asset management

Scope:
- The AM Policy applies to all departments and employees of the City & assets owned or maintained by the City.
- It also covers the ecological services provided by the natural assets that serve the City.
Strategic Asset Management
Policy Requirements

• Opening Statements
  • Policy Statement
  • Purpose
  • Definitions
  • Authority
  • Scope

• Policy Sections
  • Strategic Alignment
  • Stakeholder Engagement
  • Guiding Principles
  • Community Planning
  • Climate Change
  • Capital Thresholds
  • Financial Planning and Budgeting
  • Governance and Continuous Improvements
  • Benefits of Implementation
• Project Steering Committee – Workshop Held
  • Comments incorporated

• Corporate Leadership Team Review
  • Under review

• Council and Mayor Discussions and Review
  • To be held (later in May)
Asset Management Plan Process

- **State of the Infrastructure**
  - Asset Register
  - Current Replacement Value
  - Condition Evaluation

- **Levels of Service**
  - Current LOS
  - Proposed Levels

- **Lifecycle Management Strategy**
  - Lifecycle Activities
  - Lifecycle Modeling
  - Growth and Climate Change

- **Financial Strategy**
  - Budget History & Forecasts
  - Cost of LCM Activities
  - Strategies to Address Funding Shortfalls

- **Improvement & Monitoring**
  - Continual Improvement Opportunities
Scope & Inclusion

Transportation
- Roads
- Active Transportation (sidewalks, walkways, trails, bike lanes)
- Other (streetlights, traffic signs, retaining walls, street furniture)
- Bridges & Structures

Environmental Services
- Drinking Water assets
- Wastewater assets
- Stormwater assets

Emergency Services
- Fire assets (fire stations, fire services fleet)

Parks
- Cemetery assets
- Forestry
- Horticulture
- Park Amenities
- Natural Assets (street trees, urban forest areas, horticulture beds, parklands)

Recreation & Culture
- Indoor & Outdoor Facilities (hockey arenas, theatres, swimming pools, playgrounds, splash pads, sport fields, park & leisure amenities, senior and community centers)
- Library Buildings

Resource Management
- Corporate Facilities
- Fleet
- Information and Communication Technology Infrastructure
State of the Infrastructure Process

Develop Asset Hierarchy

Collect Data & Develop Asset Register
Asset Information, Replacement Costs, Condition, etc

Review Data and Conduct Gap Analysis

O.Reg. 588/17 State of the Infrastructure Reporting
Summary of Assets, Replacement Value, Average Age, Condition
Levels of Service Process

What services do we provide?

How do we rate our services?

What is our current Performance? (2024 AMP)

What is our proposed (target) performance? (2025 AMP)

How much does it cost to provide our services?

How much would it cost to provide our services at our target performance?
What does Level of Service really mean?

- Will you meet my basic needs?
- Will I be at risk of flooding?
- Will you be there in an emergency?
- Can we still get from A to B?
- Will I be able to find a parking space?
- Can we still play safely?
- Will the land be ready to develop?
- How often will you collect my waste?
Lifecycle Management Process

1. List lifecycle activities by LCM Categories
2. Determine frequency and triggers for activities
3. How do assets deteriorate over time? What will the condition be with (or without) interventions?
4. How much do these activities cost and how are they paid for (operating, capital, etc.)?
Asset Lifecycle Activities

- Initial construction or installation
- Operating Costs (staff time, energy, office space, vehicles etc.)
- Preventative Maintenance
- Corrective Maintenance
- Inspections and Condition Assessments
- Rehabilitation
- Disposal

- Construction
- Operating Costs
- Preventative Maintenance
- Corrective Maintenance
- Inspections
- Rehabilitation
- Disposal

State of the Infrastructure
Levels of Service
Lifecycle Management Strategy
Financial
Improvement & Monitoring
Final AMP and Presentation
Financial Strategy Process

- Itemize Capital and Operating Budget by LCM Category & Asset Class
- Determine Average Budget Spending
- LCM Modelling:
  - Current Performance Scenario
  - Anticipated Budget Scenario
  - Proposed (Target) Performance Scenario
- Scenario Comparison & Infrastructure Gap
Financial and Funding Strategy

- Develop financial plan using existing financial planning and budgeting efforts, asset data, and results from:
  - State of the Infrastructure
  - Condition Assessment Reports
  - Capital Budget and Forecast
  - Operating Budget
- Develop long-term financial model
- Link financial strategy to asset data
- 10-year Capital and Operating investment plans
O.Reg Compliant Asset Management Plan 2024 & 2025

Executive Summary
Concise summary of the plan

Corporate Asset Management Plan Overview
Asset Management in Fort Erie and Purpose

State of Local Infrastructure
Inventory and condition

Levels of Service
What we provide

Lifecycle Management Strategy
How we provide the service

Financing Strategy
What it will cost and how we will pay for it

AMP Improvement and Monitoring
Where we go from here
Next Steps

- Update of
  - Asset Management Policy
  - Asset Management Interim Plan (2024 O.Reg Requirements)
  - Both for approval June 2024
Outline

• Consultation – most popular areas of interest

• Levels of Service = the Foundation of the Parks Master Plan

• How proposed Levels of Service were developed

• Levels of Service – from walking distances and park provision to amenities

• Q & A - Discussion
Consultation…
Who provided inputs what we heard from them

- **Indigenous** = Enjoy and protect natural places and educate

- **Focus Groups** = Pickleball, Cricket, Tennis

- **Surveys** = Specific park suggestions = Atlas, safety perceptions, rating of current levels of service / desire for increased levels of service

- **Deeper dives** into specific demographics and their feedback = New Canadians, Accessibility/inclusion, Seniors / Youth
Consultation…
Common items of interest..

General amenities of Interest / Issues – “more”…. “better”:

- Splashpads
- Pickleball
- Shade, seating, gathering places, walking paths
- Teen / Adult – skatepark, disc golf, fitness stations
- Washrooms
- Safety
- Off-leash dog parks
- Food in parks, food trucks, concessions etc.

Interesting new ideas:
- Outdoor roller skating rink
- Indoor fully accessible four-season park

What we didn’t hear (e.g. Alcohol in parks)
Levels of Service – from walking distances and park provision to amenities…

Seeking feedback from Council on what you find most important and some examples of options and proposed Levels of Service

Keep in mind that “park classification” is the context for appropriate locations for existing and new amenities and is driven by parking and washrooms (i.e. available at Community Parks but not Neighbourhood Parks) … local consultation would also need to take place which may see some proposed amenities not installed at a location if opposition arises
Walking Distances … (to City, Neighbourhood, Community, POPS, Urban Square park classifications)

Community Definition

Parks are within a reasonable walking distance from my home.

Technical Definition

90% of residents / households are within 800m / 10 minute walking distance of City, Community, Neighbourhood, POPS, Urban Square park property classifications. “Underserviced areas” are those households that fall outside of the 800m / 10 minute walking distance threshold.
Park Provision... ("actively maintained areas")

Community Definition

*Enough park land for sports and other types of recreation exist in my community.*

Level of Service (Existing)
The City currently has 183 hectares of “Developed” lands (e.g. turf, maintained areas, non-naturalized areas) and 62 hectares that contain Recreation (e.g. sportsfields, courts, etc.).

- Parks Developed – 1.8 hectares / 1000 residents or 18 square metres per person

Level of Service (Proposed)
- Maintain existing Levels of Service
  - Waterloo existing 30 sq.m/person; targets 10 sq.m/person
  - Kitchener existing 20 sq.m/person; targets 10 sq.m/person
  - Burlington existing 29 sq.m/person; targets various
Community Definition
There are a sufficient number of woodlands, wetlands, and natural areas for biodiversity, sense of place, views, groundwater recharge, ecosystem services, habitat protection, education, natural heritage, mental health, protection and passive recreation (such as trails, canoeing, fishing, etc.).

Level of Service (Existing)
The City owns 668 hectares of Natural Areas and this comprises 73% of all park lands. The natural areas can be found as patches within parks as well as large ecosystems in stand alone properties.

- Natural Areas – 4.8 hectares / 1000 residents or 48 sq.m/person

Level of Service (Proposed)
- Maintain existing properties
- acquire new through development process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Area per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>39 sq.m/person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>50 sq.m/person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>11 sq.m/person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Splashpads… (Standard and Premium)

Locations:
- Central Park (Preston)
- Churchill Park (Galt)
- Duncan Ferguson Park (Galt)
- Forbes Park (Hespeler)
- Hespeler Optimist Park
- Lincoln Park (Galt)
- Northview Heights Park (Galt)
- Riverside Park (Preston)
- Soper Park (Galt)
- Victoria Park (Hespeler)
- Weaver Park (Hespeler)

1. **Lower Level of Service Than Current**: at end of life, close 5 splashpads (operational savings of $150,000/year) and maintain remaining 6 splashpads

2. **Current Level of Service**: 4 Premium and 7 Standard splashpads, 10 minute drive, washroom and parking at all but two very small splashpads (Weaver Park and Northview Heights Park) ($28,000 per location)

3. **Higher Level of Service**: renovate 3 Standard to Premium and build additional 3 Standard at Community Parks

---

**Community Parks**
- A Wayne Taylor
- Bismark Dr. (north)
- Churchill
- Dickson
- Forbes
- Gordon Chaplin
- Hancock
- Hespeler Optimist
- Maple Grove Dog Park
- Lincoln
- Lions Can-Amera
- Moyer’s Blair Landing
- Riverbluffs
- Soper
- Victoria (Hespeler)
- Victoria (Galt)
- Water St. S. Boat Launch
- Wesley Blvd.
- Willard

---

**Waterloo**
- 2 premium / 15 min

**Kitchener**
- 1 premium, 9 basic / 10 min

**Burlington**
- 4 premium, 5 basic / 15 min
Washrooms... (buildings to portables)

1. **Lower Level of Service Than Current:** not recommended given public demand and accessibility requirements

2. **Current Level of Service:**
   - Permanent (9 dedicated, 4 washroom/changeroom, 5 as part of a building) - 0.12/1000 residents
   - 41 regular portable, 4 “accessible” portable, and one wash station

3. **Higher Level of Service:**
   - Accessible portables and wash stations at every existing location
   - Community Parks (splash pads, picnic shelters, etc.) all have accessible washrooms

Lease to own, contract maintenance, etc. other configurations and costs being investigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate/1000 residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Playgrounds... (“Standard” Junior / Intermediate and “Premium” fully accessible)

PREMIUM PLAYGROUND
- Medium to large playground.
- Accessible and inclusive elements and amenities.
- A combination of ground and elevated play components.
- Rubberized soft play surfaces (e.g. poured rubber, or rubber tiles).
- Ramps may be considered in the playground equipment design and elements may be accessible by mobility devices (subject to budget considerations).
- Located near parking, washrooms, and other supportive services.

STANDARD PLAYGROUND
- Smaller playground (compared to a Community Park).
- Inclusive playground equipment.
- Ground level play components with some elevated play components.
- Engineered wood fibre surfacing used.
Community Definition

Well-maintained playstructures are available for small and older children and are accessible and inclusive.

Level of Service (Existing)
- 62 Junior / Intermediate playgrounds (“Standard”) and 4 “fully accessible” (“Premium”) playgrounds (Victoria Park (Galt), Victoria Park (Hespeler), Churchill Park (Galt), Riverside Park)
- 0.3 playgrounds per actively maintained hectare of parkland
- 0.5 playgrounds per 1000 residents
- 2.7 playgrounds per 1000 children

Level of Service (Proposed)
- Additional Premium (fully accessible) at Community Parks / replace Standard delete 2 Standard
- additional Standard playground (Apple Dr. Urban Green)

• Waterloo - 88 + 1 accessible; 5 playgrounds / 1000 child
• Kitchener - 200 + 4 accessible; 5.3 playgrounds / 1000 child
• Burlington - 68 + 4 accessible; 3.5 playgrounds / 1000 child
Off leash areas and dog parks...

Current Level of Service: 1 off-leash park 1.36 ha in size, including portable washroom and parking, ~20 minute drive

Higher Level of Service: additional two dog parks in south and central locations, ~1 ha in size, parking and washroom, ~10 minute drive

OR

Designate two naturalized parks/SWM ponds areas as off-leash dog areas.

Premium Level of Service: additional two dog parks and consult on pilot project of small temporary enclosed areas at selected Community Parks across the City (~3-5 locations)

Challenges:
- locations in residential areas given noise and previous Riverbluffs experience
- Need parking, washroom, shade, etc. and Community Parks are within residential areas
- Off-leash – many complaints, safety concerns

Ideas:
- “pop-up” pilots in existing parks (with consultation)
- Use existing fenced trails, SWM ponds, or natural areas – common in other municipalities
- “off-leash areas” (non-fenced) with additional rules (Guelph)
- Controlled access off-leash dog area – bookable for a fee.
Maintenance Levels of Service

Full Service - represents all the tasks typically expected for a park or park amenity

- Cut park grass once per week
- Check and empty garbage cans in neighbourhood parks twice per week
- Open / Mid-day check and clean / Evening clean and close washrooms daily

Current Service - represents the level we are able to achieve with resources available and constraints such as weather conditions expressed as a percentage

- 70% of the time we are able to achieve cutting grass once per week.
- 80% of the time we are able to complete mid-day check and clean on all washrooms

Proposed Service - represents improvements that can be reasonably accomplished with constraints such as weather conditions and an increase in resources/funding. Typically driven through Master Plan public consultation or re-occurring concerns raised from citizens through Service Cambridge.

- Increase weekly grass cutting to 80% of the time (remaining 20% is generally weather constrained).
- Increase daily mid-day washroom check/clean to 100% of all washrooms including portable washrooms
Example 1 — Full Service Costing Estimate Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ACTIVITY TYPE</th>
<th>SEASON</th>
<th>SERVICE STANDARD</th>
<th>AVG ESTIMATED RESOURCES PER UNIT PER OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>AVG ESTIMATED RESOURCES PER YEAR PER UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>CREW hours per occurrence</td>
<td>Effort per occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washroom spring startup</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1 annual 123456</td>
<td>6108120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morning cleaning</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 day 168050</td>
<td>1168050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Day Check</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 day 168050</td>
<td>1168050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening shutdown</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 day 168050</td>
<td>1168050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>1 year 123456</td>
<td>4462256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor vandalism</td>
<td>Re-active</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 year 168050</td>
<td>168050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major vandalism</td>
<td>Re-active</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 year 168050</td>
<td>168050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washroom fall winterization</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 year 168050</td>
<td>168050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/sewer</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 month 168050</td>
<td>168050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1 month 168050</td>
<td>168050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 1 — Current Service Level vs Proposed Service Level Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ACTIVITY TYPE</th>
<th>CURRENT ASSET INVENTORY</th>
<th>FULLY SUPPORTED ANNUAL COST AND EFFORT</th>
<th>CURRENT SUPPORTED ANNUAL COST AND EFFORT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SERVICE LEVEL CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit measure</td>
<td>Annual total Cost</td>
<td>Annual FTE</td>
<td>Consistency Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Washroom (May to September)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 232,439</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washroom spring start-up</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 7,595</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance cleaning</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 60,026</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Day Check</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 36,817</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening shutdown</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 68,802</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 4,313</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor vandalism</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 18,900</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major vandalism</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 18,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washroom fall winterization</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 5,586</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 10,800</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>9 each</td>
<td>$ 3,600</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 2 – Portable Washroom Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CURRENT ASSET INVENTORY</th>
<th>FULLY SUPPORTED ANNUAL COST AND EFFORT</th>
<th>CURRENT SUPPORTED ANNUAL COST AND EFFORT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SERVICE LEVEL CHANGES</th>
<th>OPERATING IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit measure</td>
<td>Annual total Cost</td>
<td>Consistency Level</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Portlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily check - clean / supplies - staff</td>
<td>41 each $100,083 1.20</td>
<td>23% $25,870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100% $100,083 1.20</td>
<td>$76,713 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly check - contractor</td>
<td>41 each $15,120 -</td>
<td>100% $15,120 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>41 each $10,250 -</td>
<td>100% $10,250 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Portlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily check - clean / supplies - staff</td>
<td>4 each $10,484 0.12</td>
<td>29% $3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100% $10,484 0.12</td>
<td>$7,484 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly check - contractor</td>
<td>4 each $2,000 -</td>
<td>100% $2,000 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>4 each $1,000 -</td>
<td>100% $1,000 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Wash Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily check - clean / supplies - staff</td>
<td>1 each $2,641 0.03</td>
<td>29% $770</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100% $2,641 0.03</td>
<td>$1,871 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly check - contractor</td>
<td>1 each $520 -</td>
<td>100% $520 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>1 each $250 -</td>
<td>100% $250 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Student = 4 months = 0.33 FTE

1.35 FTE ~ 4 Students for daily portable washroom servicing
# Example 2 – General Park Area Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ACTIVITY TYPE</th>
<th>FULL SERVICE Annual Cost per Unit</th>
<th>CURRENT ASSET INVENTORY</th>
<th>FULLY SUPPORTED ANNUAL COST AND EFFORT</th>
<th>CURRENT SUPPORTED ANNUAL COST AND EFFORT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SERVICE LEVEL CHANGES</th>
<th>OPERATING IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Area - General Park</td>
<td>Typical 1 Ha Par.</td>
<td>0.06 $ 8,507</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 2,381,864</td>
<td>171 $ 1,203,036</td>
<td>8.14 $ 518,342</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Litter Patrol</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 78</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 21,791</td>
<td>100% $ 21,791</td>
<td>0.15 100% $ 21,791</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Grass Mowing</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 8,502</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 980,609</td>
<td>6.56 70% $ 686,426</td>
<td>4.59 $ 754,847</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Slope Grass Trimming</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 1,891</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 529,529</td>
<td>3.54 50% $ 264,754</td>
<td>1.77 $ 517,171</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Cut Areas - Flail and litter Pick</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 420</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 117,673</td>
<td>0.79 25% $ 29,418</td>
<td>0.20 $ 58,837</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Park Grass/leaf Mulching Mowing</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 1,090</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 305,078</td>
<td>2.04 50% $ 152,539</td>
<td>1.02 $ 244,063</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park (leaf pick-up / blowing - select locations)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 251</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 70,365</td>
<td>0.58 10% $ 7,037</td>
<td>0.08 $ 56,292</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping (repair: ruts, holes, worn turf, etc.)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 75</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 21,037</td>
<td>0.06 10% $ 2,104</td>
<td>0.01 $ 10,518</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter path maintenance sod damage</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 251</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 70,365</td>
<td>0.58 40% $ 28,146</td>
<td>0.23 $ 42,199</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Grass maintenance (top dressing/seedling)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 176</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 49,199</td>
<td>0.47 0% $ -</td>
<td>- $ 49,199</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park shrub/tree/fenceline pruning</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 772</td>
<td>280 ha</td>
<td>$ 216,218</td>
<td>2.35 5% $ 10,811</td>
<td>0.12 $ 97,298</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Park - Naturalized/Wooded Area                     | Typical 1 ha acre    | 0.03 $ 4,202                       | 640 ha                   | $ 2,689,924                           | 20.86 $ 76,823                        | 0.3% $ 5,284                  | 0.02 $ 5,078      |
| Inspection - Tree Hazard / invasive Species / fence| Inspection          | $ 89                               | 640 ha                   | $ 56,924                              | 0.38 5% $ 2,848                       | 0.02 100% $ 56,924            | 0.58 $ 325,061    |
| Hazard Tree Mitigation                             | Reactive             | $ 1,442                           | 640 ha                   | $ 923,031                             | 0.10 5% $ 46,152                      | 0.00 40% $ 392,212            | 0.03             |
| Invasive Species Mitigation                        | Maintenance          | $ 1,952                           | 640 ha                   | $ 1,236,122                           | 18.67 1% $ 12,362                     | 0.19 $ 370,867               | 5.60             |
| Annual Spring Litter Perimeter Walk and Clean-Up   | Maintenance          | $ 256                             | 640 ha                   | $ 164,035                             | 1.33 0% $ -                            | - $ 82,017                   | 0.67             |
| Fence Repairs                                     | Reactive             | $ 483                             | 640 ha                   | $ 309,267                             | 0.39 5% $ 15,463                      | 0.02 100% $ 309,267           | 0.35             |
## Summary Draft Estimates - A

*2023 dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Amenity</th>
<th>Full Service Unit Cost</th>
<th>Current Inventory</th>
<th>Current Service Level *</th>
<th>Proposed Service Level *</th>
<th>Full Budget Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park General Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Area - General Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,279,860</td>
<td>$2,908,666</td>
<td>$1,629,806 19.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park - Naturalized/Wooded Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,203,036 8.1%</td>
<td>$1,721,378 12.2%</td>
<td>$518,342 4.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Receptacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Park Garbage Barrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$736,478 3.98%</td>
<td>$837,958 4.57%</td>
<td>$101,480 0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-ground garbage can (serviced by Staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,727 517 unit</td>
<td>$2,272 517 unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-ground garbage can (Molok - Serviced by Contractor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,380 71 unit</td>
<td>$2,380 71 unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-ground garbage can (Molok - Serviced by Contractor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,756 3 unit</td>
<td>$2,756 3 unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Receptacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splashpads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$231,560 1.31%</td>
<td>$244,149 1.47%</td>
<td>$12,589 0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>splashpad - premium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 $24,131 3 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>splashpad - standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 $24,131 8 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,059 1.97%</td>
<td>$345,648 3.39%</td>
<td>$95,859 1.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Season Washroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57 $64,762 0 each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Washroom (May to September)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23 $25,827 9 each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Portable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03 $2,441 41 each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Portable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03 $2,621 4 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Wash Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03 $2,641 1 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Amenity</td>
<td>Full Service Unit Cost</td>
<td>Current Inventory</td>
<td>Current Service Level *</td>
<td>Proposed Service Level *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg Annual Unit Cost</td>
<td>Avg Annual FTE per Unit</td>
<td>Service Level Delivery</td>
<td>Avg Cost per Unit</td>
<td>Total Annual Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths, Trails, Sidewalks and Parking</td>
<td>$2,844</td>
<td>0.02 FTE</td>
<td>167 each</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways (each)</td>
<td>$3,935</td>
<td>0.01 FTE</td>
<td>27 km</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Paths (km)</td>
<td>$3,935</td>
<td>0.01 FTE</td>
<td>48.8 km</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Secondary Trails</td>
<td>$2,876</td>
<td>0.02 FTE</td>
<td>46 km</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$1,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Primary Trails</td>
<td>$1,403</td>
<td>0.02 FTE</td>
<td>17.2 km</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Trails</td>
<td>$2,288</td>
<td>0.01 FTE</td>
<td>7.3 km</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Paths and Trails</td>
<td>$3,535</td>
<td>0.02 FTE</td>
<td>147 km</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$3,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Sidewalk Maintenance</td>
<td>$3,554</td>
<td>0.02 FTE</td>
<td>147 km</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$3,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Parking Lot</td>
<td>$859</td>
<td>0.01 FTE</td>
<td>31 lots</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields</td>
<td>$61,771</td>
<td>0.29 FTE</td>
<td>4 each</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$61,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Field - Artificial Turf</td>
<td>$79,901</td>
<td>0.48 FTE</td>
<td>8 each</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$46,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Field - Natural turf</td>
<td>$76,224</td>
<td>0.65 FTE</td>
<td>6 each</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$25,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Soccer Field</td>
<td>$61,997</td>
<td>0.44 FTE</td>
<td>6 each</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$16,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Mini Soccer Field</td>
<td>$74,863</td>
<td>0.57 FTE</td>
<td>8 each</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>$40,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Softball Diamond</td>
<td>$74,863</td>
<td>0.57 FTE</td>
<td>5 each</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>$32,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Baseball Diamond</td>
<td>$30,921</td>
<td>0.16 FTE</td>
<td>5 each</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$17,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Softball Diamond</td>
<td>$30,448</td>
<td>0.16 FTE</td>
<td>18 each</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$17,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radium Hardball Cricket Pitch</td>
<td>$22,623</td>
<td>0.06 FTE</td>
<td>0 each</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation hardball Cricket Pitch</td>
<td>$12,982</td>
<td>0.06 FTE</td>
<td>2 each</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$6,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation softball Cricket Pitch</td>
<td>$25,772</td>
<td>0.11 FTE</td>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$7,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lawn Bowling - Operated by Local Club | 1 |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |
| Disc Golf - Operated by Local Club  | 1 |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |  | $- |
Key Maintenance LOS Improvement Considerations under Operation Budgets

- Grass cutting
- Maintenance of natural areas
- Portable washroom check and clean
- Gravel parking area maintenance
- More garbage cans deployed and on regular service
- Sports field turf maintenance
Provision LOS Improvement Considerations under Capital Budgets

- More seating and shade structures
- More walking paths within neighbourhood parks
- Lighting in neighbourhood parks
- More full service washrooms
- More food venues (paired with washrooms and seating areas)
- More signage and educational information
- More amenities in park spaces
  - Promote sponsorships to build and maintain
Renewal LOS Improvement Considerations under Capital Renewal Budgets

- Renewal of existing park amenities that are approaching end-of-life expectancy
  - Sports fields
  - Playgrounds
  - Splashpads
  - Signage and information boards
  - Trails and Paths
  - Washrooms
Workshop Discussion

• Are there items we’ve presented that are not in alignment with expectations for the Parks Master Plan?

• What other specific service level items should we include for analysis and inclusion in Parks Master Plan?
  • Provision (i.e. more park assets….)

  • Maintenance (i.e. better day-to-day operation items…)

  • Renewal (i.e. Existing items that are past due for replacement….)
Thank you!