
Capital Asset Evaluation Policy

Date Approved: **DRAFT**

Section: Capital Asset Management

Date of Last Update:

Lead: Director, Operations

Next Review Date: August 1, 2022

Keywords: Capital Asset Management, Asset Registry, Asset Evaluation

Implements: **By-law #5300 – City of Selkirk Capital Asset Management**

OBJECTIVES

- Establish the methodology used to assess the condition of the City's Capital Assets
- Establish a schedule for the regular assessment of the City's Capital Assets
- Ensure Capital Asset condition assessments are properly recording in the City's Asset Registry
- Establish clear expectations for Administration as to their accountability for timely, accurate and complete Capital Asset condition assessment

SUPPORTING POLICY, PROCEDURES, AND TOOLS

Policy

CAM-001 Capital Asset Registry Policy

Procedures

CAM-002-001 Facility Evaluation Procedure

CAM-002-002 Fleet & Machinery Evaluation Procedure

CAM-002-003 Road Surface Evaluation Procedure

Tools

CAM-001-000-01 City of Selkirk Asset Registry

CAM-002-002-01 FECE Evaluation Form

INDEX

1	DEFINITIONS.....	3
2	SCOPE.....	4
3	ASSET EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES	4
4	ASSET EVALUATION FREQUENCY	15
5	UPDATING THE ASSET REGISTRY	16
6	RESPONSIBILITIES	16
7	POLICY REVIEW.....	16
8	EFFECTIVE DATE	16
9	AUTHORITY	16
10	PROCEDURES	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1 DEFINITIONS

“Administration” means all management and staff of the City of Selkirk as outlined within the City of Selkirk Organization Chart.

“Asset Registry” means the official recording of Capital Assets owned by the City and containing all the data and information generally considered necessary for the delivery of asset management processes.

“Capital Asset” means a Natural or Engineered Asset deemed material by the City and included in the City’s Asset Registry.

“Capital Asset Management” means the practice of using an integrated, lifecycle approach to systematically plan, source, construct, operation, maintain, renew and decommission municipal infrastructure assets to manage risk and sustainably achieve a prescribed level of service to the public.

“Chief Administrative Officer” means the Chief Administrative Officer for the City of Selkirk as designated by by-law.

“City” means the City of Selkirk.

“Council” means the Council of the City of Selkirk.

“Current Year Replacement Value” means the cost to acquire an asset if the asset had to be replaced today. The cost is the minimum cost to replace the asset with a new modern equivalent (not second hand) with the same economic benefits (service life). It is calculated using the current market rate or other rate as determined by administration, multiplied by the units required.

“Engineered Assets” means an asset that has been designed and constructed or manufactured by humans for the delivery of municipal services.

“International Roughness Index (IRI)” means a mathematical property of a two-dimensional road profile, showing road elevation as it varies with longitudinal distance and measured with units of slope

“Levels of Service” means the standards set by the City for the characteristics, condition, and/or performance of a municipal asset class, sub-class, or individual asset.

“Life-Cycle Costs” means the sum of all recurring and one-time costs related to the procurement, ownership, operation, maintenance and dispose of an asset or process.

“Natural Asset” means a naturally occurring land, water, air or subsurface feature which performs or supports the delivery of a municipal service.

“Pavement Condition Index (PCI)” means a numerical index between 0 and 100 which is used to indicate the general condition of a pavement.

“Sustainability” means the ability to maintain the characteristics and processes at a particular level, indefinitely into the future.

“Third Party Application” means any software product or service that is provided by an external provider in agreement with the Administration for the effective delivery of Capital Asset Management.

“Total Annual Cost of Repairs” means the cost of repairs that have been identified and have been completed in the current year.

“Total Deferred Maintenance” means the cost of repairs that have been identified as necessary but have not yet been undertaken.

2 SCOPE

This policy shall provide direction to Administration to ensure the accurate and timely assessment and documenting of the condition of the City’s Capital Assets.

3 ASSET EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES

- 3.1 The City shall use a conditional rating scale developed specifically for each asset subclass in order to evaluate the condition of an asset. Each conditional rating scale shall have a numeric condition rating along with a description of what a typical asset of that condition will look like and how it will perform.
- 3.2 Each conditional rating scale shall be from one to five and represent the following condition descriptions: 1 - Very Good, 2-Good, 3-Fair, 4-Poor, and 5-Very Poor.
- 3.3 The condition number and description in a conditional rating scale for any asset class shall be based on predictive models, tools accepted industry wide, as well as visual inspections.

4 FACILITY EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

- 4.1 Facilities shall be evaluated using the Facility Conditional Index (FCI). The equation is as follows:

$\text{Facility Condition Index} = \frac{\text{Total Annual Cost of Repairs} + \text{Total Deferred Maintenance}}{\text{Current Year Replacement Value}}$

- 4.2 The following table defines the conditional rating of all wood, brick, mortar and steel facilities.

Facilities			
FCI	Rating	Condition	Description
0% - 1%	1	Very Good	Facility is in like new condition and complies with engineering standards. Maintenance activities are focused on regular inspections and routine maintenance to preserve the asset.
2% - 5%	2	Good	No remedial work is required; asset still complies with engineering standards. Preventative maintenance procedures are in place.
6% - 10%	3	Fair	Facilities systems are aging. Minor remedial work will be needed. Maintenance budget increasing.
11% - 30%	4	Poor	Replacement of major components required. Major remedial work is needed.
> 30%	5	Very Poor	Facility requires replacing or major upgrades required.

5 FLEET EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

5.1 Fleet shall be evaluated using the Fleet and Equipment Conditional Index (FECI). The FECI is based on the following equation:

$$\text{Fleet and Equipment Conditional Index} = \frac{\text{Total Annual Maintenance} + \text{Total Deferred Repairs}}{\text{Current Year Replacement Value}}$$

5.2 The following table defines the FECI scores and how they translate to a conditional rating for the City's fleet.

Fleet			
FECI	Rating	Condition	Description
0% - 2%	1	Very Good	Asset is in like new condition. Maintenance activities are focused on inspection and routine maintenance to preserve the asset.
3% - 10%	2	Good	No remedial work is required. Preventative maintenance procedures are in place.
11% - 20%	3	Fair	Asset systems are aging. Minor remedial work will be needed. Maintenance budget increasing.
21% - 30%	4	Poor	Replacement of major components required. Major remedial work is required.
> 30%	5	Very Poor	Asset requires replacing or major upgrades required.

6 MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

6.1 Machinery and equipment assets shall be evaluated using the Fleet and Equipment Conditional Index (FECI). The FECI is based on the following equation:

$$\text{Fleet and Equipment Conditional Index} = \frac{\text{Total Annual Maintenance} + \text{Total Deferred Repairs}}{\text{Current Year Replacement Value}}$$

6.2 The following table defines the FECI scores and how they translate to a conditional rating for the City's machinery and equipment.

Machinery & Equipment			
FECI	Rating	Condition	Description
0% - 2%	1	Very Good	Asset is in like new condition. Maintenance activities are focused on inspection and routine maintenance to preserve the asset.
3% - 10%	2	Good	No remedial work is required. Preventative maintenance procedures are in place.
11% - 20%	3	Fair	Asset systems are aging. Minor remedial work will be needed. Maintenance budget increasing.
21% - 30%	4	Poor	Replacement of major components required. Major remedial work is required.
> 30%	5	Very Poor	Asset requires replacing or major upgrades required.

7 PARKING LOT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

7.1 Parking Lot Surface

7.1.1 The City shall use visual inspections and the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score to evaluate the condition of the City owned parking lot surfaces.

7.1.2 The following table defines the conditional ratings for asphalt parking lot surfaces.

Parking Lot - Surface (Asphalt)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Surface appears to be very smooth and is generally free of any distress. No potholes. No crack sealing required. Complies with engineering standards.
2	Good	Some surface deterioration is evident. Minimal crack sealing required. Minimal pothole patching required. Complies with engineering standards.
3	Fair	Surface deterioration is much more advanced. Minor rutting in the travelled lanes. Numerous pothole patching required. Regular crack sealing required.
4	Poor	Pavement deteriorating. Extensive potholes and cracks. Rutting is becoming more pronounced. Needs resurfacing or overlay.
5	Very Poor	Surface is severely cracked and disintegrated. Parking lot base and surface needs replacing.

7.1.3 The following table defines the conditional ratings for gravel parking lot surfaces.

Parking Lot - Surface (Gravel)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Surface appears to be smooth and is generally free of any distress. Little or no maintenance is required.
2	Good	Surface has the necessary slope and is even and firm. Some distress in isolated areas with minimal signs of potholes, loose gravel, and dust. Minimal maintenance required.
3	Fair	Surface has for the most part the necessary slope and is generally even and firm. Distress in sections with signs of potholes, loose gravel, and dust. Isolated areas with frost damage. Regular maintenance required.
4	Poor	Surface has a poor slope and surface deformation exists. Large sections of the surface are uneven due to potholes, loose gravel, and wash boarding. Sections of frost damage. Erosion channels potentially present.
5	Very Poor	The parking lot section needs to be reshaped and a new gravel layer must be constructed. Parking lot base needs replacing.

7.2 Parking Lot Base & Subbase

7.2.1 The City of Selkirk shall use predictive modelling to determine condition of non-visual parking lot assets.

7.2.2 The City is currently using a statistical deterioration model to assess the condition of all city owned parking lot bases and parking lot subbases.

8 PATHWAY EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

8.1 Pathway Surface

8.1.1 The City shall conduct visual inspections to evaluate the condition of all pathway surface.

8.1.2 The following table defines the conditional ratings of asphalt pathway surfaces:

Pathway - Surface (Asphalt)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Uniform with a flat cross slope. Complies with engineering standards.
2	Good	Uniform with a flat cross slope. Minimal small cracks. Complies with engineering standards.
3	Fair	Slight non-uniform cross slope. Multiple cracks with minimal dips and heaves.
4	Poor	Steep or multiple cross slopes. Large cracks with large dips and heaves.
5	Very Poor	The entire pathway section needs to be reconstructed. Pathway base needs replacing.

8.1.3 The following table defines the conditional ratings of gravel pathway surfaces:

Pathway - Surface (Gravel)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Surface appears to be smooth and is generally free of any distress. Little or no maintenance is required.
2	Good	Surface has the necessary cross fall and is even and firm. Some distress in isolated areas with minimal signs of potholes, loose gravel, and narrowing. Minimal maintenance required.
3	Fair	Surface has for the most part the necessary cross fall and is generally even and firm. Distress in sections with signs of potholes, loose gravel, and narrowing. Regular maintenance required.
4	Poor	Surface has a poor cross fall and surface deformation exists. Large sections of the surface are uneven due to potholes, loose gravel, and narrowing. Erosion channels potentially present.
5	Very Poor	The entire pathway section needs to be reshaped and a new gravel layer must be constructed.

8.1.4 The following table defines the conditional ratings of grass pathway surfaces:

Pathway - Surface (Grass)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Surface appears to be level and is generally free of any distress. Regular maintenance is required.
2	Good	Surface has the necessary cross fall and is even and firm. Some distress in isolated areas with minimal signs of rutting, potholes, and narrowing. Regular maintenance required.
3	Fair	Surface has for the most part the necessary cross fall and is generally even and firm. Distress in sections with signs of rutting, potholes, and narrowing. Regular maintenance required.
4	Poor	Surface has a poor cross fall and surface deformation exists. Large sections of the surface are uneven due to rutting, potholes, and narrowing. Erosion channels potentially present.
5	Very Poor	The entire pathway section needs to be reshaped and a new grass layer must be constructed.

8.2 Pathway Base

8.2.1 The City of Selkirk shall use a statistical deterioration predictive model to determine the condition of pathway base and subbase.

8.2.2

9 ROAD NETWORK EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES

9.1 Road Surface

9.1.1 The City shall use visual inspections, the International Roughness Index (IRI), and the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score to evaluate the condition of the road surfaces.

9.1.2 The City shall do visual inspections on all road curbs and sidewalk surfaces to evaluate condition.

9.1.3 The following table defines the conditional rating of asphalt road network surfaces:

Road Network - Surface (Asphalt)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Surface appears to be very smooth and is generally free of any distress. No potholes. No crack sealing required. Complies with engineering standards.
2	Good	Some surface deterioration is evident. Minimal crack sealing required. Minimal pothole patching required. Complies with engineering standards.
3	Fair	Surface deterioration is much more advanced. Minor rutting may be noticeable in the outer wheel paths. Numerous pothole patching required. Regular crack sealing required. Minimal joint heaving.
4	Poor	Pavement deteriorating. Extensive potholes and cracks. Rutting is becoming more pronounced. Needs resurfacing or overlay. Joint heaving pronounced.
5	Very Poor	Traffic ride ability is severely affected. Surface is severely cracked and disintegrated.

9.1.4 The following table defines the conditional rating of gravel road network surfaces.

Road Network - Surface (Gravel)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Surface appears to be smooth and is generally free of any distress. Little or no maintenance is required.
2	Good	Surface has the necessary cross fall and is even and firm. Some distress in isolated areas with minimal signs of potholes, loose gravel, and dust. Minimal maintenance required.
3	Fair	Surface has for the most part the necessary cross fall and is generally even and firm. Distress in sections with signs of potholes, loose gravel, and dust. Isolated areas with frost damage. Regular maintenance required.
4	Poor	Surface has a poor cross fall and surface deformation exists. Large sections of the surface are uneven due to potholes, loose gravel, and wash boarding. Sections of frost damage. Erosion channels potentially present.
5	Very Poor	The entire road section needs to be reshaped and a new gravel layer must be constructed.

9.1.5 The following table defines the conditional rating of concrete sidewalk surfaces.

Sidewalk - Surface (Concrete)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Uniform with a flat cross slope. Complies with engineering standards.
2	Good	Uniform with a flat cross slope. Minimal small cracks. Complies with engineering standards.
3	Fair	Slight non-uniform cross slope. Multiple cracks with minimal dips and heaves. Minor spalling.
4	Poor	Steep or multiple cross slopes. Large cracks with large dips and heaves. Excessive spalling.
5	Very Poor	The entire sidewalk section needs to be reconstructed. Sidewalk base may needs replacing.

9.1.6 The following table defines the conditional rating of paving stone sidewalk surfaces.

Sidewalk - Surface (Paving Stone)		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Uniform with a flat cross slope. Complies with engineering standards.
2	Good	Uniform with a flat cross slope. Surface appears to be free of any distress. Complies with engineering standards.
3	Fair	Slight non-uniform cross slope. Minimal dips and heaves. Isolated paving stones missing.
4	Poor	Steep or multiple cross slopes. Large dips and heaves. Section of paving stones missing.
5	Very Poor	The entire sidewalk section needs to be reconstructed. Sidewalk base needs replacing.

10 STORM NETWORK EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES

10.1 The City shall use a statistical deterioration predictive model to determine the condition of all City of Selkirk Storm Network Assets. These assets include Storm mains, storm manholes, and the storm manhole frame and cover.

10.2 The following table defines the conditional rating of storm mains:

Storm Main		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.
4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but work is required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.
5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.

10.3 The following table defines the conditional rating of storm manholes:

Storm Manhole		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.
4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but work is required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.
5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.

10.4 The following table outlines the conditional rating of storm manhole frames & covers:

Storm Manhole Frame & Cover		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.
4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but work is required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.
5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.

11 WASTEWATER EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES

11.1 The City shall use a statistical deterioration predictive model to determine the condition of all Wastewater Network Assets. These assets include The City is currently using a statistical deterioration model.

11.2 The following table defines the conditional rating of wastewater mains:

Wastewater Main		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.
4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but works required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.

5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.
---	-----------	---

11.3 The following table defines the conditional rating of wastewater manholes:

Wastewater Manhole		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.
4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but works required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.
5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.

11.4 The following table defines the conditional rating of wastewater manhole frames and covers:

Wastewater Manhole Frame & Cover		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.
4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but works required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.

5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.
---	-----------	---

12 WATER NETWORK

12.1 The City shall use a statistical deterioration predictive model to determine the condition of all of the water network assets. These assets include water mains and fire hydrants.

12.2 The following table defines the conditional rating of water mains:

Water Main		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.
4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but work is required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.
5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.

12.3 The following table defines the conditional rating of fire hydrants.

Fire Hydrant		
Rating	Condition	Description
1	Very Good	Sound physical condition and complies with engineering standards. Asset is in like new condition.
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition still complies with engineering standards; minimal short-term failure risk but potential for deterioration in long-term. Only minor work required (if any).
3	Fair	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in the short term but further deterioration and major replacement likely. Minor components or isolated sections of the asset need replacement or repair now but asset still functions safely at adequate level of service. Work required but asset is still serviceable.

4	Poor	Failure likely in short-term. Need to replace most or all of asset. No immediate risk to health or safety but work is required to ensure asset remains safe. Substantial work required in short-term, asset barely serviceable.
5	Very Poor	Failed or failure imminent. Immediate need to replace most or all of asset. Health and safety hazards exist which present a possible risk to public safety or asset cannot be serviced/operated without risk to personnel. Major work or replacement required urgently.

13 ASSET EVALUATION FREQUENCY

13.1 The City of Selkirk shall develop an asset evaluation schedule outlining the frequency of evaluations for each asset class and subclass. The following schedule shall be considered the official evaluation schedule for all the City's capital assets included in Phase 1.

Asset Class	Asset Sub Class	Type of Inspection	Evaluation Frequency
Facilities	All Facilities Sub Classes	FCI	5 Years
Fleet	All Fleet Sub Classes	FECI	2 Years
Machinery & Equipment	All Machinery and Equipment Subclass	FECI	2 Years
Parking Lot	Parking Lot Surface	Visual Inspection	2 Years
	Parking Lot Subbase Parking Lot Base	Predictive Modelling	1 Year
Pathways	Pathway Surface	Visual Inspection	1 Year
	Pathway Base	Predictive Modelling	1 Year
Road Network	Road Surface Curbs Sidewalk Surface	PCI Survey	1 Year
	Road Surface	IRI Survey	2 Times a Year (Summer & Winter)
	Road Subbase Road Base	Predictive Modelling	1 Year
Storm Network	Storm Main Storm Manhole Storm Manhole Frame & Cover	Predictive Modelling	1 Year
Waste Water Network	Wastewater Main Wastewater Manhole Wastewater Manhole Frame and Cover	Predictive Modelling	1 Year
Water Network	Water Main Fire Hydrant	Predictive Modelling	1 Year

14 UPDATING THE ASSET REGISTRY

- 14.1 Administration shall ensure that the Asset Registry is maintained and kept current according to the *City's Capital Asset Registry Policy*.

15 RESPONSIBILITIES

- 15.1 The City's Director of Operations (or the successor position) shall be responsible for the general fulfillment and enforcement of this policy. This position must, bring all material breaches of this policy to the attention of the City's Chief Administrative Officer.
- 15.2 The City's Director of Operations (or the successor position) shall be responsible for causing Capital Asset condition assessments to occur.
- 15.3 The City's GIS - Surveyor Technician (or the successor position) shall be responsible for accurately recording completed condition assessments within the City's Asset Registry and for maintaining an archive of the complete assessment forms.
- 15.4 Members of Administration are responsible for causing Capital Asset condition assessments to occur as delegated by the Director of Operations, in consultation with the Chief Administrative Officer.
- 15.5 Members of Administration are responsible for following and ensuring their direct reports understand and follow, the procedures enumerated in Section 10 of this policy and any processes otherwise established to fulfill this policy.

16 POLICY REVIEW

This policy shall be reviewed no less than every five years from the date it is effective.

17 EFFECTIVE DATE

THIS IS A DRAFT

18 AUTHORITY

By-law 5283 City of Selkirk Chief Administrative Officer Bylaw (or successor by-law)

- 18.1** The City shall establish, implement and maintain an asset inspection and condition evaluation system that provides the necessary data to maintain the City's Asset Registry and supports the City's asset reporting regime set out in section three (3) of this by-law.
- 18.2** The City's inspection and asset condition evaluation system will be demonstrably aligned with generally accepted asset management practices and will consistently provide reliable condition and value information for the City's Capital Asset Management program.
- 18.3** The Chief Administrative Officer is responsible for:
- 18.3.1** Ensuring the development and maintenance of a robust and sustainable Capital Asset Management program.
 - 18.3.2** Establishing policies, practices, procedures and allocating the resources necessary to competently deliver the City's Capital Asset Management program.
- 18.4** The Chief Administrative Officer is authorised to make regulations, implement policies, establish fees and charges, rules or practice and procedures, and enter into agreements that he/she considers necessary to carry out the purpose and responsibilities of this By-law or any other By-law of the City of Selkirk.