

# REPORT

TO: Reeve Dobson & Members of Committee of the Whole  
FROM: CAO G. Barnes  
DATE: January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Subject: Asset Management Plan Report

---

## **A Background**

Montague Township's existing infrastructure is aging while the demand continues to grow for better roads, bridges and equipment. This demand is a reaction to the higher standards municipalities are being held to, whether it is health and safety, bylaws and regulations, or community growth and increased expectations. As small townships such as Montague continue to grow, they are forced to adapt to these changes. In order to meet these standards we must improve the way we plan, design and manage infrastructure.

Long term planning with regard to infrastructure is not a new concept. It has more recently become known as "Asset Management" and has come to be a process of reviewing strategies, current practices and financial budgeting to create and consolidate existing infrastructure situations into a more formal Asset Management Plan.

In 2012, Ontario's Ministry of Infrastructure released a guide titled *Building Together: Guide for Municipal Asset Management Plans*. This guide forms part of a comprehensive strategy called the Municipal Infrastructure Investment Initiative (MIII) which aims to develop a strong and cooperative relationship between municipalities and the Province of Ontario to address the significant challenges that currently face our deteriorating infrastructure.

The Province is seeking to achieve standardization and consistency in the management of municipal infrastructure. To achieve this, the Province is requiring that any municipality seeking provincial capital funding for infrastructure projects ~~be required to~~ prepare an Asset Management Plan (AMP) to demonstrate the particular need of a project to the social, economic or environmental priorities of the community.

This report represents the Township's of Montague's first iteration of a strategic AMP that has been completed based on readily available information in the Township. It establishes a framework that supports an informed decision making process that is used to improve the management of the Township's infrastructure. The Township has committed to continually improving this AMP over the coming years as additional information is collected and as knowledge of asset management in the Township increases.

The short and long term capital investment needs established in this AMP are primarily based on a strategic review of the Township's asset inventory. The Township is committed to undertaking a series of activities to implement a more sophisticated asset management program. These activities will be used to develop more refined capital investment needs that are based on a better understanding of the renewal needs of the Township's infrastructure. This AMP should be updated on a periodic basis as the asset management activities are implemented.

## **B Discussion & Options**

### **Introduction**

This report represents the first strategic Asset Management Plan for the Township of Montague. It establishes a framework and makes recommendations that supports an informed decision making process that is used to improve the management of the Township's infrastructure.

### **Goals of Asset Management**

Asset management strives to continually improve the management of infrastructure. The following is a list of goals that asset management programs and processes aim to achieve.

- Reduce life cycle cost i.e. total operating, maintenance and capital expenditures.
- An informed and transparent decision making process that provides decision makers with the knowledge essential to making decisions regarding capital expenditures, operating costs and revenue requirements i.e. rate and tax levels.
- A mechanism to ensure that the services that are delivered through infrastructure can be provided at the best sustainable level at a cost that is affordable to residents.

### **Scope of the AMP**

This AMP covers the life span of assets promoted through Ontario's Ministry of Infrastructure's guide titled *Building Together: Guide for Municipal Asset Management Plans* and reports on the following assets owned by the Township:

- Roads
- Bridges
- Water and sewers
- Rolling stock
- Land improvements

### **Resource Documents**

The following documents were utilized in the development of this AMP:

- Road Needs Study (2004)
- Bill 175 Water and Wastewater System Replacement Cost Study (2007)
- Drinking Water Quality Management Systems Operational Plan (2010)
- Municipal Structural Inventory and Inspection (2012)
- Tangible Capital Asset (TCA) Register

- Relevant Provincial minimum maintenance standards
- Other relevant Township documents

### Refinement of the AMP

The Township is realistic in recognizing that this AMP is a first step along a pathway that will be able to achieve the goals outlined above. These established asset management strategies are seen as best practices in the municipal asset management industry and should be continued by the Township. The Township will look to develop an implementation strategy for all assets that includes a series of activities that will improve subsequent iterations of this AMP.

### Asset Inventory

The Township of Montague maintains a Tangible Capital Asset (TCA) Register that contains over 400 individual assets. Table 1 summarises the number of assets by asset class. The TCA entries related to Buildings (12 records) and Machinery / Equipment (50 records) were removed from the scope of work and are not detailed in this Plan.

Table 1 – Number of Assets by Asset Class

Asset Class	Description of Asset Class	Number of Assets
Water & Sewer	Water and Sewer System	94
Structures	Concrete & Large Culverts	5
Roads	HCB/LCB & Gravel Surface	117
Land Improvements	Airport runway/Landing surface	1
Rolling Stock	Cars, trucks or other vehicles used by the various departments.	12
<b>Total</b>		<b>229</b>

### Asset Value

The Township's TCA register contains the historical value of each asset. Table 2 summarizes the value of the assets. One Land Improvement is a shared asset with the Town of Smiths Falls and has not been identified in the Township's TCA.

Table 2 – Value of Assets by Asset Class

Asset Class	Replacement Value
Roads	15,161,950
Water & Sewer	879,339
Structures	865,900
Rolling Stock	2,273,000
Land Improvements	250,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,430,189</b>

## Asset Condition

Understanding the condition of the Township's assets is an essential component to an AMP. Ideally condition information is based on an assessment that provides first-hand knowledge of the condition of the infrastructure. However, for most of the assets in the Township, condition information is based on visual observations and first-hand knowledge is not readily available.

The best practice to estimate the condition of an asset, where assessment activities have not been completed, is to evaluate the amount of its useful life that has been consumed. For example, an asset that has a useful life of 10 years would be considered to be in excellent condition if it is 1 year old and poor condition if it is 9 years old. Although this approach does not always provide an accurate condition of the asset, particularly in cases of buried linear infrastructure (i.e. water mains and sewers), it is a reasonable starting point where actual condition information is not easily accessible. The Township's TCA register contains information on the asset age and the useful life that has been estimated based on industry standards, and therefore it is possible to estimate the condition of the assets useful life remaining.

For the purposes of this report, the condition of the assets where condition information was not available was estimated based on Table 3. It should be noted that there was actual condition information readily available for the following asset types:

- Roads
- Water mains & Sewers
- Structures

Condition ratings are assigned on a percentage of useful life remaining with the lower numbers assigned to those assets showing the most distress, and the higher numbers to those assets with little to no distress.

Table 3 – Estimated Condition by Useful Life Remaining

<b>Percent of Useful Life Remaining</b>	<b>Estimated Condition</b>
80% or above	Excellent
60-79%	Good
30-59%	Fair
1-29%	Poor

## **ROADS**

Montague Township has an extensive system of minor and major roadways located within its boundaries. Table 4 summarizes the current replacement value of road inventory by surface type. Tables 5 to 7 summarizes the useful life remaining of road inventory by surface type.

As previously mentioned, the condition rating procedure is based on the Township's TCA register for each road section. The actual condition rating (useful life remaining) may vary from those numbers described. The condition rating numbers provide a relative measure of the condition of all road sections, and of an appropriate treatment needed to either maintain or improve the level of service.

To obtain the most accurate measures of distress, the condition rating survey should be carried out during the "spring break-up period". It is important that the Roads Superintendent be involved in this part of the road inventory.

Table 4 – Total Road Inventory

Surface Type		Inventory (km)	Unit Replacement Cost	Current Replacement Value	% of Total Roads
HCB	High	15.2	\$ 383,000 / km	5,821,600.00	10.4
	Low	12.25	\$ 203,000 / km	2,486,750.00	8.4
LCB		28.78	\$ 90,000 / km	2,590,200.00	19.7
Gravel	High	59.0	\$ 50,000 / km	2,950,000.00	40.4
	Low	30.88	\$ 42,500 / km	1,312,000.00	21.1
<b>Total</b>		<b>146.11</b>		<b>15,160,950.00</b>	<b>100</b>

HCB - High Class Bituminous or Asphalt  
 LCB - Low Class Bituminous or Surface Treatment

Table 5 – Value by Useful Life Remaining - HCB Inventory 17.45 km

Condition Score	Inventory (km)		Total Length	% of Total Length
	High	Low		
Excellent	3.2	5.9	9.1	33.2
Good	12	2.05	14.05	51.2
Fair	0	4.3	4.3	15.6
Poor	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>12.25</b>	<b>27.45</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 6 – Value by Useful Life Remaining - LCB Inventory

Condition Score	Inventory (km)	% of Total Length
Excellent	2.3	8.0
Good	16.27	56.5
Fair	10.21	35.5
Poor	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>28.78</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7 – Value by Useful Life Remaining - Gravel Inventory

Condition Score	Inventory (km)		Total Length	% of Total Length
	High	Low		
Excellent	1.5	1.5	3	3.3
Good	20.75	9.08	29.83	33.2
Fair	36.75	20.3	57.05	63.5
Poor	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>30.88</b>	<b>89.88</b>	<b>100</b>

### Desired Level of Service

The desired levels of service for roads are based primarily on the Minimum Maintenance Standards for Municipal Highways. The optimum overall condition rating for Low Class Bituminous (LCB or surface treated) roads are based on available pavement preservation treatments and lifecycle analysis is between 5.9 and 6.4. Similarly, for High Class Bituminous (HCB or asphalt) the optimum condition rating is between 6.7 and 7.1. Based on the foregoing, for hard surface roads, a blended average condition rating should be between 6.3 and 6.75. A rating below the above mentioned ranges is an indication that the hard surfaced roads are underfunded.

### Potholes

Table 8 – Potholes on Paved Surface of Roadways

Class of Highway	Surface Area	Depth	Time
4	1000 cm <sup>2</sup>	8 cm	14 days
5	1000 cm <sup>2</sup>	8 cm	30 days

Table 9 – Potholes on Non-Paved Surface of Roadways

Class of Highway	Surface Area	Depth	Time
4	1500 cm <sup>2</sup>	10 cm	14 days
5	1500 cm <sup>2</sup>	10 cm	30 days

Table 10 – Potholes on Paved or Non-Paved of Shoulder

Class of Highway	Surface Area	Depth	Time
4	1500 cm <sup>2</sup>	10 cm	14 days
5	1500 cm <sup>2</sup>	12 cm	60 days

### ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Table 11 summarizes the overall asset management strategy for the road system. The strategies provided have been prepared with reference to the Ministry of Infrastructure's *Building Together: Guide for Municipal Asset Management Plans* as well as reference to reports previously prepared for the municipality

Table 11 – Road Asset Strategy

Asset	Road System
Inventory	Approximately 146 km of gravel and paved roadways
Anticipated Asset Life Cycle	Asphalt (HCB) roads will need to be resurfaced within 15 years and if not resurfaced, then reconstructed in 30 years. It is worth noting that the municipality cannot perpetually resurface a road; at some point in time the road must be reconstructed. Surface treated (LCB) roads have an assumed life expectancy of approximately 15 years before reconstruction is required. For gravel roads it is assumed that the condition of the road will be maintained with regular gravel resurfacing.
Integrated	The roads are integrated with buried assets in some locations, such as water and sewer, hydro or telephone.
Rehabilitation and replacement Criteria	All roads have been given a condition rating based on Useful Life Remaining.
Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategies	<p>Rehabilitation and replacement strategies are based on road surface type and visual inspection. A detailed list with associated cost per kilometre can be found in the Roads Needs Study 2004 submitted by TSH under separate cover filed with the Township.</p> <p>Gravel road maintenance will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continued grading program and granular placement</li> </ul> <p>Hard surface road maintenance will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintain crack sealing program</li> <li>▪ Increase shoulder maintenance – patching and grading</li> <li>▪ Continue Township’s surface treatment program i.e. application of single or double surface treatment</li> </ul> <p>General road maintenance will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Deficiencies elimination program</li> <li>▪ Increase in annual ditching cleanout and brushing</li> <li>▪ Increase tree clearing within right of way</li> </ul>
Life Cycle Consequences	Underfunding rehabilitation results in more road condition ratings falling below the ideal average (6.3-6.75), resulting in a severe increase in construction costs.
Previous Reports on Subject	N/A
Estimated Cost per Year for Strategy Described	A five year construction and rehabilitation program to address HCB and LCB roads with a Fair condition is estimated at \$1,791,800. The estimated minimum annual capital program for roads should be in the amount of \$358,360 per year.

## WATERMANS / SEWERS

Montague Township has a limited water and sewer system within its boundaries. The treated water is supplied to the Township through the Town of Smiths Falls distribution system from the Smiths Falls Water Treatment Plant.

The Montague Distribution System consists of approximately 2.25 km of 150 mm PVC water mains and 2.23 km of 200 mm PVC sanitary sewers located within the Atironto sub-division. There are 136 service connections and 21 fire hydrants within the system. There are no commercial, industrial or institutional facilities connected to the system.

As previously mentioned, the condition rating procedure is based on the Township's TCA register for each water main and sewer section. The actual condition rating (useful life remaining) may vary from those numbers described. The condition rating numbers provide a relative measure of the condition of all water main & sewer sections and of an appropriate treatment needed to either maintain or improve the level of service.

Table 12 summarizes the current replacement value and average useful life remaining of the water main inventory. Table 13 summarizes the current replacement value and average useful life remaining of the sanitary sewer inventory.

Table 12 – Watermain Inventory

Underground Type		Inventory (m)	Unit Replacement Cost (m)	Current Replacement Value	% of Useful life Remaining
PVC	150 mm Dia.	2,249.2	\$ 180	404,856.00	68.75 (Good)

Table 13 – Sanitary Sewer Inventory

Underground Type		Inventory (m)	Unit Replacement Cost (m)	Current Replacement Value	% of Useful life Remaining
PVC	200 mm Dia.	2,110.3	\$ 210	443,163.00	68.75 (Good)
PVC	250 mm Dia.	116	\$ 270	31,320.00	68.75 (Good)
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,226.3</b>		<b>474,483.00</b>	

### **Asset Management Strategy**

Table 14 summarizes the overall asset management strategy for the water main & sewer system. The strategies provided have been prepared with reference to the Ministry of Infrastructure's *Building Together: Guide for Municipal Asset management Plans* as well as reference to reports previously prepared for the municipality.

Table 14 – Water & Sewer Asset Strategy

Asset	Watermain / Sewer System
Inventory	Approximately 2.25 km of water supply line and approximately 2.23 km of sewer line.
Anticipated Asset Life Cycle	80 years.
Integrated	The water and sewer system is integrated with road surface assets and with hydro or telephone.
Rehabilitation and replacement Criteria	The water & sewer system has been given a condition rating (Useful Life Remaining). The threshold for rehabilitation or reconstruction is based on Useful Life Remaining.
Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategies	Rehabilitation and replacement strategies are based Useful Life Remaining. A detailed list with associated cost per kilometre can be found in the Water and Wastewater System Replacement Cost Study (2007) submitted by TSH under separate cover filed with the Township.
Life Cycle Consequences	Underfunding rehabilitation results in significant risk exposure to the Township resulting in an increase in costs to the Township.
Previous Reports on Subject	N/A
Estimated Cost per Year for Strategy Described	Water supply system is approximately \$7,237 per year and \$6,978 per year for the waste water system based on proposed Useful Life Remaining.

### Risk Management

A Drinking Water Quality Management System Operational Plan has been developed and implemented that describes the method of hazard identification, risk assessment and critical control point determination for the drinking water distribution system. The procedure consists of four main activities: hazard identification, risk assessment, critical control point determination and critical limit identification. A copy of the procedure for the Drinking Water Quality Management System Operational Plan under separate cover is filed with the Township.

### Ranking Risk

Each hazard identified shall be ranked according to:

- Likelihood is the probability/likelihood of a hazard or hazardous event occurring. Table 15 sets out likelihood.
- Severity is the potential impact to health or impact on operations if the hazard or hazardous event occurs. Table 16 sets out severity.
- Detecability is a measure of the ability to detect the presence of the hazard or hazardous event. Table 17 sets out detecability.

Table 15 – Likelihood

Level	Descriptor	Example Description
5	Almost Certain	Expected to occur in most circumstances
4	Likely	Probably occur in most circumstances
3	Possible	Will occur at some time
2	Unlikely	May occur at some time
1	Rare	May occur only in exceptional circumstances

Table 16 – Severity

Level	Descriptor	Example Description
5	Catastrophic	Major impact for population, system failure
4	Major	Major impact for population, system compromised, abnormal operations, high level of monitoring
3	Moderate	Minor impact for population, modification to normal; operation, increased monitoring
2	Minor	Minor impact for population, manageable disruption
1	Insignificant	No impact, minor disruption

Table 17 – Detectability

Level	Descriptor	Example Description
5	Undetectable	Cannot detect (i.e. Chemicals not on Schedules)
4	Poor Detectability	Problem is evident
3	Detectability	Visually detectable, rounds or maintenance
2	Moderate Detectability	Performance indicators, testing
1	High Detectability	Alarmed, fully visual

The control measures, monitoring and responding procedures shall be identified and considered when assigning ratings to hazard and hazardous events. The total risk shall be determined by adding the individual scores for Likelihood, Severity and Detectability. All hazards or hazardous events which have an overall risk rating of greater than 12 shall be identified as Critical Control Points.

## **STRUCTURES**

Table 18 summarizes the current replacement value of the structures inventory. As previously mentioned, the condition rating procedure is based on the Township's TCA register for each asset. The actual condition rating (useful life remaining) may vary from those numbers described and provides a relative measure of the condition of all structures.

Table 18 – Structure Replacement Costs

Structure Type	Range of Replacement Costs	Average Replacement Cost	% of Useful Life Remaining
<b>Bridge</b>	\$559,800	\$559,800	16 (Poor)
<b>Culvert</b>	\$287,500 - \$318,200	\$306,100	16 (Poor)

## Asset Management Strategy

Table 19 summarizes the overall asset management strategy for the structures inventory. The strategies provided have been prepared with reference to the Ministry of Infrastructure's *Building Together: Guide for Municipal Asset management Plans* as well as reference to reports previously prepared for the municipality.

Table 19 – Structure Assets Strategy

Asset	Structures – Concrete and Large Culverts
Inventory	5 Structures
Anticipated Asset Life Cycle	50 years
Integrated	The bridges are integrated with the Township's road network and other buried assets.
Rehabilitation and replacement Criteria	All structures have been given a condition rating based on Useful Life Remaining based on the Ontario Structure Inspection Manual (OSIM) during biennial inspections. The structure inspection report provides recommendations based on maintenance needs, also outlined in OSIM, and gives a timeline within which the work should be completed.
Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategies	Rehabilitation and replacement strategies are based on the structures Useful Life Remaining. Recommendations for structure can be found in the most recent Municipal Structure Inventory and Inspection submitted by AECOM under separate cover filed with the Township. It is recommended that the municipality continue to perform the biennial inspections and incorporate the results into associated asset documents.
Life Cycle Consequences	Underfunding rehabilitation results in increasing severity of deficiencies, therefore resulting in an increase in construction costs and exposure to the Township.
Previous Reports on Subject	Municipal Structure Inventory and Inspection 2012.
Estimated Cost per Year for Strategy Described	A ten year construction and rehabilitation program is estimated at \$113,000. The estimated minimum annual capital program for structural needs in years 1-5 is \$85,000 and \$28,000 for structural needs in years 6-10.

## **ROLLING STOCK**

In order to maintain Township owned property, a variety of equipment and vehicles are needed. This section of the analysis was developed based on information provided by the Township's TCA register and replacement strategy. The municipality's equipment was inventoried and recommended replacement years were based on its anticipated asset life cycle.

## Asset Management Strategy

All vehicles owned by Montague Township should be inspected annually, prior to developing the Public Works and Fire Department Budgets to ensure that sufficient funding is available to maintain the fleet. Table 20 summarizes the overall asset management strategy for the rolling stock.

Table 20 – Rolling Stock

Asset	Rolling Stock – Trucks or other vehicles used by the Public Works and Fire Departments
Inventory	Fleet of 12 vehicle
Anticipated Asset Life Cycle	Ranges from 5 to 20 years.
Integrated	N/A
Rehabilitation and replacement Criteria	All rolling stock has been assigned a replacement year based on typical life cycle. Each vehicle should be replaced within or at its life cycle year.
Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategies	Repair and replacement strategies are based on the year of the vehicle and its associated anticipated replacement year. A detailed list with associated cost per year to plan ahead for these replacements can be found with the Township.
Life Cycle Consequences	Underfunding maintenance and replacement results in increasing deficiencies, therefore resulting in an increase in costs and significant risk exposure to the Township. Minimum maintenance standards can also be affected with vehicle's unavailability due to breakdowns.
Previous Reports on Subject	N/A
Estimated Cost per Year for Strategy Described	Approximately \$135,817 per year based on typical life cycle for each vehicle.

## LAND IMPROVEMENTS

The Russ Beach Airport was created in 1960 by a group of local flying enthusiasts. Through their efforts the Smiths Fall Flying Club was created. The publicly licensed corporation owned, managed and operated the airport through to 1978 when the airport was turned over to the Town of Smiths Falls (75% ownership) and the Township of Montague (25%).

The airport is situated wholly within the Township of Montague and resides within an approximately 150 hectares (370 acres) site.

In June 1978 a joint provincial/municipal funding was approved for improvements to the airport. The improvements included the paving of the main runway, taxiways, apron area and runway landing lights.

In 1990, the airport received a further injection of provincial/municipal financial support and the runway was lengthened to its present 1219.2 meters (4000 ft) along with capital investments in an on-site re-fuelling operation.

In November 1992 the Town of Smiths Falls and the Township of Montague entered into an agreement with the Smiths Falls Flying Club to maintain and operate the airport on behalf of the municipalities. Today the airport is maintained and operated by the Smiths Falls Flying Club under the auspices Russ Beach Smiths Fall Montague Airport Commission. The commission consists of members of the Town of Smiths Falls Council, the Township of Montague Council and Smiths Falls Flying Club.

In 2004 the Commission received an estimate in the amount of \$500,000 to resurface the main runway, taxiways and apron area. It is anticipated that the present replacement cost for the main runway, taxiways and apron area is \$1,000,000. Table 20 summarizes the overall asset management strategy for land improvements.

Table 21 – Land Improvements

Asset	Land Improvements
Inventory	Approximately 1219.2 meters (4000 ft) of paved runway, taxiways and apron area
Anticipated Asset Life Cycle	N/A.
Integrated	N/A.
Rehabilitation and replacement Criteria	N/A.
Rehabilitation and Replacement Strategies	<p>Rehabilitation and replacement strategies are based on surface type and visual inspection.</p> <p>General maintenance will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Deficiencies elimination and crack sealing program</li> <li>▪ Maintain annual ditching cleanout and brushing</li> <li>▪ Continue surface treatment program i.e. application of single or double surface treatment</li> </ul>
Life Cycle Consequences	N/A
Previous Reports on Subject	N/A
Estimated Cost per Year for Strategy Described	The Township acknowledges a replacement estimate based on the 25% ownership. Resurfacing and reconstruction life expectancy of the runway, taxiways and apron has not been provided. Consequently the Useful Life Remaining is unknown at this time. Accordingly the estimated minimum annual capital program is to be completed.

## **C Financial Implications**

The Township, in developing the financing strategy of AMP, must consider long-term tax payer affordability.

The 2011 census indicated that the average household income in Lanark County was significantly below (15%) the provincial average and that Montague's average household income was below the County average. Our rural Township also has a relatively high unemployment rate and a significant number of taxpayers on fixed incomes. These factors are compounded by very slow growth in our tax base.

Montague's current infrastructure financing strategy is to pay associated infrastructure costs from reserves, including the Federal Gas Tax Reserve and to employ the same reserves to fund the Township's commitment to approved grant applications.

It is Council's intention to continue with such a strategy, while rationalizing service levels and seeking operational efficiencies on a regular basis. However, it will be impossible to adequately address our infrastructure deficit in a timely or otherwise manner without financial assistance from the federal and provincial governments.

## **D Conclusions and Recommendations**

The primary approach that was used to estimate the condition of the Township's infrastructure is a combination of the age of each asset and an estimate of its useful life remaining. This approach can produce condition results that appear worse than what would be observed with actual condition assessment because of the theoretical assumption that any asset which has reached the end of its useful life is in critical condition. For example a water main that has a useful life of 80 years in the TCA register can continue to provide a reasonable level of service for 90 or more years.

Montague should consider the following strategy to address financing shortfalls:

- Establish a special rate to levy funds for capital asset financing.
- Maintain the current infrastructure financing strategy by paying associated infrastructure costs from reserves, including the Federal Gas Tax Reserve and to employ the same reserves to fund the Township's commitment to approved grant applications
- Focus on rehabilitation and ongoing maintenance efforts, as opposed to replacement and reconstruction projects.
- Replacement and reconstruction will primarily be funded with the assistance of the federal and provincial governments
- Maintain a policy for reviewing and maintaining assets on a scheduled basis that will enable the Township to plan ahead for long term expenses.