

**INFRASTRUCTURE & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION
FACILITIES SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

CORE SERVICES REVIEW

BENCH MARKING

- No comparators available.
- MPMP (Municipal Performance Measurement Program) – no information/comparators available.
- OMBI (Ontario Municipal CAO's Benchmarking Initiative) – no information/comparators available yet.

BEST PRACTICES

- No best practices available.
- The Ontario Centre for Municipal Best Practices has currently only produced Best Practice Reports in the areas of Roads, Transit, Waste Management, Water and Sewer.
- With recent focus on Kyoto Protocol and energy savings initiatives, best practices may be developed that would assist the County in reducing its energy requirements.
- At this point, we are relying on the expertise of consultants certified in the field to meet requirements of Federal/Provincial funding programs.
- Work being carried out on a number of County facilities including social housing, long term care, public works, etc.
- Staff currently working with Finance Department to develop an asset management system with life cycle costing that will assist in budgeting as well as establishing adequate Reserves.

PROVINCIAL FUNDING COMMITMENTS

- No provincial funding available for capital and maintenance projects. From time to time funds do become available in a small number of areas such as long term care.
- Provincial legislation in some service areas (long term care) mandates the scope and detail required in capital and maintenance projects. With respect to energy upgrades, Federal legislation drives the standards if funding is desired.

ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF DELIVERY

- Option 1 - Each facility stands alone and manages its own capital and maintenance needs.
- Option 2 - Central department manages all County capital and maintenance needs for its facilities.
- Option 3 - Status Quo: Core expertise department in concert with onsite managers/supervisors of various County departments manage capital and maintenance needs.

**INFRASTRUCTURE & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION
FACILITIES SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

CORE SERVICES REVIEW

**Option 1 - EACH FACILITY STANDS ALONE AND MANAGES ITS OWN
CAPITAL AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS**

- Facility managers have to rely on consultants and/or contractors for advice on capital and maintenance needs.
- Potential for widely varying standards of care across organization. Likely that larger volume of emergency repairs required as a result.
- Facility managers and those facilities that have maintenance personnel know their particular buildings and systems.

**Option 2 - CENTRAL DEPARTMENT MANAGES ALL COUNTY CAPITAL
AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS**

- Larger number of staff centrally located not as responsive to day-to-day needs of various facilities.
- Central staff not as familiar with individual buildings and systems compared to on-site personnel.
- Central staff model not as efficient due to large travel distances between various County facilities.
- Central (i.e. one) budget centre more difficult to manage as needs of various facilities changes over time.

Option 3 - STATUS QUO

- This model has been in place since 2001 and was a result of the Galloway Report (2001) and the subsequent Way Forward Report.
- Allows for small staff group with expertise available to all managers/supervisors located in County facilities.
- Reduced need for outside advice.
- Central tendering/quotes/RFP process results in more consistent processing of capital and major maintenance projects.
- Capital and maintenance work carried out for the most part with supervision by facility-specific staff and oversight/advice from Facilities Services' staff as required.
- Budgeting and expenditure control remain in the cost centre (department) needing the capital and/or maintenance work.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Option 3 (status quo) provides the best (cost-effective, efficient) model for the delivery of services for the Facilities component of the County operation.