

DISTRICT OF LILLOOET
OPERATIONS REVIEW REPORT
APRIL 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Context.....	4
Purpose.....	4
Workplan	4
Summary Findings.....	5
Benchmark Survey Findings.....	6
Summary of Benchmarking Comparisons	9
Core Service Review Findings	10
Detailed Departmental and Service Findings	12
Recommendations.....	21
Financial Impacts of Recommendations.....	25
Conclusion.....	26

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1	-	Benchmarking Survey Analysis
Exhibit 2	-	Interview List
Exhibit 3	-	Documents and Reports Reviewed
Exhibit 4	-	Summary of Selected Payroll Data
Exhibit 5	-	Management Compensation
Exhibit 6	-	Managers' Overtime
Exhibit 7	-	Council Compensation
Exhibit 8	-	Summary of Major Contracts
Exhibit 9	-	Staffing by Department
Exhibit 10	-	Analysis of Available Working Hours
Exhibit 11	-	Innovative/Cost Saving Staffing Arrangements
Exhibit 12	-	List of Service Contractors and Temporary Workers
Exhibit 13	-	Positions Requiring Certification
Exhibit 14	-	Comparison of Collective Agreements
Exhibit 15	-	Change in Tax Assessments 2010 and 2013
Exhibit 16	-	History of Direct Energy Costs
Exhibit 17	-	Price Review History
Exhibit 18	-	Backlog of Work in Public Works
Exhibit 19	-	Major Infrastructure Challenges Facing Lillooet
Exhibit 20	-	Grants in Aid
Exhibit 21	-	District of Lillooet Spending 2009 to 2012

List of Appendices

- Appendix A - Benchmarking Survey Report
- Appendix B - Core Service Evaluation of Lillooet Services
- Appendix C - Evaluation of Recommendations

District of Lillooet Note – Pages 22 – 26.

Highlighted areas denote where Council has taken some action on the recommendation or plans to take some kind of action on the recommendation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

These notes summarize the key findings and recommendations from an operations review of the District of Lillooet.

Findings

- Lillooet is unduly dependent on residential property and utility taxes with low commercial and industrial property tax revenues.
- On the other hand, the District has been remarkably successful in securing funding for major water, sewage treatment and infrastructure projects.
- In comparison to similar size communities in BC, Lillooet is spending almost \$700,000 more on services and administration.
- This is despite several areas where Lillooet's costs are below average. Lower cost services include:

– Fire services	\$83,000
– Water services	\$102,000
– Waste water treatment	\$38,000
– Roads	\$324,000
– Parks	\$85,000
– Council and management compensation	<u>\$63,000</u>
Total	\$595,000

- Most of the District's above average spending occurs in the following areas:

– Recreation	\$213,000
– Economic Development	\$149,000
– Garbage collection	\$59,000
– General administration	<u>\$92,000</u>
Total	\$513,000

- The community's roads costs are unduly low and this important part of the District's infrastructure is under-funded.
- The District has 7 vehicles more than similar size communities. At \$6,000 operating expense per vehicle, this represents an additional cost of \$42,000 per year.

- Lillooet will be losing approximately \$100,000 in annual HST rebates when the PST returns in April 2013.
- The core service review analysis reinforces the need to look at recreation, economic development, garbage collection, and airport services and costs.
- It also identifies the need to update service pricing and to find ways to reduce/contain general administrative costs.

Recommendations

- The District should manage its services and costs to reduce spending in some areas (e.g. economic development) in order to spend the savings in other important areas (e.g. roads).
- The District has to find ways to reduce costs for:
 - Recreation services
 - Economic development
 - Garbage collection
 - General municipal administration
- Water service pricing should increase in order to bridge into the increased costs of the new water treatment plant and the new water metering infrastructure.
- Savings from reducing costs and added revenues should be used to improve roads and drainage in the order of \$200,000 per year.
- Lillooet needs to add three management/exempt positions in order to improve operations and administrative performance:
 - Fire Chief
 - Deputy Director of Finance
 - Superintendent of Public Works

Financial Impacts of Recommendations

- The financial impacts of report recommendations are summarized below. Some of these figures are more conservative than in the body of the report. This reflects the challenges of scaling back services and costs.

Savings/Cost Reduction	
Recreation	\$150,000
Economic Development	\$150,000
Garbage Collection	\$40,000
Miscellaneous	\$60,000
New Revenues	
Water Services	<u>\$100,000</u>
Funds Available	\$500,000
New Costs	
Fire Chief	\$90,000
Deputy Director of Finance	\$80,000
Superintendent of Public Works	\$80,000
Roads	\$150,000
Reduction of HST rebate	<u>\$100,000</u>
New Costs	\$500,000

There is potential to reduce Lillooet's operating costs by up to \$155,000 if report recommendations are fully implemented and the cost/revenue/savings estimates are accurate.

* * * * *

CONTEXT

Lillooet is a smaller community with 2,370 residents, but with cost, funding and infrastructure challenges of a larger centre.

Without major business, commercial and/or industrial employers, it is dependent on property and utility tax revenues from residents and small businesses for much of its operational funding.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this review is three-fold:

1. Reduce costs and increase revenues where possible to improve the viability of Lillooet services and operations
2. Find funding sources to pay for needed improvements in staffing, services and infrastructure
3. Address a backlog of service and infrastructure issues

WORKPLAN

The findings and recommendations in this report come from three analytical processes. First, we surveyed similar sized communities in BC to compare their costs and infrastructure to Lillooet (Appendix A).

Second, we conducted a core service review to identify opportunities to reduce, restructure or eliminate external and internal services provided by Lillooet (Appendix B).

Third, we carried out research and analysis of specific opportunities to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and costs of Lillooet's operations.

Details of our research and analysis are presented below:

- Conducted a benchmarking survey and analysis of infrastructure and costs with eight comparable communities in BC (Appendix A, Exhibit 1)
- Evaluated 126 external and internal service provided by the District using a core service methodology (Appendix B)

- Interviewed all councillors and managers about their ideas and concerns relating to funding, services, programs and costs (Exhibit 2)
- Reviewed Lillooet financial reports (2010, 2011, and preliminary 2012 financial statements)
- Reviewed financial plans for the next five years
- Reviewed recent reports and plans (e.g. Official Community Plan, Stantec report on the condition of the recreation centre, Boundary expansion reports, Wildfire Protection Plan report; descriptions of the water treatment plan, audit reports, etc.). A list of the documents we reviewed is presented in Exhibit 3
- Analyzed costs in key areas (e.g. airport, grants in aid, economic development, recreation, solid waste services) (Exhibits 4 to 21)

SUMMARY FINDINGS

Lillooet has relatively low municipal tax revenues of \$1.9 million. Without a significant business or industrial base, it is dependent primarily on residential property and utility tax revenues. A 1% increase in property tax revenues equates to \$14,000. Unfortunately, Lillooet's property assessment values are declining (Exhibit 15). This adds to the pressures to increase the District's property tax rates.

The District is relatively old (founded in 1860) and has a number of infrastructure challenges (e.g. water quality, old water and sewer lines, aging roads, steep terrain, slope collapse issues, and flooding risks).

Currently, Lillooet has very few long service municipal staff. Accordingly, the District has a relative weak "institutional memory". This memory would normally help answer why and how things were done decades ago and identify where key valves, mains and infrastructure are located. For example, old valves and infrastructure continue to be found in the course of capital projects.

The District's roads have been underfunded for many years. Accordingly, there is a backlog of road and drainage issues that need to be addressed.

At the same time, current municipal standards, say for water treatment, sewage treatment, drainage, fire service, and worker safety, require more intensive resourcing and closer management. Lillooet requires funding and resources both to catch up and keep up to standards that are now required in municipal operations.

In most operations reviews we have conducted, the outcome is a net savings in municipal operating costs. With Lillooet, the requirement is to shrink, eliminate or otherwise reduce costs in order to fund other needed changes (i.e. shrink some areas in order to bring other areas up to standard).

With Lillooet, there are three major areas where there are opportunities for significant cost reduction, namely recreation services, economic development and garbage collection.

Even these three services cannot provide sufficient cost savings. Accordingly, there is also a need to shrink or constrain spending in many other areas (e.g. general administration, newspaper advertising and museum grants) in order to create the funding for needed improvements.

Some of the needed improvements are significant because they involve adding staff. Examples of needed staff additions include:

- Fire Chief
- Deputy Director of Finance
- Superintendent of Public Works

Lillooet has been extremely successful in securing grant funding for infrastructure projects. In the six year period from 2007 to 2012, Lillooet secured \$17.6 million of external funding primarily for capital projects. This means that, over this period, Lillooet collected a remarkable \$2 of external funding for every dollar of taxes it collected from residents and local businesses (Exhibit 21).

One of the challenges facing Lillooet in reducing costs is its location away from larger centres. Specifically, the District frequently cannot attract many bidders and/or secure competitive pricing when it contracts out services and projects.

BENCHMARK SURVEY FINDINGS

As part of this operations review, we carried out a benchmarking survey with the following communities:

- | | |
|--------------|-------------|
| – Burns Lake | – Invermere |
| – Cumberland | – Pemberton |
| – Enderby | – Princeton |
| – Houston | – Sicamous |

The results of this survey are presented below and in Appendix A and Exhibit 1. Exhibit 1 standardizes the survey data for differences in the populations served and shows where Lillooet costs are high, average or low compared to the other communities.

Areas where Lillooet is performing well

- Lillooet's total annual revenue per capita is well above average at \$2,808 (Exhibit 1). This is a result of substantial earned revenues and grants.
- Fire service costs are below average by \$35 per capita or \$83,000 annually. This is primarily because the Lillooet Fire Department does not have any career/paid staff.
- Currently, Lillooet water costs are below average by \$43 per capita or about \$102,000 annually. This cost advantage will be reversed as the new water plant and water metering systems come on line.
- Waste water treatment and sewer costs are below average by \$16 per capita or \$38,000 annually. This advantage may decline as the operations of the waste water treatment plant are improved.
- Lillooet's road costs are well below average by \$137 per capita or \$324,000 annually. While on the surface this looks like good performance, in reality, it means that the District is under spending on roads.
- The District's parks costs are below average by \$36 per capita or by about \$85,000 annually.

Areas where Lillooet is average

- With 19 employees, Lillooet's staffing is average compared to the other survey communities. Job Career Partnership staff are not included in the District's staff count since they are not on the payroll.
- The Town's finance and accounting costs are slightly below average compared to the five communities who provided detailed costing data.
- At \$718 per capita or \$1.7 million, Lillooet's long term debt is average compared to the eight communities we surveyed.

Areas where Lillooet is not performing well

- Lillooet's total tax assessment is very low (i.e. the Town has the third lowest total property assessment per capita of the nine communities in the survey). To make matters worse, Lillooet's total tax base is shrinking Exhibit 15).
- The average residential tax assessment per capita is \$78,623 or \$49,000 below the average of the other eight communities.
- Total annual operating expenditures for Lillooet are \$289 per capita or \$684,000 above the average for the group.
- Recreation costs are somewhat higher than the group by \$27 per capita or \$64,000 annually.
- If the highest recreation spender in the survey is removed, Lillooet is spending about \$90 per capita or \$213,000 above average annually. Recreation costs are a major source of Lillooet's above average spending.
- Economic development is another area where Lillooet's spending appears to be out of line. Based on a smaller sample size, Lillooet is spending \$63 per capita or \$149,000 per year more than the average of five other communities. This is based on 2011 costs. In 2012, Lillooet spent \$119 per capita or \$282,000 more than similar size communities.
- Lillooet is spending \$39 per capita or \$92,000 annually above the group average for general municipal administration (e.g. CAO, corporate services, FOI work). However, the District recovers \$74,100 for rental of space in the Municipal Hall. Accordingly, its net per capita administrative costs are much closer to the survey average.
- Solid waste costs in Lillooet are \$25 per capita or \$59,000 above average annually for the group. This means Lillooet needs to reduce its solid waste costs significantly.
- With a fleet of 18 vehicles, Lillooet has 2.8 more vehicles per 1000 residents than the survey average. If Lillooet's fleet was at the average level, it would have 7 fewer vehicles with savings estimated at \$6,000 per vehicle or \$42,000.
- Compared to the staffing in five of the lowest staffed communities, Lillooet is above average with 1.5 more staff per 1000 residents or 3.6 more staff in total.

- Assuming an average cost per staff member with benefit loading of \$60,000, Lillooet's staffing costs are above a tight staffing standard by \$216,000 per year.

SUMMARY OF BENCHMARKING COMPARISONS

The major outcomes of the benchmarking comparisons are summarized below.

Favourable/Below Average Costs

Fire services	\$83,000	
Water costs	102,000	
Waste water treatment	38,000	
Roads	<u>324,000</u>	
Sub-total		\$547,000

High/Above Average Costs

Recreation	\$260,000	
Economic development	149,000	
General administration	92,000	
Solid waste	<u>59,000</u>	
Sub-total		\$560,000

The higher staffing levels and fleet costs in Lillooet are partially incorporated in the above analysis.

Based on this analysis, Lillooet is saving \$547,000 in several areas and spending \$560,000 more in other areas.

These results should be viewed as indicators of where to restructure Lillooet's operations, services and costs.

As a caveat, the reader should understand that the survey average costs may not fit Lillooet in some cases because of unique local factors. Also, sometimes there are situations with survey participants that distort the costing averages. Examples of this include:

- Delivery of services by a Regional District with no or low costs to the community
- Decisions to under-serve the community in such areas as economic development, bylaw enforcement and planning
- Differences in how cost data is reported and combined in each community's accounts

CORE SERVICE REVIEW FINDINGS

The summary findings from our core service review of the District of Lillooet are presented below and in detail in Appendix B.

Core Service questions used to test Lillooet's external services were as follows:

1. Is there a compelling public need for this service/program?
2. Could others deliver this service?
3. Can we afford this service?
4. Is it fair for all taxpayers to pay for this service?
5. Are costs of this service growing quickly or becoming excessive?
6. In an extreme situation, would we cut this service?

Core Service questions used to test Lillooet's internal service were as noted below:

1. Is there a compelling public need for this service/program?
2. Could others deliver this service?
3. Can we afford this service?
4. In an extreme situation, would we cut this service?

In the core service analysis, there is a bias toward supporting hard infrastructure services (e.g. water, waste water treatment, solid waste collection, roads and drainage) and scaling back softer services (e.g. general administration, recreation, and economic development).

External Services

The following are community services which need to be reviewed for reducing services and/or costs.

Service	Core Service Review Result
Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Close the pool
Water services	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Begin to price for full water service cost recovery (mains, treatment, wells, meters, billing, testing)• Capital reserve funding is not adequate
Garbage collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider collection every two weeks;• Contract out all garbage collection (i.e. only 50% is contracted out at present)• Introduce a penalty to the contractor for complaints and Town costs for complaint administration

Service	Core Service Review Result
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Consider issuing RFPs for selected municipal services (e.g. roads, snow clearing, water billing, sewage plant operations)
Airport	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Contract out airport operations/fuel salesSecure funding support from SLRD

Internal Services

The internal services listed below also need to be reviewed for cost saving and service reduction.

Service	Core Service Review Result
General administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Find ways to reduce administrative services and costs (e.g. charge for FOI requests, introduce a use it or lose it policy for unused management vacations versus paying them out, find ways to reduce benefit premium costs);Move from daily to weekly timesheets
Service pricing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Review and update pricing of all services (Exhibit 17)Move to full user pay pricing or price to achieve a contribution margin
Purchasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Improve purchasing, prices paid and controlsPartner with the school district and/or health authority for routine purchases (e.g. office supplies);
Contracting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Contract out selected internal services (payroll, project management, safety management, inventory management)
Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Add three management positions – Fire Chief; Deputy Director of Finance/Treasurer; Superintendent of Public Works to complete essential work, improve service management and/or increase productivity

DETAILED DEPARTMENTAL AND SERVICE FINDINGS

Detailed findings from this review are presented below as well as in the report exhibits.

Finance and Administration

Issues and concerns regarding the finance and administration functions in the District are presented below.

- The Director of Finance is the only staff member with formal accounting training. With the high number of capital projects and related reporting to funding agencies and the increasingly rigorous provincial reporting standards, the District is significantly at risk with only one accountant.
- Because of the workload, reporting pressures and weaknesses in the District's financial software, the Director of Finance has little time to monitor spending and purchasing.
- The Municipal Accounting Information System (MAIS) that the District is using is cumbersome, not user friendly and makes regular interim financial reporting difficult. Better monthly reporting will improve spending control and cost management.
- The District runs its own payroll. This should be reviewed to determine if contracting out payroll would reduce costs.
- Daily timesheets should be replaced by weekly time records.

Public Works

Evaluation of the Public Works function is provided below.

- The Director of Public Works has a heavy workload with the number of ongoing capital projects and the need to manage regular public works issues and operations.
- As a result, the Director of Public Works does not have time available to closely monitor infrastructure studies, purchasing, contractor pricing and inventory control.
- In addition, the Director has little time to direct the Public Works crew. Accordingly, this function falls to a CUPE Lead Hand based at the Works Yard. While the Lead Hand does a good job, the Works crew needs a non

union manager to address issues relating to setting priorities, operator training, performance evaluation, coaching, discipline and productivity improvement.

- The Public Works is thinly staffed and some important work is not getting done, namely:
 - Testing and exercising hydrants and valves
 - Rebuilding or replacing non-functioning hydrants
 - Adding to District as-built drawings as old pipes and valves are located
 - Improving drainage and initiating flood prevention initiatives
- The productivity of Public Works staff is also affected by several other factors:
 - Individual operators for the water distribution and treatment facilities are increasingly required to work continuously in these roles and are becoming less available for general duties (e.g. valve exercising, snow plowing).
 - WorkSafe BC regulations are requiring more staff be used to do some types of work such as working in confined spaces. As an example, in less regulated times, two Works staff could check 30 manholes a day. Now, a crew of three is needed to do 3 or 4 manhole checks a day because of confined space and other safety regulations.
- Along with the water and sewer operation requirements, the Town's half share of garbage collection takes 3 days a week for a labourer (i.e. .6 FTE).
- As noted in Exhibit 10, Public Works staff are generally only available to work for 3 days out of 4 because of leave, holidays and vacation time.
- In the last few years, the Public Works Department has benefitted from having up to four Job Career Partnership (JCP) staff through the Fall and Winter months. These extra staff have helped Public Works staff cope with their work during this time of year. There were no JCP staff this winter but four are booked to start in the next month (three as labourers and one in Public Works administration).
- To get the full benefit of these staff and provide required training, Public Works needs more management time beyond what can be provided by a

`working` Lead Hand.

- The Works Yard is poorly located (at the top of the road on sloped ground). The buildings are barely adequate. The Yard is unfenced and therefore accessible to the public. Some vehicles are left out and are subject to damage and vandalism.

Garbage Collection

- The division of garbage collection between the District and a local contractor needs to be reviewed.
- The District has weekly residential garbage collection with service provided equally by a contractor and Public Works staff.
- The garbage collection contract was put out for bids in 2011. The current contractor was the only bidder, and the garbage contract has never been finalized.
- Currently, there are approximately 1100 residences with pick up. The contractor picks up at 519 residences at a cost of \$151.35 per residence for a total cost of \$78,551.
- The contractor's charge for 2012 exceeded this level by \$5,113 and this overbilling needs to be reviewed.
- In 2012, the District leased to own a new garbage truck valued at \$181,000 with annual principal and interest payments of \$42,032.
- Overall, garbage costs in 2012 were \$177,600, including paying off the District's garbage truck. The District charges \$200 per year per residence for total revenue of \$199,100. Accordingly, there is a small margin on garbage collection before any overhead loading occurs (i.e. for accounting, recordkeeping, etc.)
- The District needs to decide whether it should take over garbage collection completely, continue with the present 50/50 arrangement, or move to complete contractor collection services.
- The District has a relatively favourable collective agreement for paid leave. As noted in Exhibit 10, Public Works staff are available for work about 75% of regular working hours with double time overtime commencing immediately (Exhibit 14).

- With garbage collection taking 3 days a week for one District staff, Public Works needs to dedicate almost one FTE for garbage (i.e. garbage collection requires .6 FTE and a full time worker is available to work .75 of the required weekly hours).
- With benefit loading and payments for the new garbage truck, the District is paying slightly more than the contractor for its share of garbage collection.
- However, the District's costs will drop considerably when the new garbage truck is paid off in four years.
- If the District sent out a new RFP for all of the residential garbage collection, there would likely be several positive outcomes:
 - There might be more bidders for the contract
 - The current contractor would reduce his unit pricing significantly since there would be little more costs for a vehicle and equipment (i.e. the only incremental cost should be for labour, fuel and dumping fees)
- In thinking about what to do with garbage collection, the District needs to consider its plans for recycling (i.e. curbside collection of recyclables; resident delivery of recyclables to an in-town depot/transfer station; residents' delivery of recyclables to a station at the land fill; or no recycling).

Water Rates and Metering

The District needs to collect water consumption data for about 15 to 18 months before setting a new rate structure. Data collection has just started.

The cost of the meters, software, data collection, water data analysis, rate structure development and the new water sources and treatment will be adding costs over this time.

We understand the new water infrastructure will cost about \$200 more per year per residence. It would make sense to phase in this cost by, say, increasing water fees this year by \$100 per residence or \$100,000. This will recover some of the new costs and help residents bridge into the full water rates in 2015.

Sewage Treatment Plant

The Town currently spends \$140,000 on sewage/waste water treatment operations annually.

The sewage/waste water treatment plant is not completely functional. Additional capital needs to be invested, likely, without grants from outside the District.

The rough cost to resolve sewage treatment plant issues is \$635,500. The District may need to borrow most of these funds. In turn, this will increase operating costs.

Roads and Drainage

The District has been under spending in roads for some time. As a result, there is a growing need to catch up and keep up with road renewal and patching. In this regard, the District needs to set road/curb standards and then evaluate its road infrastructure against these standards.

Extensive capital investment in roads is required over the next few years. At the same time, with potential for climate change and greater rainfall, the District needs to plan for significant drainage issues.

Similarly, there is no point in paving over old water and sewer mains and existing drainage infrastructure. Accordingly, infrastructure replacement plans also have to be incorporated in the road renewal and maintenance program.

The District needs to spend a minimum of \$200,000 more annually on roads and road renewal.

Recreation Services

Lillooet has active and well established recreation programs. The recreation centre also hosts the library, local radio station and serves as a drop in centre for youth. Unfortunately, the recreation building is old, expensive to maintain and needs significant upgrading. Some of the recommended work has already been done.

The 2009 Stantec report details significant challenges with the building. In particular, the pool is expensive to staff, heat and operate and the related plumbing, water treatment and infrastructure are deteriorating because of the hard water and treatment chemicals that are being used.

The pool only operates for six months (January to June) of the year and has modest use during this time. It has a new biotech heating plant. Pool operating

costs for six months are \$85,000 before capital, interest, lease and debenture payments.

The District needs to consider closing the pool and continuing to use the bio mass plant to heat other parts of the building.

Airport

The District owns, operates and maintains the local airport. Costs to the community are somewhat reduced through the sale of aviation fuel and the provision of site and building security by a local couple in exchange for the use of a nearby trailer pad.

The airport benefits Lillooet as a landing site for incoming and outgoing medical and other emergencies.

The runway is primarily used by organizations outside Lillooet (e.g. Ministry of Forests, helicopter tours, area pilots).

Annual operating costs at the airport are in the order of \$18,000 exclusive of runway maintenance. Without runway maintenance, the airport is essentially self-funding. However, runway maintenance is critical and could become very expensive. There is also an issue of snow clearing in the winter, which is a priority.

For the size of the site, investment in the infrastructure and current and potential maintenance costs, this is a service that may be better to contract out.

Alternatively, the District should ask the SLRD to share in costs and should consider landing fees.

Economic Development

The District's Economic Development Department has done a great job promoting business development, tourism and economic diversification in the community. However, expenditures for this service have grown and are substantially higher than similar size communities (Appendix A).

There is also the issue of sharing economic development planning, programs and funding with the Regional District, nearby electoral areas and local First Nations bands. At present, Lillooet's neighbours appear to be "free riding" to some extent on the District's investment in this service.

The District needs to review its ability to afford this function and consider scaling back and even eliminating this service. If the service was discontinued or

transferred to the Regional District, it is likely that some continuing funding would be required by Lillooet, say, in the order of \$50,000 per year. This compares to the current funding of \$355,000 in 2012.

In addition to the Economic Development Department and its services and programs, the District of Lillooet has been a huge engine of economic growth and local spending in its own right because of the grant revenues Lillooet has received of \$17.6 million over the six year period 2007 to 2012.

We estimate that Lillooet has secured funding and spent two times its property taxes on capital projects over the past six years. Much of this spending has been to contractors working in Lillooet and to local businesses. A summary of this leverage for the years 2009 to 2012 is presented in Exhibit 21.

Fire Department

In a separate report, we made a number of recommendations to improve Fire Department operations. The cost of these recommendations is estimated to be \$124,000 annually, plus \$3,000 to alarm the fire hall.

We believe that it is important to hire a full time Fire Chief at a net cost of \$90,000 per year.

With all the financial pressures on Lillooet, we assume that only 50% of the other recommended improvements and costs are affordable (i.e. \$17,000 added costs).

Permissive Tax Exemptions

Lillooet provides “permissive property tax exemptions” to twelve community, charitable, social and religious organizations who in total own seventeen properties. This excludes two exemptions for Lillooet itself. These organizations do, however, pay utility taxes for water and sewer services. The total tax exemptions for the twelve organizations is \$66,800 for 2013. This represents 3.6% of Lillooet’s property taxes.

The value of the exemptions is likely too high because the property assessment for the Curling Club is excessive.

If the District moved to a 50% property tax exemption for non-religious organizations, it would recover approximately \$18,000. This assumes the Curling Club property assessment is reduced by 50%.

Management and Staff Compensation

Part of the assessment of local government costs is how managers and Council are paid relative to those in similar size communities (Exhibits 5 and 7).

Based on our review of Council and management pay using UBCM/CivicInfo data, it appears that the Mayor, Councillors and all managers are paid below average. With allowance for benefit loading, Lillooet's savings are \$63,000 per year.

This is an indicator that both Council and staff are conscious of the need to provide good value to Lillooet taxpayers.

Courses and Conferences

In 2012, the District spent \$57,800 for managers to attend courses and conferences. This includes travel, accommodation, meals and fees. This expenditure is 12.4% of salaries of the management group.

Conference fees and related expenses for Council were \$12,300 and \$4,700 for clerical staff.

There should be opportunities to scale back course and conference expenses for the management group to the 8% level, at least until boundary expansion revenues commence. At 8% of salaries, the savings would be in the order of \$20,000.

Two Bargaining Units

The District has two CUPE collective agreements (Exhibit 14) with many minor differences. While some additional expense is involved, it would make sense to combine the two bargaining units and have one set of benefits and working conditions.

The exception to this integration would be to leave recreation centre staff on their current overtime policy.

Cost Pressures in 2013

The District of Lillooet is facing the following cost pressures in 2013:

- Need for a full time fire chief (estimated net cost of \$90,000)
- Need for a Deputy Director of Finance in the Finance Department (estimated cost of \$80,000 with benefit loading)

- Need for a Superintendent of Public Works to manage the work crew (estimated cost of \$80,000 with benefit loading)
- Five-fold increase in Freedom of Information requests (i.e. from an average of 10 requests annually in 2009 to 2011, to 50 requests in 2012 and 2013 YTD). Assuming a cost of \$1,000 per request for staff time and legal consultation, this service is becoming a significant expense.
- Need for new accounting software (VADIM software with an estimated implementation cost of \$100,000 but lower annual maintenance fees).
- Consulting, research, and legal costs for the boundary expansion project (estimated at \$50,000)
- Loss of the sales tax rebate when the PST is re-introduced on April 1, 2013 (estimated value of the lost rebate is \$100,000)
- Increased costs for District legal services (\$40,000)
- Need for a new sweeper at an estimated cost of \$150,000

Details of these and other project pressures are summarized in Exhibits 18 and 19.

Communications and Public Involvement

At present, the District does not use advisory committees to involve community members and groups in developing policies, setting priorities and considering planning issues.

Based on this review, there are a number of challenges and issues which could benefit from public involvement and participation.

In some ways, there is almost a bunker mentality that has developed over time in Lillooet's municipal hall because of past events and District decisions.

It is important that the District return to seeking greater involvement of community members in community planning and decision making.

We understand that this will be a significant challenge because of the polarized agendas of some community members and the difficulty of getting the "silent majority" to get involved.

We expect that if the District extends itself it will find that community members and groups are eager to work on issues and needs that will improve services and quality of life in Lillooet.

Opportunities for Improvement

In the course of this review, we identified over 40 opportunities for cost and service improvement. These opportunities are presented below and in Appendix C.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are literally hundreds of issues to consider in improving Lillooet's services, costs and operations. To help focus the review recommendations, we have used three models. These models are briefly described below.

1. Modest Change

- Make modest changes with the expectation that the boundary expansion and related grants in lieu of taxes will solve Lillooet's financial needs.
- Borrow for the funding gap over the next two to three years where necessary while waiting for the boundary expansion project to be completed.

2. Significant Change

- Implement significant changes in spending, services and staffing. Aim to save enough money to fund needed staff additions and needed service improvements.

3. Extreme Change

- Cut costs, services and spending severely to fully fund needed expenditures that are identified in this review.

We expect that Council will consider parts of each of these models (i.e. some modest changes, some major changes and several extreme changes).

Summary of Recommendations

The following schedule lists the recommendations for cost and service charges arising from this review.

Recommendation	Estimated Annual		Rating of Recommendations		
	Cost	Savings/ Revenues Added	Modest	Significant	Severe
1. Pursue the boundary expansion		\$1,000,000 commencing in 2015			■
2. Fix the waste water/sewage treatment plant	\$650,000 (capital)				■
3. Increase water utility rates immediately		\$100,000			■
4. Reduce economic development services		\$150,000			■
5. Conduct an inventory of the condition of all roads	\$50,000 (one time)				✓
6. Increase spending on roads	\$200,000				✓
7. Build road maintenance reserves commencing in 2015	\$100,000				✓
8. Replace the financial software	\$100,000 (one time)				■
9. Relocate the Public Works yard to East Lillooet site (2015)	\$1,000,000 (capital)				✓
10. Consider bi-weekly garbage collection		\$60,000			✓
11. Put the whole garbage collection contract out/reduce service costs		\$40,000		✓	
12. Hire a full time Fire Chief	\$90,000			■	
13. Hire a Deputy Director of Finance	\$80,000			■	
14. Hire a Superintendent of Public Works	\$80,000			■	
15. Commence replacing hydrants, (e.g. 10 per year)	\$20,000			■	

Recommendation	Estimated		Ratings of Recommendations		
	Cost	Savings/ Revenues Added	Modest	Significant	Severe
16. Develop remedial drainage and flooding plans	\$20,000 (one time)			✓	
17. Find ways to reduce the District's energy costs		\$20,000		✓	
18. Review all service pricing and fees with the objective of fully recovering costs and increasing revenues		\$40,000		✓	
19. Reduce the grant in aid to the museum and support a museum entrance fee		\$5,000		■	
20. Reduce newspaper communications costs by 50%		\$15,000		■	
21. Consolidate the bylaw and building inspector positions		\$25,000		✓	
22. Buy a new sweeper in 2013	\$150,000 (capital)			✓	
23. Find ways to reduce the fleet by 5 vehicles		\$30,000		■	
24. Reduce recreation costs/services (e.g. close the pool)		\$75,000		✓	
25. Increase recreation memberships/revenues		\$25,000	✓		
26. Secure recreation operating and capital funding from First Nations groups		\$50,000	✓		
27. Increase Public Works on call pay to \$150/weekend	\$3,000		✓		
28. Eliminate the `temporary` Lead Hand position in Public Works		\$73,000	✓		
29. Test all hydrants annually	NA		■		
30. Reduce permissive property tax exemptions by 50% for non-religious organizations		\$18,000	■		

Recommendation	Estimated		Ratings of Recommendations		
	Cost	Savings/ Revenues Added	Modest	Significant	Severe
31. Partner with the School District and Interior Health for purchasing goods and services		\$10,000	✓		
32. Integrate the two bargaining units	\$16,000		■		
33. Cut back course and conference attendance		\$20,000	■		
34. Evaluate the recreation centre for seismic integrity	\$20,000 (one time)		✓		
35. Find ways to reduce benefit plan premiums (shopping plans and considering an administrative services only (ASO) contract)		\$5,000	✓		
36. Partially implement Fire Department recommendations	\$17,000		■		
37. Require backflow valves on all properties with dual water systems and/or all commercial properties	NA		✓		
38. Improve District communications with residents and businesses about challenges, plans and improvement programs	NA		■		
39. Involve community members and groups in setting priorities and solving financial and service problems	NA		■		
40. Let the public know how they can help Public Works operations (e.g. not dumping cooking grease down the drain)	NA		✓		
41. Improve the training and supervision of Career Training Program staff and summer students	NA		✓		
42. Formalize the garbage collection contract once service plans are complete	NA		✓		

FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of the financial impacts of the report recommendations. It will be challenging to implement many of these recommendations. As well, some recommendations will take some time to achieve (e.g. reducing recreation costs and increasing recreation revenues).

Accordingly, the following financial impact summary is subject to wide variation depending on Council and management decisions and implementation plans. This schedule below omits recommendations for capital projects.

Savings and New Revenues	Annual \$
Increase water utility rates	\$100,000
Reduce economic development services	150,000
Consider bi-weekly garbage collection	60,000
Contract out all garbage collection	40,000
Reduce recreation costs/services	75,000
Increase recreation memberships	25,000
Secure recreation funding from First Nations Groups	50,000
Reduce District energy costs	20,000
Increase service pricing	40,000
Reduce communications costs	15,000
Eliminate the lead hand position in Public Works	73,000
Reduce permissive property tax exemptions by 50%	18,000
Consolidate the bylaw and building inspector positions	25,000
Partner with the School District and Health Authority for purchasing	10,000
Find ways to reduce staff benefits costs	5,000
Reduce the museum grant	5,000
Reduce the fleet by 5 vehicles	30,000
Cut back course and conference attendance	20,000
Total	\$761,000

Added Costs/Lost Revenues	Annual \$
Increase spending on roads	\$200,000
Hire a Fire Chief	90,000
Hire a Deputy Director of Finance	80,000
Hire a Superintendent of Public Works	80,000
Replace 10 hydrants per year	20,000
Increase on call pay	3,000
Integrate bargaining units	16,000
Reduction in HST rebate	100,000
Partially implement Fire Department recommendations	17,000
Total	\$606,000
Other One Time Costs	Annual \$
Replace the financial software	\$100,000
Inventory road conditions	50,000
Develop remedial drainage and flooding plans	20,000
Evaluate the seismic integrity of the recreation centre	20,000
Total	\$190,000

Based on the above summary, Lillooet's regular annual operating costs can be reduced by up to \$155,000 per year if the report recommendations are fully implemented and the cost/revenue/savings estimates are accurate.

CONCLUSION

Lillooet managers and staff have provided outstanding assistance with this review and have identified many of the opportunities for improvement and recommendations. We greatly appreciate their help and trust that this review will contribute to Lillooet's continued service, cost and financial performance and success.

* * * * *

Dugal Smith & Associates
Burnaby, BC
April 2013

OPERATIONS REVIEW REPORT

EXHIBITS

- Exhibit 1 - Benchmarking Survey Analysis
- Exhibit 2 - Interview List
- Exhibit 3 - Documents and Reports Reviewed
- Exhibit 4 - Summary of Selected Payroll Data
- Exhibit 5 - Management Compensation
- Exhibit 6 - Managers' Overtime
- Exhibit 7 - Council Compensation
- Exhibit 8 - Summary of Major Contracts
- Exhibit 9 - Staffing by Department
- Exhibit 10 - Analysis of Available Working Hours
- Exhibit 11 - Innovative/Cost Saving Staffing Arrangements
- Exhibit 12 - List of Service Contractors and Temporary Workers
- Exhibit 13 - Positions Requiring Certification
- Exhibit 14 - Comparison of Collective Agreements
- Exhibit 15 - Change in Tax Assessments 2010 and 2013
- Exhibit 16 - History of Direct Energy Costs
- Exhibit 17 - Price Review History
- Exhibit 18 - Backlog of Work in Public Works
- Exhibit 19 - Major Infrastructure Challenges Facing Lillooet
- Exhibit 20 - Grants in Aid
- Exhibit 21 - District of Lillooet Spending 2009 to 2012

BENCHMARKING SURVEY ANALYSIS

Factor	Lillooet	Survey Average	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
Population	2,367	2,987	2,142	3,398	2,892	3,147	2,955	2,994	3,000	2,370
Hectares per capita	1.2h	0.9h	0.4h	0.9h	0.15h	2.2h	0.3h	0.3h	0.5h	2.1h
Wider population served per capita	1.7	1.9 ¹	2.4	27.9	1.4	0.7	4.2	1.8	0.5	2.1
Fleet per 1000 residents	7.5	4.7	2.8	4.7	1.7	10.2	7.8	3.7	2.7	3.8
Total tax assessment per capita (\$)	\$95,184	\$149,310	\$46,078	\$117,952	\$112,690	\$68,446	\$293,570	\$110,721	\$263,333	\$181,688
Residential tax assessment per capita (\$)	\$78,623	\$128,059	\$31,513	\$102,796	\$101,487	\$47,029	\$265,990	\$91,951	\$237,000	\$146,709
Commercial tax assessment per capita (\$)	\$11,490	\$16,068	\$13,492	\$11,389	\$9,440	\$8,897	\$26,362	\$14,529	\$18,400	\$26,034
Industrial tax assessment per capita (\$)	\$1,182	\$6,063	\$560	\$23,543	\$1,487	\$11,439	\$609	\$2,672	\$933	\$7,257
Business/Commercial mil rate as multiple of residential mil rate	3.1	2.4	2.2	1.8	2.1	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.3
Industrial mil rate as multiple of residential mil rate	5.4	5.3	5.0	1.8	2.6	7.9	2.7	12.7	3.4	6.0
Municipal tax revenues per capita (\$)	\$797	\$924	\$823	\$633	\$399	\$1,235	\$1,226	\$493	\$1,318	\$1,266
Total revenues per capita (\$)	\$2,808	\$2,151	\$2,128	\$1,502	\$1,826	\$1,768	\$2,482	\$1,660	\$3,189	\$2,146

¹ Average omits Cumberland

BENCHMARKING SURVEY ANALYSIS (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Survey Average	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
Total expenditures per capita (\$)	\$1,802	\$1,513	\$1,246	\$1,424	\$1,112	\$1,586	\$1,983	\$1,432	\$1,575	\$1,748
Fire costs per capita (\$)	\$72	\$107 ¹	\$121	\$107	\$64	\$76	\$132	\$84	\$92	\$180
Water costs per capita (\$)	\$155	\$198	\$242	\$89	\$183	\$202	\$282	\$140	\$209	\$240
Sewer costs per capita (\$)	\$169	\$185 ¹	\$206	\$205	\$127	\$146	\$244	\$72	\$293	
Road costs per capita (\$)	\$183	\$320 ¹	\$293	\$279	\$169	\$176	\$568	\$267	\$488	
Road cost per km. (\$)	\$11,780	\$19,290 ¹	\$29,922	\$24,012	\$16,576	\$6,705	\$30,500	\$19,966	\$7,352	
Solid waste costs per capita (\$)	\$71	\$46 ¹	\$44	\$50	\$35	\$29	\$72		\$47	
Parks cost per capita (\$)	\$21	\$57 ¹	\$23	\$36	\$65	\$62	\$94	-	\$164	\$16
Recreation & culture costs per capita (\$)	\$268	\$241 ^{1 3}	\$269	\$128	\$133	\$555	-	\$133	\$226	
Planning & development costs per capita (\$)	\$74.2	\$129 ²	-	\$144	\$15	\$10	\$79		\$89	\$182
Building inspection costs per capita (\$)	\$12	\$15 ¹	\$13	\$5	\$4	\$9	\$43			
Economic development costs per capita (\$)	\$94	\$31 ¹		\$12	\$15	\$46	\$40		\$13	
Finance costs per capita (\$)	\$85	\$92 ¹	\$67	\$95	\$46	\$82	\$172			

¹ Not all communities provided data² Data reported is likely not consistent³ The average for the lowest 5 communities is \$178 when Houston is omitted

BENCHMARKING SURVEY ANALYSIS (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Survey Average	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
Municipal administration costs per capita (\$)	\$222	\$183 ¹	\$223	\$71	\$156	\$94	\$104	\$275	\$360	
Long term debt per capita	\$718	\$725 ²	\$78	\$736	\$439	\$732	\$988	Ø	\$1,800	\$1,688
Total staff per 1000 residents	8.1	8.2 ³	14.0	6.3	5.0	11.8 (?)	6.4	6.0	7.7	8.4
Management staff per 1000 residents	2.1	1.7	2.3	1.5	1.0	2.2	1.4	1.0	1.7	2.5
Non-management staff per 1000 residents	6.0	6.5	11.7	4.8	4.0	9.6	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.9
Public Works staff per 1000 residents	3.2	2.8	3.7	2.1	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.3	2.3	2.1

¹ Not all communities provided data

² Data reported is likely not consistent

³ Average staffing of 6.6 per 1000 residents if the two high staff communities are not counted

INTERVIEW LIST

We interviewed the following people in the course of this review:

Kevin Anderson	– Councillor
Dennis Bontron	– Mayor
Erick Davidson	– Bylaw Enforcement Officer
Greg de Strake	– Councillor
David Harder	– Fire Chief
Steve Hohner	– Director, Public Works
Marg Lampman	– Councillor
John LaRue	– Lead Hand, Public Works
Grant Loyer	– CAO
Nate Moyer	– Accounting Clerk
Margarite Parker	– Reception/Accounting Clerk
Wendy Parker	– Councillor
Ben Parnell	– Deputy Corporate Officer
Leslie Piderman	– Director
Wayne Robinson	– Director Recreation
Bob Sheridan	– Director, Chamber of Commerce
Jerry Sucharyna	– Manager, Economic Development
Tom Willey	– Building Inspector

DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS REVIEWED

We reviewed the following documents in the course of this operations review.

- Economic Development Assessment, Strategy and Action Plan (for the Squamish-Lillooet Regional District Areas A and B and the District of Lillooet), December 2012
- General Condition Assessment Report – Lillooet and District Recreation, Education and Cultural Centre – Stantec Architecture Ltd., November 17, 2009
- District of Lillooet draft financial records for the year ending December 31, 2012
- District of Lillooet Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2011
- District of Lillooet Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2010
- Management Letter for the District of Lillooet – BDO Canada Chartered Accountants, July 2012
- Management Letter for the District of Lillooet – BDO Canada Chartered Accountants, 2011
- Council Strategic Plan – 2012–2016, November 2012
- Official Community Plan
- Lillooet and District Recreational, Educational & Cultural Centre 2012/2013 Winter Program Guide – District of Lillooet
- Water System Service Replacement – Detailed Project Description – TRUE Consulting, February 2011
- Lillooet Community Newsletter – Special Water Edition – District of Lillooet, November 2011
- Lillooet Community Newsletter – District of Lillooet, December 2012

- Zoning Bylaw 400, 2011 Schedule A – District of Lillooet, November 2011
- Residential Garbage Pickup RFP – District of Lillooet, April 2011. (This forms the working agreement with the current contractor)
- Manager Employment Agreements – District of Lillooet, January 2012
- Report on Economic Development Activities and Results – District of Lillooet, April 2011
- Financial Plan (Tax Rates) Bylaws, 2012 – Numbers 366 and 367, May 2012
- BC Assessment Roll Summary Totals for Lillooet for 2010, 2011 and 2012 – BC Assessment Authority
- Report on the Governance Audit for the District of Lillooet/Excellence in Governance Workshop Report – George B Cuff, June 2010
- Manager Overtime Records for 2012
- Collective Agreement with CUPE, Local 173 – January 2012
- Collective Agreement with CUPE, Local 173 – Recreation Centre – January 2012
- Community Wildfire Protection Plan – 2012

SUMMARY OF SELECTED PAYROLL DATA

This exhibit summarizes selected payroll data relating to overtime, paid leave and other pay factors.

Factor	2011	2012	Notes
Total paid hours	46,766 hrs.	50,351 hrs.	
Bereavement leave	97 hrs.	44 hrs.	
Dirty pay	1,062 hrs.	2,039 hrs.	
Family leave	271 hrs.	249 hrs.	
Stat holidays	1,726 hrs.	1,907 hrs.	
Flex day	125 hrs.	105 hrs.	
Overtime paid ¹	215 hrs.	264 hrs.	
Overtime banked	568 hrs.	726 hrs.	
Sick pay	876 hrs.	1,446 hrs.	
Sick leave accrued	2,046 hrs.	2,142 hrs.	
Vacation time	1,913 hrs.	2,360 hrs.	
Vacation time paid out	877 hrs.	225 hrs.	
Vacation accrued	2,888 hrs.	2,871 hrs.	
On call pay	\$3,500	\$4,260	
Sick day payout	1,239 hrs.	426 hrs.	
Banked time paid out	341 hrs.	303 hrs.	
Banked overtime/leave taken	837 hrs.	726 hrs.	
Unpaid leave	188 hrs.	222 hrs.	
Average pay rate	\$26.53/hr.	\$25.94/hr.	

¹ Excludes allowance for managers in lieu of overtime

MANAGEMENT COMPENSATION

This chart compares management salaries in Lillooet for 2012 to those in similar size communities in BC. The Lillooet management group is paid \$37,943 lower than the market salary averages.

Position	Lillooet Salary	Average Salary in Similar Communities ¹	Difference (Lillooet More) / Less
CAO	\$113,072	\$115,428	\$2,356
Director of Finance	\$84,529	\$85,947	\$1,418
Director of Public Works	\$84,683	\$89,032	\$4,349
Director of Recreation	\$56,539	\$75,301 ²	\$18,762
Economic Development Officer	\$74,344	\$77,318 ²	\$2,974
Deputy Corporate Officer	\$54,376	\$62,460 ²	\$8,084
Total	\$467,543	\$505,486	\$37,943 ³

¹ Salary data for 2012 from the CivicInfo website for communities in the Province from 2000 to 3999 residents. The number of salaries used to calculate the averages are as follows:

Position	# of Data Points
CAO	17
Director of Finance	15
Director of Public Works	10
Director of Recreation	6
Economic Development Officer	5
Deputy Corporate Officer	5

² Many smaller communities do not have these positions and/or the work is assigned to other positions.

³ With 25% benefit and payroll loading, savings to Lillooet are in the order of \$48,000 annually.

MANAGERS' OVERTIME

This exhibit provides information on managers' overtime and related pay in 2011 and 2012. Managers' unpaid overtime continues to be significant (i.e. over 0.5 FTE in total on an annual basis).

Position	2011			2012		
	Reported Overtime Hours	Paid Hours	Unpaid Hours	Reported Overtime Hours	Paid Hours	Unpaid Hours
CAO	371	35	336	278	70	208
Director of Finance	470	35	435	288	70	218
Director of Public Works	318	35	283	233	70	163
Director of Recreation (started Nov. 14/11)	No incumbent for the full year			204	70	134
Economic Development Officer	470	35	435	226	70	156
Deputy Corporate Officer	103	35	68	101	70	31
Total	1732	175	1557	1330	420	970

COUNCIL COMPENSATION

The chart below compares Lillooet Council compensation for 2012 to fifteen similar size communities in BC. In total, Lillooet's Council compensation is \$15,201 below similar size communities across BC.

Position	Lillooet	Similar Size Communities	Difference (Lillooet More) / Less
Mayor	\$13,333	\$19,194	\$5,861
Councillor	\$7,267	\$9,602	\$2,335

SUMMARY OF MAJOR CONTRACTS

This exhibit summarizes major contracts for services to the District.

Contract	Provider	Contract Expiry	2012 Cost
Consulting engineering	TRUE Consulting	Open	\$508,300 ¹
Garbage collection	Lillooet Disposal & Recycling	No contract	\$90,700
Janitorial services	Wayne's Window Cleaning and Janitorial	December 13	\$8,400
Vehicle maintenance		Open	
Sewer Treatment Plant	R Malm	No contract	\$71,356
	Bridge River Band	No contract	\$20,555

¹ Includes significant fees for work on Lillooet capital projects.

STAFFING BY DEPARTMENT

This exhibit presents Lillooet's staffing by department.

Department	Positions	FTE ¹	Notes
Administration	CAO	1.0	
	Deputy Corporate Officer	1.0	
Finance	Director of Finance	1.0	
	Accounting Clerk	1.0	
	Receptionist/Accounting Clerk	1.0	
Recreation	Director of Recreation	1.0	
	Arena Maintenance Workers	1.0	
	Custodian	1.0	
	Recreation Supervisor	1.0	
Public Works	Director of Public Works	1.0	
	Lead Hand	1.0	
	Water Operator	1.0	
	Waste Water Treatment Plant Operator	1.0	
	Utility Worker/Equipment Operator	2.0	
	Labourer	1.0	
	Summer Students	1.2 ²	
Economic Development	Manager Economic Development	1.0	
Protection Services	Building Inspector 1	0.4	
	Bylaw Enforcement Officer	1.0	
	Fire Chief	-	
Total		19.6	

¹ FTE = Full time equivalent employee

² 4 students for 4 months each

ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE WORKING HOURS

This exhibit shows the hours that are available for work for a Public Works staff member after deductions for vacations, holidays and various leaves.

Factor	Hours	Notes
Normal working hours	2080	8 hrs per day x 52 weeks x 5 days per week
Less:		
Break time	110	30 minutes per work day for 220 work days
Statutory holidays	96	12 days x 8 hours per day
Floater holiday	8	1 day per year
Vacation time	160	Assume 4 weeks after 5 years of service
Sick days	40	Assume 5 days per year
Family days	40	Assume 5 days per year
Bereavement leave	8	Assume 8 hours per year
Training time	16	Assume 16 hours per year
Total leave/non work time	478	
Hours available for work	1,602	
% available hours vs annual working hours	77%	

INNOVATIVE/COST SAVING STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS

Lillooet uses the following arrangements to manage overall staffing levels and staff costs.

Department	Staffing Arrangement
Administration	<p>The Municipal Hall Receptionist Clerk position is shared by two staff. One of these staff works half-time in the Recreation Centre (i.e. she has a full time position).</p> <p>The Municipal Hall is closed for lunch (i.e. no staff coverage is provided).</p>
Recreation	<p>The Maintenance Worker maintains and operates all aspects of the Recreation Centre including the pool, ice rink and biomass heater.</p> <p>As noted above, the Recreation Centre Receptionist/Administrative Supervisor job shares with the Receptionist Clerk at the Municipal Hall.</p>
Building Inspection	<p>The Building Inspector works a 10 to 15 hour week in the winter and regular hours in the summer.</p>
Bylaw Office	<p>The Bylaw Officer has a Building Inspection Level 1 certificate and thus can back up the Building Inspector. He also operates the Lillooet pound and collects water meter readings as well as normal bylaw enforcement.</p>
Job Career Partnership (JCP)	<p>The Town participates in a Federal/Provincial program whereby it "hires" workers for one year for career training with the wages paid by the Province. Lillooet will have 4 staff in Public Works and 1 in Administration in 2013/14.</p>
Summer Students	<p>Public Works hires students to provide mowing, gardening, parks maintenance and cleanup for four months from May to September</p>

LIST OF SERVICE CONTRACTORS AND TEMPORARY WORKERS

This exhibit lists positions and work that is being carried out by individuals who are not Lillooet staff members or who are contractors.

Department	Work/Contractor	Estimated Cost in 2013 ¹	Notes
Public Works	Mechanic	\$25,000	\$32/hr. x 18 hrs./week for 45 weeks
	Project Management Coordinator (funded by grant projects)	\$40,000	\$25/hr. x 32 hrs./week for 48 weeks
	Garbage/solid waste collection	\$90,000	Contractor for 50% of residences in Lillooet
	Municipal engineering	\$200,000	Estimated cost for operations consulting
	Oversight of sewage treatment plant operations	\$40,000	
Fire Service	Fire inspections	\$5,000	Some inspection work contracted out
	Urban interface fuel reduction	\$200,000	2013 portion of contract for reduction in forest fuel in the District
Finance	Information Systems support	\$20,000	
Administration	Legal services (all areas)	\$40,000	
	Janitorial services	\$8,400	

¹ These costs are all rough estimates.

POSITIONS REQUIRING CERTIFICATION

The following positions require specific qualifications and/or certification.

Position	Certification	Working Hours Needed to Qualify for Certification¹	Notes
Waste Water Treatment Plant Operator	Waste Water Treatment Operator 2 ¹	3600 hours	
Water Plant Operator	Water Treatment Operator 2 ¹	3600 hours	A Level 3 certification may be needed depending on Provincial requirements for the new water plant
Water Distribution Operator	Combined with the Water Treatment Officer		
Building Inspector	Building Inspector I	Courses and exam	
Bylaw Officer	Bylaw Officer I	Courses and exam	
Accountant	Enrolled in the Certified Management Accountant/Certified General Accountant programs	No specific requirement	Staff member must work in accounting to continue in program courses

¹ Certification is based on work experience and passing a Provincial Government test.

COMPARISON OF COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS

This exhibit compares the CUPE collective agreements for Lillooet's general operations and for the recreation centre.

Factor	General Collective Agreement	Recreation Collective Agreement
Sick days	1.5 days per month	1 day per month
Maximum sick day bank	105 days	100 days
Bereavement leave for attending a funeral	1 day	½ day
Extended care co-insurance	No reference to this	75% reimbursement after a \$25 annual deductible
Vacations	10 days after 1 yr 15 days after 2 yrs 20 days after 5 yrs 25 days after 10 yrs	10 days after 1 yr 15 days after 3 yrs 20 days after 10 yrs
Employee assistance plan	Premium shared equally	No reference to this benefit
Hearing aids	\$500 every 5 yrs	\$400 every 5 yrs
Vision care	\$400 every 2 yrs	\$300 every 2 yrs
Dental plan	100% A 60% B 50% C to max of \$2,500	100% A 60% B 50% C to max of \$1,000
Recreation centre passes	Passes granted on request	No reference to this benefit
Loss of seniority	12 months after layoff	8 months after layoff
Retention of seniority if transferred out of the bargaining unit	12 months	3 months
Minimum call back pay	2 hrs at double time	3 hrs at time and one half
Overtime	2x from the first hr	1.5x to the 11 th hour and 2x thereafter

CHANGE IN TAX ASSESSMENTS 2010 AND 2013

This exhibit compares the net taxable values by property class for 2010 and 2013 as provided by the BC Assessment Authority. In total, property tax assessments have declined by 5% from 2010 to 2013.

Property Class	2010	2013	Change 2010 to 2013	% Change Over 3 Years
	(\$ millions)		(\$ millions)	
Residential – vacant	11.0	8.9	(2.1)	(19%)
Residential – single family	166.0	158.7	(7.3)	(4%)
Residential – AR	2.7	2.6	(0.1)	(4%)
Residential – farm	1.3	0.5	(0.8)	(61%)
Residential – strata	1.2	0.9	(0.3)	(25%)
Residential – other	10.6	10.6	-	-
Total Residential ¹	192.6	182.2	(10.6)	(5%)
Utilities	8.3	8.4	0.1	1%
Major industry	0.9	0.9	-	-
Light industry	2.1	0.4	(1.7)	(81%)
Business & other	27.8	29.6	1.8	65%
Recreation/non profit	0.4	0.2	(0.2)	(50%)
Farm	0.6	0.5	(0.1)	(17%)
Total Other ¹	40.1	40.0	(0.1)	-
Grand Total	232.9	222.2	(10.7)	(5%)

¹ These totals differ from BC Assessment Authority actual totals because of rounding.

HISTORY OF DIRECT ENERGY COSTS

This exhibit summarizes energy costs for the District of Lillooet for the period 2009 to 2012. There are significant indirect energy costs incurred by the District which are not identified separately in the accounts. These indirect costs include:

- Mileage paid to staff
- Road contracts
- Cement deliveries
- Staff and Council air travel
- Material deliveries
- Construction contracts
- Fabricated products used by the District (e.g. tires)
- Courier services

Year	Hydro	Fuel (oil; gas; diesel)	Propane	Pellets	Total Energy Costs
2009	\$151,450	\$29,179	\$84,864		\$265,493
2010	\$187,133	\$29,204	\$110,267		\$326,604
2011	\$156,727	\$42,721	\$124,710		\$324,158
2012	\$182,603	\$40,330	\$40,016	\$29,789	\$292,738
Growth/change over 3 years (%)	21%	38%	(53%)	-	21%

PRICE REVIEW HISTORY

This exhibit summarizes when District of Lillooet prices were last reviewed.

Service/Factor	Date of Last Price Review
Aviation fuel	2012
Development cost charges	2006
Building permit fees	2004
Water rates	2011
Sewer rates	2011
Cemetery charges	2008
Recreation Centre passes	2013
Recreation Centre course fees	2011
Park lease rates to School District	?
Solid waste fee	2012
Business licenses	2006
Dog licenses/animal control	2008
Burning permits	2004
Fire inspection fees	2004
False alarm responses	2004
Tax structure ¹	2013
Permissive property tax exemptions	2011

¹ Property tax rates

BACKLOG OF WORK IN PUBLIC WORKS

The following is a summary of work that should be done by the Public Works Department. By deferring and not doing this work, the District has kept its operating costs at a lower level.

Work Not Done	Estimated Hours/\$ Needed per Year	Notes
Annual hydrant testing (126 hydrants)	200 hrs.	The fire service can't count on hydrants. Lack of regular hydrant testing could reduce fire protection levels and increase fire insurance premiums.
Hydrant rebuilding	200 hrs.	There is a continuing need to rebuild a certain number of hydrants each year.
Hydrant replacement	200 hrs. plus 10 @ \$2,000 - \$20,000	Some hydrants need to be replaced since repair parts are no longer available. There are seven types of hydrants in Lillooet.
Clearing roads and ditches	200 hrs.	Failure to remove sand and clearing ditches may cause flooding.
Locating and exercising water distribution valves	100 hrs.	New shut off valves continue to be discovered.
Updating "as built" records	100 hrs.	As built drawings need to be continually updated Need to use GPS unit to locate valves so they can be easily found when covered by snow.
Public Works training	200 hrs. (about 30 hrs per year per worker)	Public Works staff need regular training (e.g. WorkSafe regulations, rebuilding hydrants, equipment operation, drainage and flood planning, equipment operations).
Flushing wet lines	200 hrs.	
Total hours required	1400 ¹	This time gap could be covered if JCP staff are able to relieve regular Public Works staff of general labouring work.

¹ This represents about .75 of an FTE.

MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE CHALLENGES FACING LILLOOET

This exhibit lists major operational and capital project issues facing the District of Lillooet at this time.

Issue	Operational Issue	Capital Project	Notes
The sewage treatment plant is not operating properly.	✓	✓	Capital cost of \$640,000 to fix the plant.
The Public Works Yard is not functional or secure.	✓	✓	It could cost up to \$1 million to relocate the Yard and build new facilities on a 5-acre site in East Lillooet owned by the District.
Reclamation of the old landfill site needs to be completed.	✓	✓	In process; site needs additional soil.
Contaminated sites owned by the District need to be identified, and plans for remediation developed.		✓	District has few such sites.
The Recreation Centre needs a lot of work (e.g. roof, plumbing, heating, electrical services) and is expensive to operate.	✓	✓	Roof repairs completed in 2011/12.
Hydrants are not flushed and checked regularly as required to ensure they function for the Fire Department.	✓	✓	There are seven types of hydrants in Lillooet. Many hydrants need to be rebuilt or replaced. This is a fire protection issue. The District is avoiding costs of about \$20,000/yr. (parts).
The financial information system (MAIS) is cumbersome and makes it hard to prepare user friendly reports and achieve efficiencies in financial operations.	✓	✓	Conversion to VADIM software estimated at \$100,000.
Lillooet roads are deteriorating. Plans and funding for rebuilding roads are needed.	✓	✓	Lillooet needs to spend \$200,000 more per year on roads.
Lillooet needs to start monitoring water use now that all the meters are installed. Public reporting on water consumption needs to start soon.	✓		Collection of data has started with a goal of setting water rates in early 2015.

MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE CHALLENGES FACING LILLOOET (cont'd.):

Issue	Operational Issue	Capital Project	Notes
The District needs to set water rates by early 2015.	✓		A consultant will be retained to develop a pricing strategy (e.g. water metering reduces consumption and pricing has to ensure full cost recovery with lower usage).
Water rates per connection will increase by \$200 per year to pay for the new water treatment infrastructure and water metering.	✓		The District should begin increasing water rates in 2013.
The District needs to resolve the financial compensation for residents where residency permits cannot be issued because of the flooding/slope risks.		✓	In process.
The District is pursuing the boundary expansion to include the BC Hydro power generation facility.	✓		This process may take up to two years. When successful, utility taxes should increase by \$1 million.
Public Works only had Job Career Partnership (JCP) placements in part of 2012.	✓		There were approximately 1800 person hours of CTP staff in 2012 paid by the Province.
The District needs a new sweeper. The current one is 24 years old.		✓	The cost for a sweeper is estimated at \$150,000.

GRANTS IN AID

Grants made by the District and the Lillooet Community Foundation from 2009 to 2012 are as follows.

Agency/Benefactor	2009	2010	2011	2012
Lillooet District Historical Society	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
High School Scholarship	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$2,000
Chamber of Commerce			\$7,500 (washrooms)	
High School Litter Pick-up ¹		\$500		
Lillooet Community Foundation Grants ¹	\$6,680	\$5,265	\$4,065	\$3,840
Total	\$29,680	\$28,765	\$34,565	\$27,840

¹ Paid by the Lillooet Community Foundation

**DISTRICT OF LILLOOET SPENDING
2009 TO 2012**

This exhibit presents the District of Lillooet's capital and operational spending from 2009 to 2012 and demonstrates the capital spending leverage that has been achieved.

Year	Spending on Operations	Spending on Capital Equipment and Projects ¹	Total Spending	District Municipal Taxes ²	Total Spending vs. District Taxes (%)
2009	\$3,331,809	\$1,456,387	\$4,788,196	\$1,570,593	305%
2010	\$3,307,715	\$1,257,249	\$4,564,964	\$1,662,186	275%
2011	\$3,390,537 ³	\$1,151,621	\$4,542,258	\$1,834,435	248%
2012	\$3,962,235 ³	\$3,313,206	\$7,275,441	\$1,886,332	386%
Total	\$13,992,296	\$7,178,463	\$21,170,759	\$6,953,546	304%

¹ Includes grants

² Excludes school and hospital taxes

³ Mountain View emergency expenses included in above: 2011 - \$143,862; 2012 - \$202,100

APPENDIX A

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT

This report summarizes benchmarking data provided by the following communities:

Community	Population
Burns Lake	2142
Cumberland	3398
Enderby	2892
Houston	3147
Invermere	2955
Lillooet	2367
Princeton	2994
Pemberton	2370
Sicamous	3000

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT – 2011 DATA

Factor	Lillooet	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
A. INFRASTRUCTURE									
Population	2367	2142	3398	2892	3147	2955	2994	3000	2370
Population of Wider Area	4105	5100	94,700	3938	2246	12,528	5500	1500	5000
Size (hectares)	2823 h	851 h	3,002 h	422 h	7071 h	938 h	1000 h	1649 h	5061
Roads (km)	36.8 km	21 km	39.5 km	29.5 km	82.5 km	55 km	40 km	202 km	25 km
# of Parks	5	6	8	4	21	11	NA	7	9
Park size (hectares)	18	10.5	18.4	9.3	115	31	-	21	42.6
# of pools and rinks	2	1	-	2	2	1	2	-	-
# of community centres	1	-	2	-	1	1	1	-	1
Fleet (w/o fire trucks)	18	6	16	5	32	23	11	8	9
# of hydrants	136	89	114	108	96	137	NA	200	95
# of water systems	4	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
# of residential water meters	997	44 ¹	1215	1269	75	1500	78	1100	50
Water mains (km)	31.8 km	29 km	30.8 km	30.3 km	27.3 km	48 km	41.5 km	51 km	24
# of reservoirs	3	2	-	2	1	2	4	3	1
Sanitary sewers (km)	15.1 km	26.25 km	27.32 km	25.6 km	19.5 km	35 km	21.75 km	34 km	20
Storm sewers (km)	5.7 km	12 km	23.12 km	14.1 km	9.5 km	5 km	NA	6 km	2.4
# of catch basins	115	102	338	255	124	NA	NA	45	200
Airport operations (yes/no)	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

¹ Most properties pay an annual charge.

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT – 2011 DATA (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
B. TAXBASE & TAXES (cont'd.)									
Total tax assessment (\$ millions)	\$225.3	\$98.7	\$400.8	\$325.9	\$215.4	\$867.5	\$331.5	\$790.0	\$430.6
Residential tax assessment (\$ millions)	\$186.1	\$67.5	\$349.3	\$293.5	\$148.0	\$786.0	\$275.3	\$711.0	\$347.7
Commercial tax assessment (\$ millions)	\$27.2	\$28.9	\$38.7	\$27.3	\$28.0	\$77.9	\$43.5	\$55.2	\$61.7
Industrial tax assessment (\$ millions)	\$2.8	\$1.2	\$8.0	\$4.3	\$36.0	\$1.8	\$8.0	\$2.8	\$17.2
Agricultural tax assessment (\$ millions)	\$.5	Ø	Ø	\$.257	\$.9	Ø	Ø	\$.4	\$.2
Other tax assessment (\$ millions)	\$8.7	\$1.0	\$4.9	\$.59	\$2.5	\$1.5	\$3.9	\$20.5	\$3.9
Residential mil rate (per \$1,000) ⁽¹⁾	\$4.788	\$7.225	\$4.315	\$3.153	\$7.056	\$3.196	\$2.643	\$4.208	\$2.155
Business/Commercial mil rate (per \$1,000) ⁽¹⁾	\$14.843	\$16.158	\$7.601	\$6.697	\$20.24	\$8.879	\$7.219	\$10.310	\$4.849
Industrial mil rate (per \$1,000) ⁽¹⁾	\$25.855	\$35.928	\$7.737	\$8.283	\$55.825	\$8.788	\$33.500	\$14.308	\$12.930
Agricultural mil rate (per \$1,000) ⁽¹⁾	\$4.788	-	-	\$2.802	\$6.800	\$3.196	\$2.886	\$5.429	\$2.155

⁽¹⁾ Data cross-checked with CivicInfo website for 2011

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT – 2011 DATA (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
C. REVENUES									
Municipal tax revenues	\$1,886,332	\$1,760,253	\$2,149,855	\$1,154,782	\$3,886,460	\$3,624,042	\$1,475,802	\$3,953,474	\$3,001,259
Earned revenues	\$1,594,279	\$372,900	\$1,269,670	\$1,301,232	\$410,595	\$2,318,347			\$752,375
Grants/transfers in	\$2,919,188	\$2,265,902	\$1,124,485	\$1,857,136	\$817,001	\$1,265,991			\$1,126,794
Other revenues/grants	\$247,423	\$273,520	\$561,085	\$976,981	\$448,726	\$127,168			\$214,804
Total revenue	\$6,647,222	\$4,672,575	\$5,105,095	\$5,279,459	\$5,562,791	\$7,335,548	\$4,968,852	\$11,068,178	\$5,086,906
D. EXPENDITURES									
Total expenditures (excluding capital)	\$4,265,930	\$2,668,778	\$4,840,100	\$3,215,850	\$4,990,464	\$5,859,875	\$4,288,667	\$4,725,359	\$4,142,065
Fire	\$170,131	\$259,297	\$365,060	\$184,647	\$237,705	\$389,603	\$251,268	\$274,943	\$427,268
Water	\$366,548	\$517,407	\$303,430	\$528,474	\$634,489	\$832,725	\$418,200	\$628,018	\$569,090
Sewer	\$400,507	\$440,490	\$697,530	\$367,501	\$460,610	\$721,499	\$216,165	\$878,750	\$560,575
Roads	\$433,518	\$628,352	\$948,470	\$488,980	\$553,126	\$1,677,522	\$798,637	\$1,465,199	
Solid Waste	\$167,336	\$95,132	\$171,350	\$100,026	\$92,285	\$213,021		\$140,575	
Parks	\$50,187	\$50,000	\$123,180	\$187,631	\$193,743	\$426,703		\$493,051	\$37,567
Recreation & Culture	\$634,138	\$577,183	\$435,070	\$384,495	\$1,746,540	\$9,074 ¹	\$399,135	\$679,224	
Library	RD	-	\$110,359	\$94,876	\$113,671	\$87,021			
Planning & Development	\$175,580	\$58,000	\$488,390	\$43,067	\$30,737	\$233,812	NA	\$266,586	\$431,081

¹ Rink owned by Regional District

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT – 2011 DATA (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
D. EXPENDITURES (cont'd.)									
Engineering	\$313,298		\$535,865	\$11,380	\$875,081	\$25,625	NA		
Bylaw Enforcement	\$65,479		\$80,280	\$4,865	\$23,599	\$11,540	NA		
Building Inspection	\$28,414	\$28,549	\$17,610	\$10,340	\$27,154	\$125,960	NA		
Economic Development	\$222,454 ¹		\$40,693	\$43,067	\$145,812	\$117,450	NA	\$40,450	
Human Resources				\$4,018			NA		
Finance & Accounting	\$201,682	\$142,454	\$322,440 ²	\$134,000	\$256,652	\$508,796	NA		
Legislative Service	\$106,181				\$105,489	\$95,907	NA		\$111,327
City Administration	\$525,096	\$478,000	\$242,840	\$450,305	\$296,434	\$308,171	\$823,741	\$1,081,152	\$1,152,539
Grants/Donations/ Emergency Funding	\$229,077		\$12,000	\$132,607	-	\$75,446	\$171,200		\$40,978
Airport	\$97,890								\$147,677
Capital Expenditures (all areas)									

¹ \$355,000 in 2012

² Includes legal services and administration

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT – 2011 DATA (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
E. MAJOR CONTRACTS									
Garbage/Solid Waste	\$83,300 ¹		\$108,000	\$96,903		\$94,134	\$169,315		
Recycling				\$20,499			\$62,885		
Solid Waste Disposal						\$101,578			
Landfill							\$169,259		
Sludge Removal	\$75,000								
Water Sampling						\$16,785			
Crack Sealing					\$24,000				
Parks/Grounds Mntnce.				\$55,516	\$56,457	\$76,595			
Planning				\$43,068					
Engineering			\$400,000					\$50,000	\$179,000
Jet Rodding						\$133,076			
IT		\$40,000	\$48,000						
Janitorial					\$52,640	\$69,341		\$35,000	
Safe Communities				\$14,466					
Building Inspection		\$30,000	\$17,000						\$23,000
Records Management									\$12,000
Total									

¹ 50% of Town

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT – 2011 DATA (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
F. STAFFING/FTEs									
Total Staff (FTEs)	19.25	30	21.4	13	37 ¹	19	18	23	20
Mgmt. Staff	5	5	5	3	7	4	3	5	6
Exempt Clerical Staff	1	4	-	-		3	-	-	9
Total Mgmt & Exempt Staff	6	9	5	3	7	7	3	5	15
Non-Mgmt/Non-Exempt Staff	13.25	21	17	10	30	12	15	17	5
Fire Career Staff	-	1	1		1	2	-		1
Fire Volunteer/Paid on Call Staff	27		35	29	27	28	25	20	20
Parks Staff			1	2		1		Seasonal	-
Recreation Staff	4	6	2.5		9 ^{1 2}			1	-
Public Works Staff (sewer/water/roads)	7.5	8	7	8	10	9	10 ²	7	5
Solid Waste Staff	.5				-		Contract	1	
Engineering Staff					1			1	
Finance Staff	2.5	2	3	2	4	5	2	3	3
IT Staff									
GIS Staff							Contract		
Corporate Office Staff	2	2	1		2	1	2		4

¹ Estimated

² Includes Parks staff

BENCHMARKING SURVEY REPORT – 2011 DATA (cont'd.):

Factor	Lillooet	Burns Lake	Cumberland	Enderby	Houston	Invermere	Princeton	Sicamous	Pemberton
F. STAFFING/FTEs (cont'd.)									
Planning Staff + Building Inspection	1.25	1	1.8		2	2	Contract	1.3	3
Bylaw Enforcement Staff	1		1		2		1	.3	1
HR Staff							Contract		
General Admin Staff	5	1	1	1	4	1			2
G. OTHER DATA									
WorkSafe Claims	1	1	4	2	11	1	2	-	4
WorkSafe Lost Hours	84.5	-	808	670	35	20	-	-	1072
Grievances 2011	2	-	1		7		-	-	-
# of regular Council meetings	20	24	21	21	23	20	24	22	22
# of special Council meetings	14	24	9	1	1	16	16	6	6
Total Council Meetings	34	48	30	20	24	36	40	28	28
Staff on LTD	1	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	
Long Term Debt (millions)	\$1.7	\$.16	\$2.5	\$1.3	\$2.3	\$2.9	-	\$5.4	\$4.0

APPENDIX B

CORE SERVICE EVALUATION OF DISTRICT SERVICES

CORE SERVICE EVALUATION OF DISTRICT SERVICES

A) External Services	There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services							
1. Airport operations/administration	No for Lillooet residents; yes for the region	Yes (contractor/society/SLRD)	No	No	Yes (e.g. runway maintenance) Currently sales of aircraft fuel offset some costs	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract out airport services Reduce airport spending Seek funding from SLRD Self-fueling system sells fuel, collects and deposits funds Maintenance of building exchanged for pad rental
2. Animal control operations	Yes	Yes (contractor/society)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit animal control hours Raise licensing fees Look for non profit society to manage this service
3. Building inspection	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already a low cost service Increase inspection fees
4. Building leases/rental of public buildings	NA						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase rental/lease rates
5. Bus/transit services	NA						<ul style="list-style-type: none">
6. Bylaw enforcement	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bylaw Officer provides animal control and backs up the Building Inspector
7. Bylaw prosecution	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a material service

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
8. Cemetery services and maintenance	Yes	Yes (society)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider increasing fees so it becomes a user pay service
9. Communications/public relations	No	Yes (contractor)	Yes (contractor)	Yes (little done)	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set a specific limit on communications costs Reduce newspaper advertising
10. Community events	No	Yes (society)	Yes (society)	Yes (little done)	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek co-funding and event sponsors
11. Community service funding/Grants in Aid	No	No	No	Yes	Yes (if grants limited)	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Grants in Aid into the museum
12. Community planning/OCP	No	Yes (society/Chamber of Commerce)	Yes (society/Chamber of Commerce)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No need for planning other than boundary expansion
13. Public complaint process/FOI services	Yes	No	No	No, if not managed	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicize the costs of these functions
14. Contracting of projects	Yes (based on grant award record)	Yes (contractor)	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to contract for projects Seek multiple bidders
15. Contracting of services (e.g. garbage collection)	Yes (depends on service)	Yes (contractor)	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Depends on service	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find opportunities to reduce costs
16. Council meetings	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
17. Cultural funding		No	Yes (society)	Yes (little done)	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid funding cultural programs
18. Development/variance permits		Yes	No	Yes (little done)	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charge for services (user pay)
19. Drainage planning and infrastructure		Yes	Yes (contractor)	No	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key area that needs work
20. Economic development		No	Yes (contractor/SLRD)	No	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the scope of ED operations Seek SLRD funding Transfer the function to SLRD
21. Emergency preparedness		Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes (little done)	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assign to Fire Chief
22. Emergency water/sewer/road services		Yes	Yes (contractor)	No	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue as is Document issues to identify patterns
23. Engineering services		No	Yes (contractor)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get quotes for engineering services to improve pricing
24. Fees and fine billings/collection		Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review/update all fees and prices
25. Fire inspection services		Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes (limited work at present)	Yes	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charge for re-inspections

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
26. Fire protection services	Yes	No	Yes (user pay pricing)	Yes	No	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charge for false alarms
27. Fire protection services contracted to others	No	Yes (local FD)	Yes (user pay pricing)	Yes	No	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price to recover capital costs
28. Garbage collection – residential	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider bi-weekly collection • Contract out all collection
29. Garbage collection – commercial	No	Yes (contractor)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to require businesses to look after their own garbage collection
30. Hydrant maintenance	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Unknown	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service required to support fire protection • Test all hydrants each year
31. Library services	NA – not funded by Lillooet							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
32. Licensing – businesses	No	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price licenses for full cost recovery
33. Licensing – dogs	No	Yes (contractor/society)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price licenses for full cost recovery
34. Lobbying other levels of government	Yes	Yes (PR contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue aggressive grant seeking
35. Museum operations	No	Yes (society)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce museum funding • Encourage user pay museum fees (e.g. \$2 per visit)

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
36. Parking fines	No	Yes (contractor)	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	• Not an issue
37. Parks maintenance	No	(contractor/ School District)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	• Scale back parks maintenance
38. Walking trails	No	(contractor)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	• Seek volunteer assistance for trail maintenance
39. Permits – building/plumbing	Yes	(contractor)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	• Continue part time building inspection • Review fees
40. Permits – subdivision/zoning/rezoning	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	• Ensure user pay pricing
41. Development approvals	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	• Ensure user pay pricing
42. Playgrounds	No	(contractor)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	• Seek co-funding and grants
43. Playing fields	No	(School District)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	• Seek community and School District assistance
44. Policing	Yes	(RCMP)	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	No	• Not an issue

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
45. Pool operations	No	Unknown	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the pool
46. Property tax billing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue as is
47. Public meetings/reporting/consultation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce newspaper advertising • Use the Lillooet web page • Increase public consultation and involvement
48. Public works – sale of services	No	Yes (contractors)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action. No capacity for sale of services
49. Sale of District property	No	Yes (agent)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review opportunities
50. Recreation programs	No	Yes (contractors)	Unknown	Unknown	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review pricing to increase program utilization
51. Recycling	No	Yes (contractor)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an issue at present • Discuss incremental costs with solid waste contractor
52. Regional planning	No	Yes (SLRD)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delegate to SLRD
53. Road cleaning	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize work to anticipate and manage flooding
54. Road maintenance	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop road standards and maintenance plan

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
55. Road sanding	Yes (many steep roads)	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget to remove sand in the Spring
56. Sewage collection mains	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check valves Replace faulty valves
57. Sewage treatment and disposal	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop remediation plan for sewage treatment Consider claims against the construction contractor and/or engineer Consider contracting out sewage treatment plant operations
58. Sidewalk maintenance	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (cut back)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare RFP to assess contractor cost
59. Signage	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a major issue
60. Snow removal – public parking lots	No (few lots)	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a major issue
61. Snow removal – roads	Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Unknown	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare RFP to assess contractor cost
62. Snow removal – sidewalks	No	Yes (contractor/owners)	Yes	Unknown	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue as is

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
63. Storm sewers		Yes (flooding risk abatement)	Yes (contractor)	Unknown	Yes	Yes	No (danger of flooding)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear drainage ditches • Flush lines
64. Street lighting		No	No	Unknown	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue as is
65. Tax collection		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review tax levels and prices/fees for all services
66. Setting tax rates		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify ways to increase tax rates
67. Tourism Bureau operations		No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek co-funding from tourism operations/Chamber of Commerce
68. Traffic signals		No	No	No	No	Unknown	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an issue
69. Victim assistance		NA						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not provided at present
70. Water distribution		Yes	Yes (contractor)	Unknown	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price water for full cost recovery
71. Water fees/rate setting		Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price for full cost recovery

¹ Includes contracting out

A) External Services		There is a compelling public need for this service	Others can deliver this service ¹	This service is affordable	It's fair to ask all taxpayers to pay for this service	Costs of this service could become excessive	In an extreme situation we would cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Public and Community Services (cont'd.):								
72. Water treatment		Yes	Yes (contractor)	Unknown	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metering should reduce use
73. Water reservoirs		Yes	Yes (contractor)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (dry area)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue as is
74. Zoning		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue as is
75.								
76.								
77.								
78.								
79.								

¹ Includes contracting out

CORE SERVICE EVALUATION OF DISTRICT SERVICES

B) Internal Services	There is a compelling need for this function in Town services	Others can deliver this service	This service is affordable	In an extreme situation we could cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Internal Administrative Support Services					
200. Accounting – postings & records	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Need additional accounting expertise and support
201. Accounts payable	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
202. Accounts receivable	Yes	No	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
203. Banking	Yes	No	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
204. Benefits contracts (life ins, LTD, dental)	No	Yes	Unknown	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Price benefits for ASO coverage
205. Budgeting – operating and capital	Yes	No	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
206. Buildings and facilities maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
207. Janitorial services	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Service is already contracted outNo price escalation from contractor over several years
208. Capital planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

B) Internal Services		There is a compelling need for this function in Town services	Others can deliver this service	This service is affordable	In an extreme situation we could cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Internal Administrative Support Services						
209.	Internal communications	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	•
210.	Contracting for services/RFPs	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	•
211.	Service and program costing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	•
212.	Council support/research	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	•
213.	Council committee support	NA				•
214.	E-business	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	• Enhance the District's website
215.	Engineering	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (temporarily)	• Contracted out
216.	Equipment/vehicle maintenance	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (temporarily)	• PW vehicle maintenance is contracted out
217.	Financial reporting	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	• Buy new accounting/reporting software
218.	Geographic information system	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	• Contract out/specialized service
219.	Grants – federal	Yes	No	Yes	No	• Pursue aggressively

B) Internal Services	There is a compelling need for this function in Town services	Others can deliver this service	This service is affordable	In an extreme situation we could cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Internal Administrative Support Services (cont'd.):					
220. Grants – provincial	Yes	No	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pursue aggressively
221. Grants – in lieu of taxes	No	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modest grants at present
222. Collective bargaining and grievance administration	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine the two bargaining units
223. GST/HST recoveries	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
224. Human resources administration	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assigned to Director of Finance
225. Information systems – consulting	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
226. Information systems – maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
227. Information systems – purchasing software	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchase new accounting software
228. Information systems – purchasing hardware	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
229. Investment of funds	No	Yes	Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracted to Province

B) Internal Services		There is a compelling need for this function in Town services	Others can deliver this service	This service is affordable	In an extreme situation we could cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Internal Administrative Support Services (cont'd.):						
230. Job posting		No	No	Yes	Yes (with CUPE agreement)	•
231. Legal services		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	•
232. Media relations		No	Yes	No	Yes	•
233. Municipal insurance		Yes	Yes (MIA)	No	Yes	• Contracted to Municipal Insurance Association (MIA)
234. Payroll		No	Yes	No	Yes	• Could be contracted out
235. Policy research and development		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	•
236. Project management		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	• Currently using a temporary project coordinator
237. Provincial government interfaces/relations		Yes	No	Yes	No	•
238. Purchasing (equipment, vehicles, supplies)		No	Yes	Yes (decentralized)	Yes	• No specific purchasing function • Partner with the School District and/or Interior Health Authority • Improve spending controls
239. Records management		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (temporarily)	•

B) Internal Services		There is a compelling need for this function in Town services	Others can deliver this service	This service is affordable	In an extreme situation we could cut this service	Recommendation/Action
Internal Administrative Support Services (cont'd.):						
240.	Recruitment/selection/employment	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	•
241.	Health and safety programs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (limited)	•
242.	Salaries – compensation administration	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	• All managers are on contracts
243.	Sale of services	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	•
244.	Staff orientation	No	No	Yes	Yes	•
245.	Staff training	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	• Limited training budget for staff temporarily
246.	Inventory management	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	•
247.	Tax rate planning	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	•
248.	Sister cities	NA				•
249.	Use of reserve accounts	Yes	No	Unknown	No	• Set target reserves by service/asset
250.	WorkSafe BC administration	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	•

		There is a compelling need for this function in delivering Town services	Others can deliver this service	This service is affordable	In an extreme situation we could cut this service	Recommendation/Action
B) Internal Services						
Internal Administrative Support Services (cont'd.):						
251.	Public Works inventory management	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	•
252.	Pricing of services	Yes	No	Yes	No	• Pricing of services, permits, fees and fines need to be reviewed regularly with a user pay approach
253.						•
254.						•
255.						•
256.						•
257.						•

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This appendix provides a framework to evaluate the report recommendations based on such factors as: residence acceptance; ease of implementation; certainty of savings/revenues and service performance impacts.

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST

This list includes opportunities for cost reduction, service improvement, revenue generation and capital projects.

1. FINANCE

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					Status
		Estimated Annual Savings/Revenue/(Cost)	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/Revenues	Service Performance Impact	
1.	Pursue the boundary expansion						
2.	Increase water utility rates						
3.	Replace the financial software						
4.	Build road maintenance reserves commencing in 2015						
5.	Review all service pricing and fees with the objective of fully recovering costs and increasing revenues						
6.	Reduce the grant in aid to the museum and support a museum entrance fee						
7.	Reduce the permissive property tax exemption by 50% for non-religious organizations						

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST**2. ADMINISTRATION**

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					Status
		Estimated Annual Savings/Revenue/(Cost)	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/Revenues	Service Performance Impact	
8.	Find ways to reduce the fleet by 5 vehicles						
9.	Partner with the School District and Interior Health for purchasing goods and services						
10.	Cut back on management courses and programs						

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST

3. HUMAN RESOURCES

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					
		Estimated Annual Savings/Revenue/(Cost)	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/Revenues	Service Performance Impact	Status
11.	Hire a full time Fire Chief						
12.	Hire a Deputy Director of Finance						
13.	Hire a Superintendent of Public Works						
14.	Consolidate the bylaw and building inspector positions						
15.	Find ways to reduce benefit plan premiums (shopping plans and considering an administrative services only (ASO) contract						
16.	Integrate the two CUPE bargaining units						
17.	Fix the waste water/sewage treatment plant						

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST**4. PUBLIC WORKS**

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					Status
		Estimated Annual Savings/ Revenues	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/ Revenues	Service Performance Impact	
18.	Conduct an inventory of the condition of all roads						
19.	Increase spending on roads						
20.	Put the whole garbage collection contract out/reduce service costs						
21.	Consider bi-weekly garbage collection						
22.	Relocate the Public Works yard to East Lillooet site (2015)						
23.	Test all hydrants annually						
24.	Commence replacing hydrants, (e.g. 10 per year)						
25.	Develop remedial drainage and flooding plans						
26.	Find ways to reduce the District's energy costs						

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST

4. PUBLIC WORKS (cont'd.)

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					
		Estimated Annual Savings/ Revenues	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/ Revenues	Service Performance Impact	Status
27.	Increase Public Works on call pay to \$150/weekend						
28.	Require backflow valves on all properties with dual water systems and on all commercial properties						
29.	Buy a new sweeper in 2013						
30.	Improve the training and supervision of Job Career Partnership staff and summer students						
31.	Formalize the garbage collection contract						

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST

5. RECREATION

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					
		Estimated Annual Savings/ Revenues	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/ Revenues	Service Performance Impact	Status
32.	Reduce recreation costs/services (e.g. close the pool)						
33.	Increase recreation memberships/ revenues						
34.	Secure recreation operating and capital funding from First Nations bands						
35.	Evaluate the recreation centre for seismic integrity						

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST

6. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					Status
		Estimated Annual Savings/ Revenues	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/ Revenues	Service Performance Impact	
36.	Reduce economic development services						

7. FIRE DEPARTMENT

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					
		Estimated Annual Savings/ Revenues	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/ Revenues	Service Performance Impact	Status
37.	Partially implement Fire Department recommendations (i.e. increase firefighter compensation, alarm the Hall, increase the officer training budget, budget for recruiting)						

IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITY LIST

7. COMMUNICATIONS/OTHER IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

#	RECOMMENDATION	ASSESSMENT FACTORS					Status
		Estimated Annual Savings/ Revenues	Resident Acceptance	Ease of Implementation	Certainty of Savings/ Revenues	Service Performance Impact	
38.	Reduce newspaper communications costs by 50%						
39.	Improve District communications with residents and businesses about challenges, plans and improvement programs						
40.	Involve community members and groups in setting priorities and solving financial and service problems						
41.	Let the public know how they can help Public Works operations (e.g. not dumping cooking grease down the drain)						