

Report to Council



Date: October 30, 2023
To: Council
From: City Manager
Subject: Rescind Council Policy No. 265: Engineering Drawing Submission Requirements
Department: Infrastructure Division

Recommendation:

THAT Council receives, for information, the report from the Development Services Department, dated October 30th, 2023, regarding Council Policy 265;

AND THAT Council Policy No. 265, being Engineering Drawing Submission Requirements, be rescinded;

AND THAT Bylaw No. 12584, being Amendment No. 25 to Subdivision, Development and Servicing Bylaw No. 7900, be forwarded for reading consideration.

Purpose:

To rescind Council Policy No. 265: Engineering Drawing Submission Requirements and replace it with an Administrative Policy to improve administration efficiency.

Background:

In 1999, Council adopted [Policy 265: Engineering Drawing Submission Requirements](#) to define the standards for engineering drawings for works and services submitted to the City for acceptance into our infrastructure asset inventory. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that required information is provided with consistent formatting and detailing to a defined minimum standard in order to support established asset operational and management practices. To enable this, the Engineering Drawing Submission Requirements (EDS) identifies, in detail, the paper sizes, scale sizes, plotting appearance, and formatting of engineering drawings. It also outlines detailed requirements for various types of drawings that are to be submitted, such as composite utility plans, road and utility drawings, grading & stormwater management plans, signage and pavement marking plans, and construction details.

Engineering Drawings are reviewed for construction approval and record (as-built) intake approval. These drawings are used to generate asset management information for the infrastructure represented on the drawings. The City’s asset management practices have changed significantly since the adoption of Policy 265, with a digital GIS (geographic information system) platform currently being used to visualise and store infrastructure asset data. The current policy was intended to function primarily in a paper intake system and is not well suited for our current digital and future automated practice.

Discussion:

The Policy requires Council's approval for any changes. With the evolving nature of data collection for various types of infrastructure with dozens of unique attributes (pipe size, material, etc.), the process required to bring frequent and highly technical information to Council for approval is inefficient. As a replacement to Policy 265, Staff are developing an Administrative Policy that ensures multi-departmental review of any changes to the Engineering Drawing Submission Requirements and final approval by the General Manager, Infrastructure – similar to the recent Approved Products List policy.

The intent of upcoming change is to establish clear and consistent submission standards that can integrate seamlessly with an automated intake system. This automated system will greatly reduce manual staff time, existing backlog, and result in improved quality and speed of the intake process. The types and attributes of required infrastructure asset data changes and will require regular review of the policy to ensure asset operational and management objectives are met. The Policy will require engineering consulting firms to use and prepare drawings in accordance with a City-provided standard template, for which there will be prior consultation, training, and an implementation transition period.

Conclusion:

The rescindment of Policy 265, if approved by Council, will allow staff to implement a new Engineering Data Submission Requirements - Administrative Policy that will ensure consistency and quality of engineering infrastructure asset and operational data, and will facilitate more efficient and responsive asset operations and management practice.

Internal Circulation:

Asset Management & Capital Planning Manager
General Manager, Infrastructure
Data Services & Analytics Manager
Planning & Development Services Director
City Clerk

Considerations applicable to this report:

Legal/Statutory Authority:

Legal/Statutory Procedural Requirements:

Existing Policy:

Considerations not applicable to this report:

Financial/Budgetary Considerations:

Consultation and Engagement:

Communications Comments:

Submitted by: N. Chapman, Development Engineering Manager

Approved for inclusion: M. Logan, General Manager, Infrastructure

cc:

J. Shaw, Asset Management & Capital Planning Manager

M. Logan, General Manager, Infrastructure

B. Beach, Infrastructure Delivery Manager

C. Trent, Data Services & Analytics Manager