



# MN2050 | State of the Infrastructure 2015/2016 Survey

## Data Book

J U N E 2 0 1 6

Prepared by:  
Anna Bartholomay and Nicole MartinRogers, Ph.D.



*Photo courtesy of TKDA*

451 Lexington Parkway North | Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104  
651-280-2700 | [www.wilderresearch.org](http://www.wilderresearch.org)

**Wilder  
Research**

Information. Insight. Impact.

# Contents

Study methodology .....	1
Survey instrument design.....	1
Sample.....	1
Data collection .....	2
Data cleaning and analysis.....	3
Calculations in the summary report .....	3
How to read the tables in this data book .....	5
Survey findings .....	7

## **Infrastructure management overview**

Does your organization use Asset Management? .....	7
Who participates? Who leads?	
Does your jurisdiction have an Asset Management Plan? .....	12
Does your jurisdiction create as-built drawings? .....	13
Does your jurisdiction participate in an AM consortium? .....	14
[If your jurisdiction participates in a consortium] Does your consortium share electronic base maps, asset management systems, personnel? .....	15

## **Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets**

Which of the following infrastructure assets do you have in your jurisdiction? .....	18
Roads, Bridges, Transit lines, Traffic fixtures, Buildings, Water supply & distribution pipes, Waste water collection & treatment assets, Storm sewers, Storm ponds, Airports, Ports, Railways, Electrical systems, Solid waste facilities, Natural gas network, Parks, Fleet	
(The set of questions below are repeated for each asset.)	
Are roads in your jurisdiction mapped? .....	20
In what software tools are roads mapped (GIS/CAD/Both)? .....	21
Which other information is tracked about roads? .....	22

## **Value of Infrastructure Assets**

How does your jurisdiction place a value on infrastructure assets? .....	71
Funding gap .....	72
Roads, Bridges, Transit lines, Traffic fixtures, Buildings, Water supply & distribution pipes, Waste water collection & treatment assets, Storm sewers, Storm ponds, Airports, Ports, Railways, Electrical systems, Solid waste facilities, Natural gas network, Parks, Fleet	
(The set of questions below are repeated for each asset.)	
Do you know the value (\$) of roads in your jurisdiction? .....	73
[If jurisdiction knows the value of <u>all</u> roads] What is the value of all roads in your jurisdiction? .....	74

## **Asset Management Tools and Systems**

How many asset management systems is the goal? .....	106
Tools used for asset management. ....	107
Software systems used for asset management. ....	108
Miscellaneous systems used for asset management.....	109
Total number of different software tools or asset management systems used.....	110
Success factors (Ease of use, cost, multiple assets, time, etc.) .....	111

## **Asset Management Reflections**

Top reasons to practice Asset Management.....	118
Top reasons <u>not</u> to practice Asset Management .....	119
Effectiveness rating.....	120

## **Appendix**

Survey instrument 2015 .....	121
Analysis codebook 2015 .....	149
Survey instrument 2016 .....	154
Analysis codebook 2016 .....	189

# Acknowledgements

Wilder Research would like to acknowledge our study partners from MN2050 and the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) State Aid for their continued guidance throughout all phases of this study; their expertise and insight were and continue to be invaluable. MnDOT funded this study.

We are grateful for the guidance of the study's advisory board, including:

Tom Eggum, MN2050  
James Grube, Minnesota County Engineers Association  
Brad Henry, MN2050  
Kelvin Howieson, MnDOT  
Malaki Ruranika, MnDOT  
Michael Thompson, City Engineers Association of Minnesota  
Joel Ulring, MnDOT

Wilder Research would also like to express our gratitude to Jeff Johnson from the City Engineers Association of Minnesota and Mark Krebsbach from the Minnesota County Engineers Association for assisting with the pre-notification to respondents, and the League of Minnesota Cities for their assistance with providing contact information for city and county engineers.

Finally, we would like to thank the 529 city and county engineers and other professionals who took the time to complete this survey in 2015 and/or 2016. Without them, this report would not be possible.

The following Wilder Research staff contributed to this study:

Mark Anton	Phil Cooper
Barry Bloomgren, Jr.	Ryan Evans
Jennifer Bohlke	Stephanie Peterson
Walker Bosch	Dan Swanson
Benjamin Bushee	



# Study methodology

On behalf of the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and with the support and guidance of MN2050, Wilder Research conducted an online survey of engineers and other professionals from jurisdictions across the state of Minnesota, including cities, counties, and two state agencies: Metropolitan Council and MnDOT. This survey was first conducted in 2015 and revised in 2016. The list of jurisdictions was expanded to include more small cities for the 2016 administration.

The goals of the ‘State of the Infrastructure’ survey are: 1) to learn to what degree city, county, and state agencies are using asset management practices in Minnesota, and 2) to share collective knowledge regarding the wide range of infrastructure types in Minnesota and the characteristics and condition of these infrastructure assets.

MN2050 ([www.mn2050.org](http://www.mn2050.org)) is a coalition of partners comprising engineering and infrastructure professional organizations working in the public, private, and educational sectors. MN2050’s mission is to promote infrastructure investment across Minnesota by providing a coordinated voice drawing attention to infrastructure needs and informing citizens and leaders of necessary action steps to ensure appropriate infrastructure in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## Survey instrument design

The survey was designed by Wilder Research and MN2050 with input from MnDOT State Aid and the study’s advisory group. The survey includes questions about the use of asset management practices: types of infrastructure managed: and the condition, value, and mapping of each type of infrastructure. See the Appendix for a PDF version of the survey instruments from 2015 and 2016. The survey was programmed into Wilder Research’s web survey software (Voxco’s Acuity4) and administered in an online format via email.

## Sample

MN2050 and Wilder Research worked with MnDOT State Aid and the League of Minnesota Cities to obtain the names and email addresses of city, county, and state engineers or other representatives that are responsible for asset management in their jurisdiction. Most often, survey respondents were engineers or other professionals or consultants hired by the jurisdiction. Email addresses for county representatives and city representatives (for cities with populations of 5,000 or greater) were obtained from MnDOT State Aid. We were able to obtain a list of cities and available contact information for cities with populations of less than 5,000 from the League of Minnesota

Cities. It should be noted that while there are a total of 2,496 cities and townships in Minnesota with populations of less than 5,000, the sample file that Wilder Research received from the League of Minnesota Cities only included contact information for 710 cities due to missing contact information. Although the sample is incomplete, it is more comprehensive than the sample of cities with populations of less than 5,000 received for the 2015 survey, which only included 269 small cities for which the League of Minnesota Cities had a public works engineer listed. It is also important to note that not all state agencies responsible for managing infrastructure assets were included in the sample. MnDOT and the Metropolitan Council were included in the sample because it is our understanding that these agencies manage the greatest number of assets in the state.

## Data collection

For the 2016 administration, MN2050 sent pre-notification emails about the study to each contact in the sample. The pre-notification email outlined the goals of the survey as well as what information the survey sought to collect. The following week, Wilder Research sent all sampled respondents a customized/unique email inviting them to participate in the web survey (the email appeared as if it was from the heads of the city and county engineers associations). This invitation was sent on February 17, 2016. The survey officially closed on April 1, 2016, after five reminder emails were sent to the sample to complete the survey.

A summary of the survey questions was made available to respondents in PDF format to help them prepare the information necessary to complete the survey. At the end of the survey, respondents were given the option of emailing themselves their completed survey responses for their records.

In 2016, the survey was emailed to representatives from 87 counties, 148 large cities (with populations of 5,000 or more), 710 small cities (all small cities with populations of less than 5,000 that had contact information available through the League of Minnesota Cities), and two state agencies: MnDOT and Metropolitan Council. In 2015, the survey was sent to the same state agencies, counties, and larger cities, and a smaller list of smaller cities (only those that had a public works contact listed with the League of Minnesota Cities).

The completed surveys for 2015 and 2016 combined include 316 smaller cities (45% of all small cities that were invited to participate), 129 larger cities (87%), 82 counties (94%), and both state agencies for a total of 529 respondents (56% overall response rate). (Responses from 79 jurisdictions from 2015 were included in the 2015/2016 analysis because they did not respond in 2016.) See the chart below for more information about the sample and response rate.

## 2. Sample group

	Total number of jurisdictions of this type in MN <sup>3</sup>	Number of jurisdictions					Response rate 2015/2016 <sup>5</sup>
		Sampled		Completed			
		2015	2016	2015	2016	2015/2016 <sup>4</sup>	
Cities with less than 5,000 residents <sup>1</sup>	2,496	269	710	96	266	316	45%
Cities with 5,000 or more residents <sup>2</sup>	159	148	148	104	109	129	87%
Counties <sup>2</sup>	87	87	87	64	73	82	94%
State agencies	2	2	2	2	2	2	100%
Total	2,744	506	946	266	450	529	56%

<sup>1</sup> Sample provided by League of Minnesota Cities

<sup>2</sup> Sample provided by MnDOT State Aid

<sup>3</sup> Minnesota State Demographic Center and the Metropolitan Council, 2014

<sup>4</sup> Calculated with 2016 sample as the denominator and number of completed responses from 2015 and 2016 combined as the numerator

<sup>5</sup> Includes all responses from 2016 and responses from 2015 for those jurisdictions that did not respond in 2016

## Data cleaning and analysis

Completed surveys were checked for accuracy and clarity, and to verify that all responses were within range and followed the programmed skip patterns. Data were then analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to produce response frequencies, means/medians, and ranges. Cross-tabs were used to analyze responses by respondent subgroups (cities, counties, and state agencies, cities by population, counties by geography, and counties and cities by MnDOT district).

For open-ended questions, categories were developed from the available responses. These categories were used to code open-ended responses for analysis in SPSS. Both analysis codebooks for the 2015 survey and the 2016 survey that were used to categorize respondents' comments are included in the Appendix.

This data book includes combined data from the 2015 and 2016 surveys. If a jurisdiction completed both surveys, their data from 2016 was used. If a jurisdiction did not complete the 2016 survey but did complete it in 2015 (N=79), their data from the 2015 survey was used.

## Calculations in the summary report

The summary report includes calculations based on responses from survey participants and population data from 2014 estimates from the Minnesota State Demographic Center and the Metropolitan Council. Based on very limited survey data, we calculated the per capita value of each asset by jurisdiction type. The per capita value of each asset type was

calculated by adding the total value of an asset type given for each type of jurisdiction that responded to that question, divided by the population of those jurisdictions. Some per capita estimates differ greatly among different types of jurisdictions.

Also, an estimate of the annual gap between annual infrastructure investment needs and available funds was calculated by finding the sum of the gap in funds provided by survey respondents by each jurisdiction type.

While these estimates provide some useful insights, readers should exercise caution in interpreting the figures without understanding the reasons behind the discrepancies in the estimates. Overall, these value and annual gap in funding amounts were provided by only a small proportion of all jurisdictions that participated in this survey. Better data are needed to estimate the true value of Minnesota's infrastructure and the gap between available funds and funds needed to maintain it.



# How to read the tables in this data book

For every table in this data book, results are displayed for sub-groups of respondents based on:

- By jurisdiction type: smaller cities (cities with less than 5,000 residents), larger cities (cities with 5,000 or more residents), counties, and state agencies (includes Metropolitan Council and MnDOT).
- Cities by populations, including: less than 5,000 residents, 5,000-19,999 residents, 20,000-49,999 residents, and 50,000 or more residents.
- Counties by geography including the seven-county Twin Cities metro, Greater Minnesota counties with 60,000 or more residents, and Greater Minnesota counties with less than 60,000 residents. Analysis excludes data for Scott and Washington counties in the seven-county Twin Cities metro sub-group due to these counties' non-response. The subgroup of Greater Minnesota counties with 60,000 or more residents excludes data for Blue Earth County, and the subgroup of Greater Minnesota counties with less than 60,000 residents excludes data for Freeborn and Koochiching counties due to non-response.
- Counties and cities by MnDOT district.
- The table footnotes listed below apply for each table in the data book.
  1. These cities do not receive State Aid funds.
  2. These cities receive State Aid funds administered by MnDOT.
  3. Includes Metropolitan Council and MnDOT
  4. Includes Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, and Ramsey counties (Scott and Washington counties did not complete a survey)
  5. Includes Clay, Crow Wing, Olmsted, Rice, Saint Louis, Sherburne, Stearns, and Wright counties (Blue Earth County did not complete a survey)
  6. Includes (Aitkin, Becker, Beltrami, Benton, Brown, Carlton, Cass, Chippewa, Chisago, Clearwater, Cook, Cottonwood, Dodge, Douglas, Faribault, Fillmore, Goodhue, Grant, Houston, Hubbard, Isanti, Itasca, Jackson, Kanabec, Kandiyohi, Kittson, Lac Qui Parle, Lake, Lake Of The Woods, Le Sueur, Lincoln, Lyon, Mahnomen, Marshall, Martin, McLeod, Meeker, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Mower, Murray, Nicollet, Nobles, Norman, Otter Tail, Pennington, Pine, Pipestone, Polk, Pope, Red Lake, Redwood, Renville, Rock, Roseau, Sibley, Steel, Stevens, Swift,

Todd, Traverse, Wabasha, Wadena, Waseca, Watonwan, Wilkin, Winona, and Yellow Medicine counties (Freeborn and Koochiching counties did not complete a survey)

The N value located at the top of each column in the data tables represents the number of respondents for that question. The Ns vary significantly across questions due to a variety of reasons: 79 responses from the 2015 survey were merged into the 2016 survey responses, not all questions were the same from 2015 to 2016, and not all respondents answered all questions.

See Figure 2 for an example of the table format that is used for every survey question.

## 2. Data book template

Question	Response 1		Response 2		Response 3		Total N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<b>All survey respondents</b>							
Cities with less than 5,000 residents <sup>1</sup>							
Cities with 5,000 or more residents <sup>2</sup>							
Counties							
State agencies <sup>3</sup>							
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Less than 5,000 residents							
5,000-19,999 residents							
20,000-49,999 residents							
50,000 or more residents							
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro <sup>4</sup>							
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents <sup>5</sup>							
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents <sup>6</sup>							
<b>Counties and cities by MnDOT district</b>							
District 1							
District 2							
District 3							
District 4							
Metro							
District 6							
District 7							
District 8							

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 1. Does your organization use Asset Management practices to operate, maintain, and extend the life of infrastructure assets in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>526</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	140	44%	175	56%	315
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	105	82%	23	18%	128
Counties	58	72%	23	28%	81
State agencies (3)	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	140	44%	175	56%	315
5,000-19,999 residents	55	71%	22	29%	77
20,000-49,999 residents	34	97%	1	3%	35
50,000 or more residents	16	100%	0	0%	16
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	6	100%	0	0%	6
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	8	100%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	44	66%	23	34%	67
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	26	60%	17	40%	43
District 2	17	43%	23	57%	40
District 3	46	57%	34	43%	80
District 4	31	53%	27	47%	58
Metro	87	79%	23	21%	110
District 6	33	55%	27	45%	60
District 7	31	46%	36	54%	67
District 8	32	48%	34	52%	66

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 1A. From [JURISDICTION], who participates at any level in Asset Management? (Check all that apply)

	Engineering / Public Works personnel		Finance personnel		GIS personnel		Data Processing personnel		Planning personnel		Other personnel		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	285	96%	180	60%	100	34%	18	6%	64	21%	82	28%	298
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	123	90%	81	60%	9	7%	4	3%	30	22%	61	45%	136
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	103	100%	70	68%	67	65%	8	8%	22	21%	13	13%	103
Counties	57	100%	27	47%	22	39%	4	7%	10	18%	6	11%	57
State agencies (3)	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	123	90%	81	60%	9	7%	4	3%	30	22%	61	45%	136
5,000-19,999 residents	54	100%	38	70%	27	50%	2	4%	14	26%	5	9%	54
20,000-49,999 residents	34	100%	27	79%	27	79%	4	12%	6	18%	5	15%	34
50,000 or more residents	15	100%	5	33%	13	87%	2	13%	2	13%	3	20%	15
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	5	100%	4	80%	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	8	100%	4	50%	4	50%	0	0%	1	13%	1	13%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	44	100%	18	41%	14	32%	2	5%	6	14%	5	11%	44
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	22	92%	10	42%	2	8%	3	13%	4	17%	7	29%	24
District 2	14	82%	10	59%	3	18%	0	0%	4	24%	6	35%	17
District 3	45	98%	31	67%	15	33%	0	0%	12	26%	10	22%	46
District 4	29	97%	17	57%	10	33%	2	7%	8	27%	9	30%	30
Metro	85	100%	58	68%	49	58%	9	11%	20	24%	18	21%	85
District 6	28	88%	22	69%	10	31%	1	3%	5	16%	11	34%	32
District 7	29	97%	14	47%	6	20%	0	0%	5	17%	13	43%	30
District 8	31	97%	16	50%	3	9%	1	3%	4	13%	6	19%	32

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 1A. From [JURISDICTION], who participates at any level in Asset Management? Other personnel

	Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)		Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)		Counties		State agencies (3)		All survey respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
City Council/Clerk	33	54%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	33	40%
Administration	20	33%	4	31%	2	33%	0	0%	26	32%
Other	8	13%	7	54%	4	67%	2	100%	21	26%
Streets	2	3%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%
Utilities	0	0%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%
Maintenance	2	3%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%
Parks	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
<b>N of respondents</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 1B. Which department leads Asset Management at [JURISDICTION]?

	Engineering / Public Works		Finance		GIS		Data Processing		Planning		Other (please specify department):		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>295</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	78	58%	22	16%	1	1%	1	1%	5	4%	27	20%	134
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	91	89%	6	6%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	102
Counties	51	89%	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	57
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	78	58%	22	16%	1	1%	1	1%	5	4%	27	20%	134
5,000-19,999 residents	50	93%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	54
20,000-49,999 residents	31	91%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	34
50,000 or more residents	10	71%	1	7%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	6	75%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	41	93%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	44
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	16	67%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	2	8%	5	21%	24
District 2	14	82%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	17
District 3	33	73%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	5	11%	45
District 4	23	77%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	5	17%	30
Metro	73	87%	6	7%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	2	2%	84
District 6	19	59%	8	25%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	32
District 7	19	63%	6	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	17%	30
District 8	23	74%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	13%	31



## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 1B. Which department leads Asset Management at [JURISDICTION]? Other

	Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)		Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)		Counties		State agencies (3)		All survey respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
City Council/Clerk/Manager	15	52%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	15	44%
Administration	11	38%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	12	35%
Other	2	7%	1	33%	1	100%	1	100%	5	15%
Split up by individual departments	1	3%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%
<b>N of respondents</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 2. Does [JURISDICTION] have an Asset Management Plan?

	Yes, we have completed a plan		We have started a plan, but it is not completed		No, we have not considered or started a plan		No, but we are currently considering implementing a plan		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>286</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	12	9%	36	28%	50	38%	32	25%	130
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	18	18%	44	44%	18	18%	20	20%	100
Counties	6	11%	12	22%	21	39%	15	28%	54
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	12	9%	36	28%	50	38%	32	25%	130
5,000-19,999 residents	8	15%	23	43%	12	23%	10	19%	53
20,000-49,999 residents	8	24%	12	36%	6	18%	7	21%	33
50,000 or more residents	2	14%	9	64%	0	0%	3	21%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	43%	1	14%	1	14%	2	29%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	3	7%	9	21%	20	48%	10	24%	42
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	1	5%	3	16%	8	42%	7	37%	19
District 2	1	6%	2	13%	11	69%	2	13%	16
District 3	7	16%	12	27%	11	25%	14	32%	44
District 4	2	7%	9	31%	11	38%	7	24%	29
Metro	17	20%	35	42%	11	13%	20	24%	83
District 6	4	13%	10	32%	12	39%	5	16%	31
District 7	2	7%	12	40%	8	27%	8	27%	30
District 8	2	6%	9	28%	17	53%	4	13%	32

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 7A. Does [JURISDICTION] create as-built drawings after infrastructure construction or repair projects?

	Yes, for all construction and repair projects		Yes, for some construction and repair projects		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>479</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	108	39%	117	42%	54	19%	279
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	91	76%	29	24%	0	0%	120
Counties	15	19%	44	56%	19	24%	78
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	108	39%	117	42%	54	19%	279
5,000-19,999 residents	58	78%	16	22%	0	0%	74
20,000-49,999 residents	22	69%	10	31%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	25%	6	75%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	13	20%	34	52%	18	28%	65
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	14	41%	15	44%	5	15%	34
District 2	13	35%	12	32%	12	32%	37
District 3	34	44%	37	48%	6	8%	77
District 4	20	38%	19	37%	13	25%	52
Metro	57	57%	34	34%	9	9%	100
District 6	21	38%	27	49%	7	13%	55
District 7	32	52%	20	33%	9	15%	61
District 8	23	38%	26	43%	12	20%	61

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 7B. Does [JURISDICTION] participate in an Asset Management countywide or other consortium?

	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>479</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	9	3%	272	97%	281
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	8	7%	111	93%	119
Counties	12	16%	65	84%	77
State agencies (3)	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	9	3%	272	97%	281
5,000-19,999 residents	2	3%	71	97%	73
20,000-49,999 residents	4	12%	29	88%	33
50,000 or more residents	2	15%	11	85%	13
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	60%	2	40%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	43%	4	57%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	6	9%	59	91%	65
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	1	3%	33	97%	34
District 2	2	5%	35	95%	37
District 3	5	7%	71	93%	76
District 4	3	6%	49	94%	52
Metro	8	8%	94	92%	102
District 6	6	11%	49	89%	55
District 7	3	5%	57	95%	60
District 8	1	2%	60	98%	61

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 7C. Does your consortium share electronic base maps, i.e., property aerals, planimetrics, topos?

	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>29</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	6	86%	1	14%	7
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	7	88%	1	13%	8
Counties	11	92%	1	8%	12
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	6	86%	1	14%	7
5,000-19,999 residents	2	100%	0	0%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	3	75%	1	25%	4
50,000 or more residents	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	100%	0	0%	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	100%	0	0%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	5	83%	1	17%	6
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 2	2	100%	0	0%	2
District 3	3	75%	1	25%	4
District 4	3	100%	0	0%	3
Metro	7	88%	1	13%	8
District 6	5	100%	0	0%	5
District 7	3	100%	0	0%	3
District 8	1	100%	0	0%	1

## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 7D. Does your consortium share asset management systems?

	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>23</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	2	40%	3	60%	5
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	4	57%	3	43%	7
Counties	2	22%	7	78%	9
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	2	40%	3	60%	5
5,000-19,999 residents	2	100%	0	0%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	1	33%	2	67%	3
50,000 or more residents	1	50%	1	50%	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	33%	2	67%	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	20%	4	80%	5
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 3	1	25%	3	75%	4
District 4	1	50%	1	50%	2
Metro	2	29%	5	71%	7
District 6	2	67%	1	33%	3
District 7	1	50%	1	50%	2
District 8	1	100%	0	0%	1



## Infrastructure Management Overview

### 7E. Does your consortium share personnel?

	Yes		No		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>25</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	1	20%	4	80%	5
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	1	14%	6	86%	7
Counties	4	36%	7	64%	11
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	1	20%	4	80%	5
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	2	100%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	1	33%	2	67%	3
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	67%	1	33%	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	2	100%	2
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	2	33%	4	67%	6
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 3	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 4	1	33%	2	67%	3
Metro	3	43%	4	57%	7
District 6	1	25%	3	75%	4
District 7	1	50%	1	50%	2
District 8	0	0%	1	100%	1

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

8. Which of the following infrastructure assets do you have in [JURISDICTION]? (Check all that apply)

	Roads		Bridges		Transit lines		Traffic fixtures (signs, signals, lights, pedestrian ramps, etc.)		Buildings		Drinking water supply and distribution pipes (water pipes)		Waste water collection and treatment (sanitary sewers)		Storm sewers (pipes, culverts, drainage ditches)		Storm ponds		Airports		Ports (for watercraft)		Railways (for freight or transit)		Electrical systems (including fiber optics)		Solid waste facilities (including recycling)		Natural gas network		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
All survey respondents	465	97%	204	43%	19	4%	333	69%	408	85%	360	75%	378	79%	421	88%	279	58%	80	17%	9	2%	43	9%	122	25%	63	13%	55	11%	480
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	267	96%	52	19%	5	2%	166	59%	240	86%	244	87%	253	91%	244	87%	129	46%	39	14%	4	1%	25	9%	63	23%	28	10%	39	14%	279
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	119	98%	73	60%	9	7%	104	86%	99	82%	111	92%	119	98%	120	99%	115	95%	29	24%	3	2%	9	7%	47	39%	11	9%	10	8%	121
Counties	77	99%	78	100%	4	5%	61	78%	67	86%	5	6%	4	5%	56	72%	33	42%	12	15%	2	3%	8	10%	11	14%	24	31%	6	8%	78
State agencies (3)	2	100%	1	50%	1	50%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	1	50%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Cities by population																															
Fewer than 5,000 residents	267	96%	52	19%	5	2%	166	59%	240	86%	244	87%	253	91%	244	87%	129	46%	39	14%	4	1%	25	9%	63	23%	28	10%	39	14%	279
5,000-19,999 residents	73	99%	36	49%	3	4%	60	81%	61	82%	68	92%	72	97%	73	99%	68	92%	22	30%	2	3%	4	5%	26	35%	8	11%	6	8%	74
20,000-49,999 residents	32	97%	24	73%	2	6%	30	91%	28	85%	29	88%	33	100%	33	100%	33	100%	6	18%	0	0%	4	12%	14	42%	2	6%	3	9%	33
50,000 or more residents	14	100%	13	93%	4	29%	14	100%	10	71%	14	100%	14	100%	14	100%	14	100%	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%	7	50%	1	7%	1	7%	14
Counties by geography																															
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	5	100%	1	20%	5	100%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5	100%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	8	100%	8	100%	0	0%	8	100%	7	88%	0	0%	0	0%	5	63%	5	63%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	4	50%	1	13%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	64	98%	65	100%	3	5%	48	74%	57	88%	5	8%	4	6%	46	71%	23	35%	11	17%	2	3%	6	9%	8	12%	20	31%	5	8%	65
Counties and cities by MNDOT district																															
District 1	32	94%	10	29%	0	0%	17	50%	31	91%	23	68%	26	76%	28	82%	14	41%	5	15%	0	0%	6	18%	8	24%	5	15%	4	12%	34
District 2	35	95%	15	41%	1	3%	24	65%	30	81%	23	62%	23	62%	26	70%	9	24%	7	19%	0	0%	1	3%	8	22%	6	16%	3	8%	37
District 3	75	97%	33	43%	1	1%	53	69%	65	84%	55	71%	60	78%	69	90%	48	62%	14	18%	0	0%	2	3%	12	16%	6	8%	7	9%	77
District 4	54	100%	20	37%	3	6%	36	67%	49	91%	39	72%	39	72%	46	85%	22	41%	16	30%	1	2%	9	17%	10	19%	13	24%	6	11%	54
Metro	100	99%	56	55%	7	7%	78	77%	79	78%	85	84%	87	86%	98	97%	89	88%	4	4%	2	2%	8	8%	31	31%	4	4%	12	12%	101
District 6	54	98%	31	56%	2	4%	40	73%	49	89%	42	76%	43	78%	46	84%	34	62%	10	18%	4	7%	4	7%	19	35%	12	22%	7	13%	55
District 7	57	95%	18	30%	2	3%	41	68%	53	88%	48	80%	49	82%	54	90%	33	55%	9	15%	1	2%	4	7%	22	37%	7	12%	8	13%	60
District 8	56	93%	20	33%	2	3%	42	70%	50	83%	45	75%	49	82%	53	88%	28	47%	15	25%	1	2%	8	13%	11	18%	10	17%	8	13%	60

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**8. Which of the following infrastructure assets do you have in [JURISDICTION]? (Check all that apply) - (2016 survey only)**

	Parks (trees, trails, buildings, furniture)		Fleet		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>410</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	190	82%	68	29%	233
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	94	90%	81	78%	104
Counties	42	59%	56	79%	71
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	190	82%	68	29%	233
5,000-19,999 residents	55	89%	42	68%	62
20,000-49,999 residents	26	90%	27	93%	29
50,000 or more residents	13	100%	12	92%	13
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	4	80%	5	100%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	38%	7	88%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	35	60%	44	76%	58
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	16	67%	9	38%	24
District 2	25	78%	10	31%	32
District 3	51	77%	33	50%	66
District 4	41	84%	18	37%	49
Metro	74	85%	63	72%	87
District 6	40	89%	23	51%	45
District 7	42	79%	27	51%	53
District 8	37	71%	22	42%	52

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 10B. Are roads in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, roads are fully mapped		Yes, roads are partially mapped		No, roads are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>462</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	200	75%	47	18%	18	7%	265
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	112	95%	6	5%	0	0%	118
Counties	67	87%	9	12%	1	1%	77
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	200	75%	47	18%	18	7%	265
5,000-19,999 residents	67	92%	6	8%	0	0%	73
20,000-49,999 residents	31	100%	0	0%	0	0%	31
50,000 or more residents	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	54	84%	9	14%	1	2%	64
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	22	69%	9	28%	1	3%	32
District 2	25	71%	10	29%	0	0%	35
District 3	61	81%	10	13%	4	5%	75
District 4	39	72%	12	22%	3	6%	54
Metro	95	96%	2	2%	2	2%	99
District 6	48	91%	2	4%	3	6%	53
District 7	46	82%	7	13%	3	5%	56
District 8	43	77%	10	18%	3	5%	56

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**10C. In what software tools are roads in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>443</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	64	26%	66	27%	37	15%	80	32%	247
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	41	35%	10	8%	67	57%	0	0%	118
Counties	26	34%	9	12%	41	54%	0	0%	76
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	64	26%	66	27%	37	15%	80	32%	247
5,000-19,999 residents	21	29%	9	12%	43	59%	0	0%	73
20,000-49,999 residents	14	45%	1	3%	16	52%	0	0%	31
50,000 or more residents	6	43%	0	0%	8	57%	0	0%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	25%	0	0%	6	75%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	21	33%	9	14%	33	52%	0	0%	63
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	10	32%	10	32%	3	10%	8	26%	31
District 2	8	23%	10	29%	10	29%	7	20%	35
District 3	21	30%	14	20%	27	38%	9	13%	71
District 4	8	16%	11	22%	15	29%	17	33%	51
Metro	42	43%	9	9%	43	44%	3	3%	97
District 6	14	28%	5	10%	22	44%	9	18%	50
District 7	18	34%	12	23%	9	17%	14	26%	53
District 8	10	19%	14	26%	16	30%	13	25%	53

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 10F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about roads? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of roads		Age of roads		Material of roads		Size of roads		Our inventory includes other information about roads		We do not track any information about roads		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>458</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	155	59%	127	48%	121	46%	122	47%	7	3%	70	27%	262
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	96	82%	97	83%	96	82%	98	84%	20	17%	3	3%	117
Counties	66	86%	73	95%	66	86%	54	70%	14	18%	2	3%	77
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	155	59%	127	48%	121	46%	122	47%	7	3%	70	27%	262
5,000-19,999 residents	57	79%	54	75%	56	78%	57	79%	8	11%	3	4%	72
20,000-49,999 residents	26	84%	30	97%	28	90%	29	94%	7	23%	0	0%	31
50,000 or more residents	13	93%	13	93%	12	86%	12	86%	5	36%	0	0%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%	2	40%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	7	88%	8	100%	8	100%	6	75%	1	13%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	54	84%	60	94%	53	83%	43	67%	11	17%	2	3%	64
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	21	66%	13	41%	21	66%	17	53%	2	6%	6	19%	32
District 2	21	60%	20	57%	18	51%	14	40%	2	6%	8	23%	35
District 3	53	71%	46	61%	41	55%	38	51%	7	9%	13	17%	75
District 4	31	58%	33	62%	27	51%	33	62%	4	8%	13	25%	53
Metro	81	83%	81	83%	75	77%	78	80%	16	16%	6	6%	98
District 6	38	72%	32	60%	33	62%	29	55%	2	4%	9	17%	53
District 7	36	64%	35	63%	31	55%	30	54%	2	4%	11	20%	56
District 8	36	67%	37	69%	37	69%	35	65%	6	11%	9	17%	54



## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 11B. Are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, bridges are fully mapped		Yes, bridges are partially mapped		No, bridges are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>194</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	28	60%	5	11%	14	30%	47
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	57	81%	8	11%	5	7%	70
Counties	63	83%	8	11%	5	7%	76
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	28	60%	5	11%	14	30%	47
5,000-19,999 residents	28	80%	4	11%	3	9%	35
20,000-49,999 residents	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	23
50,000 or more residents	10	83%	2	17%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	51	80%	8	13%	5	8%	64
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	3	30%	5	50%	2	20%	10
District 2	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	15
District 3	25	83%	1	3%	4	13%	30
District 4	14	70%	3	15%	3	15%	20
Metro	43	81%	6	11%	4	8%	53
District 6	23	79%	1	3%	5	17%	29
District 7	12	71%	2	12%	3	18%	17
District 8	14	74%	2	11%	3	16%	19

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

11C. In what software tools are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>169</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	15	45%	7	21%	5	15%	6	18%	33
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	27	42%	8	12%	26	40%	4	6%	65
Counties	23	33%	22	31%	21	30%	4	6%	70
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	15	45%	7	21%	5	15%	6	18%	33
5,000-19,999 residents	10	31%	8	25%	12	38%	2	6%	32
20,000-49,999 residents	11	52%	0	0%	8	38%	2	10%	21
50,000 or more residents	6	50%	0	0%	6	50%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	43%	1	14%	3	43%	0	0%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	17	29%	21	36%	16	28%	4	7%	58
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	4	50%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	8
District 2	3	20%	6	40%	3	20%	3	20%	15
District 3	14	54%	3	12%	6	23%	3	12%	26
District 4	6	35%	5	29%	5	29%	1	6%	17
Metro	27	55%	3	6%	17	35%	2	4%	49
District 6	5	21%	6	25%	11	46%	2	8%	24
District 7	4	29%	3	21%	4	29%	3	21%	14
District 8	2	13%	8	53%	5	33%	0	0%	15

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 11F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about bridges? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of bridges		Age of bridges		Material of bridges		Size of bridges		Our inventory includes other information about bridges		We do not track any information about bridges		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>195</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	24	51%	19	40%	13	28%	17	36%	3	6%	18	38%	47
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	59	83%	60	85%	49	69%	59	83%	2	3%	6	8%	71
Counties	74	97%	73	96%	70	92%	69	91%	6	8%	1	1%	76
State agencies (3)	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	24	51%	19	40%	13	28%	17	36%	3	6%	18	38%	47
5,000-19,999 residents	30	83%	30	83%	23	64%	30	83%	2	6%	3	8%	36
20,000-49,999 residents	19	83%	19	83%	16	70%	19	83%	0	0%	3	13%	23
50,000 or more residents	10	83%	11	92%	10	83%	10	83%	0	0%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%	1	20%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	8	100%	8	100%	8	100%	7	88%	0	0%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	61	97%	60	95%	57	90%	57	90%	5	8%	1	2%	63
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	8	80%	9	90%	7	70%	9	90%	1	10%	1	10%	10
District 2	13	93%	13	93%	10	71%	13	93%	1	7%	1	7%	14
District 3	24	77%	23	74%	19	61%	18	58%	3	10%	4	13%	31
District 4	16	80%	14	70%	13	65%	13	65%	0	0%	4	20%	20
Metro	46	85%	46	85%	40	74%	47	87%	2	4%	4	7%	54
District 6	21	72%	19	66%	18	62%	19	66%	1	3%	6	21%	29
District 7	13	76%	13	76%	13	76%	13	76%	0	0%	4	24%	17
District 8	16	84%	15	79%	12	63%	13	68%	3	16%	1	5%	19

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 12B. Are transit lines in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, transit lines are fully mapped		Yes, transit lines are partially mapped		No, transit lines are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>16</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	5
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%	7
Counties	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	3
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	5
5,000-19,999 residents	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3
20,000-49,999 residents	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
50,000 or more residents	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 3	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 4	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Metro	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	5
District 6	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 8	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**12C. In what software tools are transit lines in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>9</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	5
Counties	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
5,000-19,999 residents	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	3
20,000-49,999 residents	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
50,000 or more residents	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 3	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 4	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	2
Metro	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	0	0%	3
District 6	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 8	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 12F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about transit lines? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of transit lines		Age of transit lines		Material of transit lines		Size of transit lines		Our inventory includes other information about transit lines		We do not track any information about transit lines		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>15</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	5
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	3	50%	6
Counties	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	3
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	5
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	2	67%	2	67%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 3	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
Metro	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5
District 6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 8	1	50%	2	100%	1	50%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2



## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 13B. Are traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, traffic fixtures are fully mapped		Yes, traffic fixtures are partially mapped		No, traffic fixtures are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>322</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	20	12%	26	16%	116	72%	162
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	38	38%	42	42%	20	20%	100
Counties	20	34%	24	41%	14	24%	58
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	20	12%	26	16%	116	72%	162
5,000-19,999 residents	17	29%	24	41%	18	31%	59
20,000-49,999 residents	14	48%	13	45%	2	7%	29
50,000 or more residents	7	58%	5	42%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	6
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	14	30%	19	40%	14	30%	47
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	4	24%	5	29%	8	47%	17
District 2	5	21%	6	25%	13	54%	24
District 3	7	14%	15	31%	27	55%	49
District 4	9	25%	7	19%	20	56%	36
Metro	24	32%	35	47%	16	21%	75
District 6	11	28%	7	18%	21	54%	39
District 7	10	24%	9	22%	22	54%	41
District 8	8	21%	8	21%	23	59%	39

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**13C. In what software tools are traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>171</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	10	22%	8	17%	6	13%	22	48%	46
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	47	59%	9	11%	21	26%	3	4%	80
Counties	26	60%	6	14%	5	12%	6	14%	43
State agencies (3)	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	10	22%	8	17%	6	13%	22	48%	46
5,000-19,999 residents	19	46%	8	20%	12	29%	2	5%	41
20,000-49,999 residents	21	78%	1	4%	4	15%	1	4%	27
50,000 or more residents	7	58%	0	0%	5	42%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	6
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	22	69%	4	13%	1	3%	5	16%	32
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	2	22%	3	33%	1	11%	3	33%	9
District 2	4	36%	4	36%	0	0%	3	27%	11
District 3	12	55%	3	14%	6	27%	1	5%	22
District 4	6	38%	1	6%	3	19%	6	38%	16
Metro	40	68%	2	3%	13	22%	4	7%	59
District 6	9	53%	3	18%	3	18%	2	12%	17
District 7	7	37%	2	11%	2	11%	8	42%	19
District 8	3	19%	5	31%	4	25%	4	25%	16

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 13F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about traffic fixtures? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of traffic fixtures		Age of traffic fixtures		Material of traffic fixtures		Size of traffic fixtures		Our inventory includes other information about traffic fixtures		We do not track any information about traffic fixtures		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>321</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	52	32%	33	20%	26	16%	21	13%	6	4%	101	63%	161
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	45	45%	62	62%	51	51%	44	44%	7	7%	20	20%	100
Counties	35	60%	48	83%	39	67%	42	72%	3	5%	8	14%	58
State agencies (3)	1	50%	2	100%	2	100%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	52	32%	33	20%	26	16%	21	13%	6	4%	101	63%	161
5,000-19,999 residents	24	41%	33	56%	27	46%	25	42%	0	0%	16	27%	59
20,000-49,999 residents	13	45%	18	62%	16	55%	13	45%	5	17%	4	14%	29
50,000 or more residents	8	67%	11	92%	8	67%	6	50%	2	17%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%	1	20%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	4	67%	5	83%	3	50%	4	67%	0	0%	1	17%	6
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	26	55%	38	81%	31	66%	33	70%	2	4%	7	15%	47
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	5	29%	8	47%	8	47%	6	35%	1	6%	5	29%	17
District 2	10	42%	6	25%	5	21%	5	21%	3	13%	12	50%	24
District 3	13	27%	20	41%	14	29%	14	29%	2	4%	25	51%	49
District 4	17	47%	15	42%	11	31%	13	36%	1	3%	17	47%	36
Metro	39	52%	44	59%	40	53%	31	41%	6	8%	16	21%	75
District 6	12	31%	14	36%	13	33%	11	28%	1	3%	20	51%	39
District 7	20	50%	18	45%	12	30%	15	38%	1	3%	18	45%	40
District 8	16	41%	18	46%	13	33%	12	31%	1	3%	16	41%	39

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 14B. Are buildings in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, buildings are fully mapped		Yes, buildings are partially mapped		No, buildings are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>387</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	64	28%	56	24%	109	48%	229
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	41	44%	24	26%	29	31%	94
Counties	13	21%	19	31%	30	48%	62
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	64	28%	56	24%	109	48%	229
5,000-19,999 residents	20	33%	15	25%	25	42%	60
20,000-49,999 residents	16	59%	7	26%	4	15%	27
50,000 or more residents	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	7
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	9	16%	17	31%	29	53%	55
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	6	20%	10	33%	14	47%	30
District 2	8	27%	5	17%	17	57%	30
District 3	22	37%	11	19%	26	44%	59
District 4	13	28%	14	30%	20	43%	47
Metro	30	41%	17	23%	27	36%	74
District 6	14	30%	17	36%	16	34%	47
District 7	14	27%	13	25%	25	48%	52
District 8	11	24%	12	26%	23	50%	46

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**14C. In what software tools are buildings in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>218</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	35	29%	14	12%	12	10%	59	49%	120
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	31	48%	9	14%	18	28%	7	11%	65
Counties	15	48%	2	6%	7	23%	7	23%	31
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	35	29%	14	12%	12	10%	59	49%	120
5,000-19,999 residents	11	31%	7	20%	13	37%	4	11%	35
20,000-49,999 residents	16	70%	2	9%	3	13%	2	9%	23
50,000 or more residents	4	57%	0	0%	2	29%	1	14%	7
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	11	44%	2	8%	6	24%	6	24%	25
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	3	19%	2	13%	3	19%	8	50%	16
District 2	6	46%	2	15%	1	8%	4	31%	13
District 3	13	39%	4	12%	7	21%	9	27%	33
District 4	8	30%	2	7%	4	15%	13	48%	27
Metro	27	57%	3	6%	8	17%	9	19%	47
District 6	13	43%	2	7%	7	23%	8	27%	30
District 7	7	26%	4	15%	3	11%	13	48%	27
District 8	4	17%	6	26%	4	17%	9	39%	23

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 14F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about buildings? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of buildings		Age of buildings		Material of buildings		Size of buildings		Our inventory includes other information about buildings		We do not track any information about buildings		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>384</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	81	35%	93	41%	47	21%	75	33%	6	3%	112	49%	229
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	35	38%	53	58%	30	33%	42	46%	3	3%	33	36%	92
Counties	17	28%	36	59%	16	26%	26	43%	2	3%	18	30%	61
State agencies (3)	1	50%	2	100%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	81	35%	93	41%	47	21%	75	33%	6	3%	112	49%	229
5,000-19,999 residents	21	36%	31	53%	15	25%	25	42%	1	2%	26	44%	59
20,000-49,999 residents	10	38%	17	65%	11	42%	13	50%	2	8%	6	23%	26
50,000 or more residents	4	57%	5	71%	4	57%	4	57%	0	0%	1	14%	7
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	67%	2	67%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	14	25%	33	60%	14	25%	23	42%	1	2%	16	29%	55
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	12	40%	16	53%	8	27%	13	43%	1	3%	10	33%	30
District 2	11	37%	11	37%	4	13%	7	23%	1	3%	15	50%	30
District 3	19	32%	27	46%	10	17%	19	32%	1	2%	25	42%	59
District 4	14	29%	21	44%	9	19%	17	35%	1	2%	25	52%	48
Metro	30	41%	41	56%	28	38%	31	42%	3	4%	27	37%	73
District 6	11	24%	19	41%	11	24%	16	35%	3	7%	21	46%	46
District 7	19	37%	26	50%	10	19%	21	40%	1	2%	22	42%	52
District 8	17	39%	21	48%	13	30%	19	43%	0	0%	18	41%	44

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 15B. Are drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, drinking water supply and distribution pipes are fully mapped		Yes, drinking water supply and distribution pipes are partially mapped		No, drinking water supply and distribution pipes are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>345</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	179	76%	47	20%	9	4%	235
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	103	98%	2	2%	0	0%	105
Counties	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	5
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	179	76%	47	20%	9	4%	235
5,000-19,999 residents	64	97%	2	3%	0	0%	66
20,000-49,999 residents	28	100%	0	0%	0	0%	28
50,000 or more residents	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	5
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	15	68%	7	32%	0	0%	22
District 2	19	83%	3	13%	1	4%	23
District 3	43	81%	9	17%	1	2%	53
District 4	30	79%	5	13%	3	8%	38
Metro	76	94%	4	5%	1	1%	81
District 6	31	76%	8	20%	2	5%	41
District 7	35	76%	10	22%	1	2%	46
District 8	34	83%	5	12%	2	5%	41

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**15C. In what software tools are drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>334</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	42	19%	78	35%	26	12%	80	35%	226
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	47	45%	8	8%	50	48%	0	0%	105
Counties	0	0%	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	3
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	42	19%	78	35%	26	12%	80	35%	226
5,000-19,999 residents	25	38%	8	12%	33	50%	0	0%	66
20,000-49,999 residents	15	54%	0	0%	13	46%	0	0%	28
50,000 or more residents	7	64%	0	0%	4	36%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	3
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	4	18%	8	36%	1	5%	9	41%	22
District 2	3	14%	12	55%	0	0%	7	32%	22
District 3	15	29%	13	25%	14	27%	10	19%	52
District 4	5	14%	10	29%	7	20%	13	37%	35
Metro	36	45%	12	15%	29	36%	3	4%	80
District 6	8	21%	7	18%	10	26%	14	36%	39
District 7	13	29%	13	29%	5	11%	14	31%	45
District 8	5	13%	13	33%	10	26%	11	28%	39



## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

15F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about drinking water supply and distribution pipes?  
(Check all that apply)

	Condition of drinking water supply and distribution pipes		Age of drinking water supply and distribution pipes		Material of drinking water supply and distribution pipes		Size of drinking water supply and distribution pipes		Our inventory includes other information about drinking water supply and distribution pipes		We do not track any information about drinking water supply and distribution pipes		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	141	41%	238	70%	246	72%	270	79%	12	4%	42	12%	342
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	103	44%	144	62%	142	61%	166	72%	5	2%	38	16%	232
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	36	34%	92	87%	102	96%	102	96%	7	7%	2	2%	106
Counties	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	103	44%	144	62%	142	61%	166	72%	5	2%	38	16%	232
5,000-19,999 residents	18	27%	56	84%	63	94%	65	97%	3	4%	2	3%	67
20,000-49,999 residents	13	46%	25	89%	28	100%	26	93%	2	7%	0	0%	28
50,000 or more residents	5	45%	11	100%	11	100%	11	100%	2	18%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	10	48%	13	62%	15	71%	17	81%	0	0%	3	14%	21
District 2	11	48%	18	78%	16	70%	14	61%	0	0%	3	13%	23
District 3	21	40%	33	62%	37	70%	41	77%	0	0%	8	15%	53
District 4	18	47%	28	74%	26	68%	29	76%	2	5%	5	13%	38
Metro	23	28%	66	81%	71	88%	71	88%	6	7%	7	9%	81
District 6	19	48%	22	55%	23	57%	30	75%	1	3%	7	18%	40
District 7	17	37%	26	57%	28	61%	37	80%	2	4%	6	13%	46
District 8	22	55%	32	80%	30	75%	31	78%	1	3%	3	8%	40

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 16B. Are waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, waste water collection and treatment assets are fully mapped		Yes, waste water collection and treatment assets are partially mapped		No, waste water collection and treatment assets are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>352</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	168	71%	57	24%	11	5%	236
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	105	94%	7	6%	0	0%	112
Counties	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	3
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	168	71%	57	24%	11	5%	236
5,000-19,999 residents	63	91%	6	9%	0	0%	69
20,000-49,999 residents	32	100%	0	0%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	3
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	16	64%	8	32%	1	4%	25
District 2	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	23
District 3	45	83%	8	15%	1	2%	54
District 4	27	71%	9	24%	2	5%	38
Metro	76	93%	5	6%	1	1%	82
District 6	29	73%	9	23%	2	5%	40
District 7	32	70%	12	26%	2	4%	46
District 8	31	72%	9	21%	3	7%	43

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**16C. In what software tools are waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>339</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	41	18%	80	36%	24	11%	79	35%	224
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	49	44%	11	10%	52	46%	0	0%	112
Counties	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	41	18%	80	36%	24	11%	79	35%	224
5,000-19,999 residents	24	35%	10	14%	35	51%	0	0%	69
20,000-49,999 residents	18	56%	1	3%	13	41%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	7	64%	0	0%	4	36%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	4	17%	9	38%	2	8%	9	38%	24
District 2	3	13%	13	57%	0	0%	7	30%	23
District 3	15	28%	14	26%	14	26%	10	19%	53
District 4	4	11%	14	39%	6	17%	12	33%	36
Metro	36	45%	9	11%	31	39%	4	5%	80
District 6	8	21%	6	16%	10	26%	14	37%	38
District 7	15	34%	14	32%	3	7%	12	27%	44
District 8	5	13%	14	35%	10	25%	11	28%	40

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**16F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about waste water collection and treatment? (Check all that apply)**

	Condition of waste water collection and treatment		Age of waste water collection and treatment		Material of waste water collection and treatment		Size of waste water collection and treatment		Our inventory includes other information about waste water collection and treatment		We do not track any information about waste water collection and treatment		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>347</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	121	52%	148	64%	142	61%	167	72%	9	4%	40	17%	231
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	63	56%	98	88%	107	96%	110	98%	6	5%	1	1%	112
Counties	0	0%	2	67%	2	67%	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	3
State agencies (3)	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	121	52%	148	64%	142	61%	167	72%	9	4%	40	17%	231
5,000-19,999 residents	34	49%	58	84%	67	97%	68	99%	2	3%	1	1%	69
20,000-49,999 residents	22	69%	29	91%	29	91%	31	97%	2	6%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	7	64%	11	100%	11	100%	11	100%	2	18%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	2	67%	2	67%	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	3
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	13	54%	15	63%	19	79%	19	79%	1	4%	2	8%	24
District 2	9	39%	18	78%	16	70%	17	74%	1	4%	4	17%	23
District 3	27	49%	35	64%	36	65%	39	71%	2	4%	12	22%	55
District 4	23	62%	28	76%	27	73%	31	84%	2	5%	5	14%	37
Metro	44	55%	67	84%	70	88%	74	93%	4	5%	3	4%	80
District 6	24	60%	25	63%	22	55%	30	75%	1	3%	8	20%	40
District 7	20	44%	27	60%	29	64%	36	80%	2	4%	5	11%	45
District 8	24	57%	33	79%	32	76%	33	79%	2	5%	3	7%	42

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 17B. Are storm sewers in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, storm sewers are fully mapped		Yes, storm sewers are partially mapped		No, storm sewers are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>399</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	109	47%	83	36%	38	17%	230
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	97	85%	17	15%	0	0%	114
Counties	3	6%	27	50%	24	44%	54
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	109	47%	83	36%	38	17%	230
5,000-19,999 residents	57	80%	14	20%	0	0%	71
20,000-49,999 residents	31	97%	1	3%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	2%	21	48%	22	50%	44
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	10	37%	11	41%	6	22%	27
District 2	12	46%	9	35%	5	19%	26
District 3	33	50%	20	30%	13	20%	66
District 4	23	51%	15	33%	7	16%	45
Metro	67	73%	21	23%	4	4%	92
District 6	21	50%	12	29%	9	21%	42
District 7	24	46%	20	38%	8	15%	52
District 8	19	40%	19	40%	10	21%	48

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**17C. In what software tools are storm sewers in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>335</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	37	19%	73	38%	21	11%	60	31%	191
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	50	44%	13	11%	51	45%	0	0%	114
Counties	8	28%	11	38%	8	28%	2	7%	29
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	37	19%	73	38%	21	11%	60	31%	191
5,000-19,999 residents	26	37%	12	17%	33	46%	0	0%	71
20,000-49,999 residents	18	56%	1	3%	13	41%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	6	55%	0	0%	5	45%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	4
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	4
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	4	19%	11	52%	4	19%	2	10%	21
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	3	14%	10	48%	3	14%	5	24%	21
District 2	3	14%	12	57%	0	0%	6	29%	21
District 3	21	40%	12	23%	12	23%	8	15%	53
District 4	2	5%	15	41%	7	19%	13	35%	37
Metro	41	47%	10	11%	33	38%	3	3%	87
District 6	7	21%	8	24%	10	30%	8	24%	33
District 7	13	30%	16	36%	6	14%	9	20%	44
District 8	5	13%	14	37%	9	24%	10	26%	38

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 17F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about storm sewers? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of storm sewers		Age of storm sewers		Material of storm sewers		Size of storm sewers		Our inventory includes other information about storm sewers		We do not track any information about storm sewers		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>395</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	83	36%	94	41%	109	48%	137	60%	3	1%	73	32%	228
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	45	40%	78	69%	101	89%	110	97%	5	4%	2	2%	113
Counties	10	19%	22	42%	27	51%	27	51%	2	4%	23	43%	53
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	83	36%	94	41%	109	48%	137	60%	3	1%	73	32%	228
5,000-19,999 residents	21	30%	42	60%	62	89%	69	99%	2	3%	1	1%	70
20,000-49,999 residents	18	56%	25	78%	28	88%	31	97%	2	6%	1	3%	32
50,000 or more residents	6	55%	11	100%	11	100%	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	4	80%	3	60%	4	80%	5	100%	1	20%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	20%	2	40%	3	60%	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	5	12%	17	40%	20	47%	19	44%	1	2%	21	49%	43
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	10	37%	13	48%	18	67%	18	67%	0	0%	7	26%	27
District 2	8	31%	11	42%	13	50%	14	54%	0	0%	10	38%	26
District 3	16	25%	25	38%	32	49%	38	58%	2	3%	22	34%	65
District 4	14	32%	25	57%	26	59%	31	70%	1	2%	11	25%	44
Metro	40	44%	55	61%	68	76%	79	88%	4	4%	9	10%	90
District 6	14	33%	14	33%	22	52%	26	62%	0	0%	13	31%	42
District 7	15	29%	23	44%	29	56%	37	71%	1	2%	13	25%	52
District 8	21	44%	28	58%	29	60%	31	65%	2	4%	13	27%	48

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 18B. Are storm ponds in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, storm ponds are fully mapped		Yes, storm ponds are partially mapped		No, storm ponds are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>263</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	73	60%	27	22%	22	18%	122
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	81	75%	25	23%	2	2%	108
Counties	4	13%	12	39%	15	48%	31
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	73	60%	27	22%	22	18%	122
5,000-19,999 residents	47	72%	16	25%	2	3%	65
20,000-49,999 residents	25	78%	7	22%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	6	29%	15	71%	21
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	6	43%	1	7%	7	50%	14
District 2	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	9
District 3	25	54%	11	24%	10	22%	46
District 4	17	81%	0	0%	4	19%	21
Metro	53	64%	27	33%	3	4%	83
District 6	17	53%	11	34%	4	13%	32
District 7	20	63%	5	16%	7	22%	32
District 8	14	58%	7	29%	3	13%	24



## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**18C. In what software tools are storm ponds in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>222</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	25	25%	34	34%	14	14%	27	27%	100
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	56	53%	11	10%	37	35%	1	1%	105
Counties	4	25%	2	13%	8	50%	2	13%	16
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	25	25%	34	34%	14	14%	27	27%	100
5,000-19,999 residents	29	47%	10	16%	22	35%	1	2%	62
20,000-49,999 residents	20	63%	1	3%	11	34%	0	0%	32
50,000 or more residents	7	64%	0	0%	4	36%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	40%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	6
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	1	14%	7
District 2	2	25%	5	63%	0	0%	1	13%	8
District 3	16	46%	7	20%	9	26%	3	9%	35
District 4	3	18%	4	24%	5	29%	5	29%	17
Metro	47	59%	5	6%	23	29%	5	6%	80
District 6	6	21%	7	25%	9	32%	6	21%	28
District 7	5	20%	7	28%	6	24%	7	28%	25
District 8	4	19%	10	48%	5	24%	2	10%	21

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 18F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about storm ponds? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of storm ponds		Age of storm ponds		Material of storm ponds		Size of storm ponds		Our inventory includes other information about storm ponds		We do not track any information about storm ponds		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>258</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	43	36%	56	47%	30	25%	56	47%	1	1%	47	39%	119
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	56	53%	62	58%	37	35%	82	77%	9	8%	9	8%	106
Counties	3	10%	8	26%	4	13%	10	32%	1	3%	21	68%	31
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	43	36%	56	47%	30	25%	56	47%	1	1%	47	39%	119
5,000-19,999 residents	27	43%	34	54%	20	32%	48	76%	4	6%	5	8%	63
20,000-49,999 residents	20	63%	19	59%	12	38%	24	75%	2	6%	4	13%	32
50,000 or more residents	9	82%	9	82%	5	45%	10	91%	3	27%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	4	80%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	5%	5	24%	2	10%	6	29%	0	0%	15	71%	21
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	2	14%	6	43%	5	36%	6	43%	0	0%	7	50%	14
District 2	2	22%	3	33%	2	22%	3	33%	0	0%	5	56%	9
District 3	16	36%	23	51%	8	18%	24	53%	2	4%	14	31%	45
District 4	11	55%	12	60%	9	45%	13	65%	0	0%	6	30%	20
Metro	42	52%	41	51%	24	30%	55	68%	8	10%	13	16%	81
District 6	7	22%	9	28%	5	16%	16	50%	0	0%	15	47%	32
District 7	11	34%	18	56%	11	34%	18	56%	0	0%	11	34%	32
District 8	11	48%	14	61%	7	30%	13	57%	1	4%	6	26%	23

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 19B. Are airports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, airports are fully mapped		Yes, airports are partially mapped		No, airports are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	63	84%	10	13%	2	3%	75
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	29	81%	7	19%	0	0%	36
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	26	90%	3	10%	0	0%	29
Counties	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%	10
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	29	81%	7	19%	0	0%	36
5,000-19,999 residents	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	22
20,000-49,999 residents	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	6
50,000 or more residents	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	7	78%	0	0%	2	22%	9
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	4
District 2	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%	7
District 3	10	71%	3	21%	1	7%	14
District 4	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	15
Metro	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4
District 6	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10
District 7	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	9
District 8	9	75%	3	25%	0	0%	12

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**19C. In what software tools are airports in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>72</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	10	28%	12	33%	10	28%	4	11%	36
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	5	17%	12	41%	12	41%	0	0%	29
Counties	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	0	0%	7
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	10	28%	12	33%	10	28%	4	11%	36
5,000-19,999 residents	3	14%	10	45%	9	41%	0	0%	22
20,000-49,999 residents	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	6
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	6
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4
District 2	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	6
District 3	2	15%	5	38%	6	46%	0	0%	13
District 4	3	20%	5	33%	4	27%	3	20%	15
Metro	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	4
District 6	0	0%	3	33%	6	67%	0	0%	9
District 7	3	33%	3	33%	3	33%	0	0%	9
District 8	4	33%	4	33%	4	33%	0	0%	12

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

19F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about airports? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of airports		Age of airports		Material of airports		Size of airports		Our inventory includes other information about airports		We do not track any information about airports		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>74</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	21	58%	22	61%	17	47%	20	56%	0	0%	10	28%	36
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	22	76%	23	79%	19	66%	20	69%	2	7%	2	7%	29
Counties	3	33%	4	44%	2	22%	3	33%	0	0%	4	44%	9
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	21	58%	22	61%	17	47%	20	56%	0	0%	10	28%	36
5,000-19,999 residents	19	86%	19	86%	16	73%	15	68%	1	5%	1	5%	22
20,000-49,999 residents	2	33%	3	50%	2	33%	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	6
50,000 or more residents	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	3	38%	4	50%	2	25%	3	38%	0	0%	3	38%	8
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	2	50%	3	75%	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	4
District 2	4	57%	4	57%	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	3	43%	7
District 3	7	50%	8	57%	7	50%	6	43%	0	0%	5	36%	14
District 4	11	73%	10	67%	10	67%	10	67%	0	0%	2	13%	15
Metro	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4
District 6	5	56%	6	67%	4	44%	7	78%	0	0%	1	11%	9
District 7	5	56%	6	67%	6	67%	6	67%	0	0%	3	33%	9
District 8	10	83%	10	83%	6	50%	7	58%	1	8%	1	8%	12

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 20B. Are ports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, ports are fully mapped		Yes, ports are partially mapped		No, ports are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	2	25%	3	38%	3	38%	8
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	4
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
Counties	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	4
5,000-19,999 residents	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 4	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Metro	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
District 6	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4
District 7	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
District 8	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**20C. In what software tools are ports in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	3
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Counties	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	3
5,000-19,999 residents	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 4	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Metro	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 6	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
District 7	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 8	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

20F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about ports? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of ports		Age of ports		Material of ports		Size of ports		Our inventory includes other information about ports		We do not track any information about ports		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	2	25%	2	25%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	5	63%	8
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	4
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
Counties	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	2
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	4
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 4	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
Metro	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 6	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	4
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 8	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1



## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 21B. Are railways in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, railways are fully mapped		Yes, railways are partially mapped		No, railways are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	18	44%	12	29%	11	27%	41
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	9	36%	9	36%	7	28%	25
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	4	50%	1	13%	3	38%	8
Counties	4	57%	2	29%	1	14%	7
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	9	36%	9	36%	7	28%	25
5,000-19,999 residents	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4
20,000-49,999 residents	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	5
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	6
District 2	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 3	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
District 4	3	33%	4	44%	2	22%	9
Metro	3	43%	2	29%	2	29%	7
District 6	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4
District 7	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4
District 8	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	7

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**21C. In what software tools are railways in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	11	37%	5	17%	4	13%	10	33%	30
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	4	22%	3	17%	1	6%	10	56%	18
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	5
Counties	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	6
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	4	22%	3	17%	1	6%	10	56%	18
5,000-19,999 residents	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	4
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	5
District 2	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 3	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	2
District 4	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	3	43%	7
Metro	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	5
District 6	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
District 7	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	3
District 8	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	4

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

21F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about railways? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of railways		Age of railways		Material of railways		Size of railways		Our inventory includes other information about railways		We do not track any information about railways		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	4	10%	3	7%	3	7%	2	5%	4	10%	32	78%	41
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	20	80%	25
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	7	88%	8
Counties	1	14%	1	14%	2	29%	1	14%	1	14%	5	71%	7
State agencies (3)	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	20	80%	25
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%	4
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	5
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	4	67%	6
District 2	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
District 4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	8	89%	9
Metro	1	14%	1	14%	1	14%	1	14%	2	29%	4	57%	7
District 6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 8	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	7

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 22B. Are electrical systems in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, electrical systems are fully mapped		Yes, electrical systems are partially mapped		No, electrical systems are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>110</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	24	41%	15	26%	19	33%	58
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	29	69%	10	24%	3	7%	42
Counties	3	33%	2	22%	4	44%	9
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	24	41%	15	26%	19	33%	58
5,000-19,999 residents	18	72%	5	20%	2	8%	25
20,000-49,999 residents	7	54%	5	38%	1	8%	13
50,000 or more residents	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	2	33%	1	17%	3	50%	6
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	8
District 2	5	63%	0	0%	3	38%	8
District 3	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	11
District 4	5	56%	2	22%	2	22%	9
Metro	13	48%	8	30%	6	22%	27
District 6	7	41%	5	29%	5	29%	17
District 7	12	57%	6	29%	3	14%	21
District 8	4	50%	0	0%	4	50%	8

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**22C. In what software tools are electrical systems in [JURISDICTION] mapped?**  
(Check all that apply)

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>84</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	5	13%	12	31%	7	18%	15	38%	39
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	16	41%	7	18%	15	38%	1	3%	39
Counties	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	1	20%	5
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	5	13%	12	31%	7	18%	15	38%	39
5,000-19,999 residents	6	26%	7	30%	9	39%	1	4%	23
20,000-49,999 residents	9	75%	0	0%	3	25%	0	0%	12
50,000 or more residents	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	3
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	3	50%	6
District 2	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	5
District 3	2	20%	3	30%	2	20%	3	30%	10
District 4	1	14%	1	14%	3	43%	2	29%	7
Metro	11	52%	5	24%	4	19%	1	5%	21
District 6	1	8%	3	25%	6	50%	2	17%	12
District 7	7	39%	4	22%	3	17%	4	22%	18
District 8	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	4

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

22F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about electrical systems? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of electrical systems		Age of electrical systems		Material of electrical systems		Size of electrical systems		Our inventory includes other information about electrical systems		We do not track any information about electrical systems		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	35	32%	46	42%	55	50%	56	51%	5	5%	38	35%	109
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	21	36%	20	34%	23	40%	25	43%	1	2%	24	41%	58
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	13	32%	23	56%	28	68%	28	68%	2	5%	9	22%	41
Counties	0	0%	2	22%	3	33%	2	22%	1	11%	5	56%	9
State agencies (3)	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	21	36%	20	34%	23	40%	25	43%	1	2%	24	41%	58
5,000-19,999 residents	8	33%	13	54%	15	63%	16	67%	2	8%	5	21%	24
20,000-49,999 residents	3	23%	7	54%	10	77%	9	69%	0	0%	3	23%	13
50,000 or more residents	2	50%	3	75%	3	75%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	1	50%	2	100%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	6
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	3	38%	2	25%	2	25%	3	38%	0	0%	4	50%	8
District 2	5	63%	4	50%	3	38%	3	38%	0	0%	3	38%	8
District 3	3	27%	3	27%	5	45%	5	45%	2	18%	4	36%	11
District 4	4	44%	4	44%	6	67%	7	78%	0	0%	2	22%	9
Metro	4	15%	12	44%	16	59%	13	48%	2	7%	8	30%	27
District 6	7	41%	8	47%	9	53%	8	47%	0	0%	7	41%	17
District 7	5	25%	8	40%	9	45%	12	60%	0	0%	6	30%	20
District 8	3	38%	4	50%	4	50%	4	50%	0	0%	4	50%	8

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 23B. Are solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, solid waste facilities are fully mapped		Yes, solid waste facilities are partially mapped		No, solid waste facilities are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>59</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	9	35%	5	19%	12	46%	26
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	6	60%	1	10%	3	30%	10
Counties	8	35%	5	22%	10	43%	23
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	9	35%	5	19%	12	46%	26
5,000-19,999 residents	4	50%	1	13%	3	38%	8
20,000-49,999 residents	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	6	32%	5	26%	8	42%	19
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	5
District 2	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	6
District 3	4	67%	0	0%	2	33%	6
District 4	5	38%	2	15%	6	46%	13
Metro	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	3
District 6	3	25%	4	33%	5	42%	12
District 7	2	29%	1	14%	4	57%	7
District 8	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%	7

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**23C. In what software tools are solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION] mapped?**  
(Check all that apply)

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>34</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	4	29%	3	21%	2	14%	5	36%	14
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	3	43%	1	14%	2	29%	1	14%	7
Counties	8	62%	2	15%	1	8%	2	15%	13
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	4	29%	3	21%	2	14%	5	36%	14
5,000-19,999 residents	2	40%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	5
20,000-49,999 residents	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	6	55%	2	18%	1	9%	2	18%	11
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	3
District 2	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	4
District 3	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	4
District 4	4	57%	1	14%	1	14%	1	14%	7
Metro	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 6	4	57%	1	14%	1	14%	1	14%	7
District 7	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	3
District 8	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	5



## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

23F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about solid waste facilities? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of solid waste facilities		Age of solid waste facilities		Material of solid waste facilities		Size of solid waste facilities		Our inventory includes other information about solid waste facilities		We do not track any information about solid waste facilities		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	17	30%	26	46%	19	33%	25	44%	2	4%	28	49%	57
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	10	40%	11	44%	9	36%	10	40%	1	4%	14	56%	25
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	3	30%	6	60%	5	50%	6	60%	0	0%	4	40%	10
Counties	4	18%	9	41%	5	23%	9	41%	1	5%	10	45%	22
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	10	40%	11	44%	9	36%	10	40%	1	4%	14	56%	25
5,000-19,999 residents	2	25%	4	50%	4	50%	4	50%	0	0%	4	50%	8
20,000-49,999 residents	1	50%	2	100%	1	50%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	4	21%	8	42%	5	26%	9	47%	1	5%	8	42%	19
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	2	40%	3	60%	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	5
District 2	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	4	67%	6
District 3	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5
District 4	5	38%	7	54%	5	38%	7	54%	2	15%	5	38%	13
Metro	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	3
District 6	3	27%	5	45%	1	9%	4	36%	0	0%	5	45%	11
District 7	3	43%	3	43%	3	43%	3	43%	0	0%	4	57%	7
District 8	2	29%	4	57%	5	71%	4	57%	0	0%	2	29%	7

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 24B. Is the natural gas network in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, the natural gas network is fully mapped		Yes, the natural gas network is partially mapped		No, the natural gas network is not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>50</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	19	51%	2	5%	16	43%	37
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	5	63%	0	0%	3	38%	8
Counties	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	5
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	19	51%	2	5%	16	43%	37
5,000-19,999 residents	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	5
20,000-49,999 residents	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	3
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4
District 2	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3
District 3	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5
District 4	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	6
Metro	3	27%	0	0%	8	73%	11
District 6	4	57%	0	0%	3	43%	7
District 7	4	50%	1	13%	3	38%	8
District 8	4	67%	0	0%	2	33%	6

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**24C. In what software tools is the natural gas network in [JURISDICTION] mapped?**  
(Check all that apply)

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>28</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	4	19%	5	24%	0	0%	12	57%	21
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	5
Counties	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	4	19%	5	24%	0	0%	12	57%	21
5,000-19,999 residents	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	4
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 2	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 4	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5
Metro	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3
District 6	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	4
District 7	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	5
District 8	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	4

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

24F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about the natural gas network? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of natural gas network		Age of natural gas network		Material of natural gas network		Size of natural gas network		Our inventory includes other information about natural gas network		We do not track any information about natural gas network		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	6	12%	10	20%	13	26%	13	26%	2	4%	36	72%	50
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	4	11%	8	22%	10	27%	10	27%	1	3%	26	70%	37
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	2	25%	2	25%	3	38%	3	38%	1	13%	5	63%	8
Counties	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	4	11%	8	22%	10	27%	10	27%	1	3%	26	70%	37
5,000-19,999 residents	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	3	60%	5
20,000-49,999 residents	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	3
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 2	1	33%	1	33%	2	67%	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	3
District 3	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	5
District 4	0	0%	3	50%	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	3	50%	6
Metro	1	9%	1	9%	2	18%	2	18%	0	0%	9	82%	11
District 6	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	5	71%	7
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	7	88%	8
District 8	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	4	67%	6

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 25B. Are the parks in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, the parks are fully mapped		Yes, the parks are partially mapped		No, the parks are not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	164	53%	91	29%	56	18%	311
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	87	48%	47	26%	48	26%	182
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	60	67%	27	30%	2	2%	89
Counties	17	43%	17	43%	6	15%	40
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	87	48%	47	26%	48	26%	182
5,000-19,999 residents	35	66%	16	30%	2	4%	53
20,000-49,999 residents	17	68%	8	32%	0	0%	25
50,000 or more residents	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	4
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	12	36%	15	45%	6	18%	33
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	5	31%	9	56%	2	13%	16
District 2	9	36%	10	40%	6	24%	25
District 3	29	60%	11	23%	8	17%	48
District 4	20	50%	8	20%	12	30%	40
Metro	42	61%	21	30%	6	9%	69
District 6	23	62%	6	16%	8	22%	37
District 7	18	44%	14	34%	9	22%	41
District 8	18	51%	12	34%	5	14%	35

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**25C. In what software tools are parks in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>253</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	37	28%	26	19%	13	10%	58	43%	134
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	45	52%	11	13%	24	28%	6	7%	86
Counties	16	48%	3	9%	10	30%	4	12%	33
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	37	28%	26	19%	13	10%	58	43%	134
5,000-19,999 residents	22	44%	10	20%	14	28%	4	8%	50
20,000-49,999 residents	13	52%	1	4%	9	36%	2	8%	25
50,000 or more residents	10	91%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	4
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	13	50%	3	12%	7	27%	3	12%	26
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	2	14%	4	29%	0	0%	8	57%	14
District 2	8	42%	5	26%	1	5%	5	26%	19
District 3	20	51%	6	15%	6	15%	7	18%	39
District 4	4	15%	2	7%	6	22%	15	56%	27
Metro	34	54%	6	10%	18	29%	5	8%	63
District 6	11	38%	2	7%	9	31%	7	24%	29
District 7	12	38%	6	19%	3	9%	11	34%	32
District 8	7	23%	9	30%	4	13%	10	33%	30

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 25F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about parks? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of parks		Age of parks		Material of parks		Size of parks		Our inventory includes other information about parks		We do not track any information about parks		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>307</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	87	49%	57	32%	59	33%	72	40%	5	3%	74	42%	178
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	38	43%	43	48%	38	43%	62	70%	9	10%	18	20%	89
Counties	5	13%	11	28%	8	20%	21	53%	2	5%	17	43%	40
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	87	49%	57	32%	59	33%	72	40%	5	3%	74	42%	178
5,000-19,999 residents	20	38%	22	42%	19	36%	33	62%	2	4%	14	26%	53
20,000-49,999 residents	10	40%	14	56%	14	56%	20	80%	4	16%	3	12%	25
50,000 or more residents	8	73%	7	64%	5	45%	9	82%	3	27%	1	9%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	2	50%	4
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	1	33%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	4	12%	9	27%	7	21%	17	52%	0	0%	14	42%	33
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	8	50%	4	25%	4	25%	6	38%	0	0%	7	44%	16
District 2	14	56%	9	36%	6	24%	9	36%	1	4%	10	40%	25
District 3	18	39%	11	24%	13	28%	21	46%	2	4%	17	37%	46
District 4	14	35%	10	25%	14	35%	20	50%	1	3%	17	43%	40
Metro	28	41%	32	47%	28	41%	44	65%	10	15%	17	25%	68
District 6	15	42%	14	39%	13	36%	14	39%	1	3%	14	39%	36
District 7	16	39%	16	39%	14	34%	23	56%	0	0%	16	39%	41
District 8	17	49%	15	43%	13	37%	18	51%	1	3%	11	31%	35

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

### 26B. Is the fleet in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

	Yes, the fleet is fully mapped		Yes, the fleet is partially mapped		No, the fleet is not mapped		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	37	19%	27	14%	132	67%	196
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	9	14%	7	11%	50	76%	66
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	18	24%	12	16%	46	61%	76
Counties	10	19%	8	15%	34	65%	52
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	9	14%	7	11%	50	76%	66
5,000-19,999 residents	2	5%	9	23%	29	73%	40
20,000-49,999 residents	9	35%	2	8%	15	58%	26
50,000 or more residents	7	70%	1	10%	2	20%	10
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	9	21%	5	12%	28	67%	42
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	11%	2	22%	6	67%	9
District 2	1	10%	2	20%	7	70%	10
District 3	4	13%	4	13%	22	73%	30
District 4	0	0%	2	11%	16	89%	18
Metro	15	25%	9	15%	35	59%	59
District 6	5	24%	2	10%	14	67%	21
District 7	9	33%	3	11%	15	56%	27
District 8	2	10%	3	15%	15	75%	20



## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

**26C. In what software tools is the fleet in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)**

	GIS only		CAD only		Both GIS and CAD		We don't use software		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>57</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	100%	16
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	9	38%	0	0%	1	4%	14	58%	24
Counties	4	24%	0	0%	1	6%	12	71%	17
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	100%	16
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	9	90%	10
20,000-49,999 residents	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	5	50%	10
50,000 or more residents	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	4
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	10	77%	13
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	3
District 2	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	7
District 4	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	2
Metro	8	40%	0	0%	0	0%	12	60%	20
District 6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	6
District 7	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	9	82%	11
District 8	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5

## Types and Known Characteristics of Infrastructure Assets

26F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about the fleet? (Check all that apply)

	Condition of fleet		Age of fleet		Material of fleet		Size of fleet		Our inventory includes other information about fleet		We do not track any information about fleet		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>196</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	35	54%	40	62%	19	29%	32	49%	3	5%	22	34%	65
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	53	71%	67	89%	34	45%	51	68%	11	15%	5	7%	75
Counties	25	46%	49	91%	25	46%	36	67%	7	13%	4	7%	54
State agencies (3)	1	50%	2	100%	1	50%	2	100%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>													
Fewer than 5,000 residents	35	54%	40	62%	19	29%	32	49%	3	5%	22	34%	65
5,000-19,999 residents	25	64%	34	87%	15	38%	22	56%	4	10%	5	13%	39
20,000-49,999 residents	20	77%	24	92%	14	54%	22	85%	5	19%	0	0%	26
50,000 or more residents	8	80%	9	90%	5	50%	7	70%	2	20%	0	0%	10
<b>Counties by geography</b>													
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	4	80%	4	80%	2	40%	3	60%	3	60%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	4	57%	6	86%	4	57%	4	57%	2	29%	1	14%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	17	40%	39	93%	19	45%	29	69%	2	5%	3	7%	42
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>													
District 1	7	78%	8	89%	5	56%	5	56%	0	0%	1	11%	9
District 2	4	40%	8	80%	5	50%	6	60%	0	0%	1	10%	10
District 3	17	57%	23	77%	10	33%	16	53%	4	13%	6	20%	30
District 4	8	44%	14	78%	6	33%	9	50%	3	17%	3	17%	18
Metro	42	71%	52	88%	26	44%	39	66%	10	17%	5	8%	59
District 6	12	57%	15	71%	9	43%	15	71%	1	5%	4	19%	21
District 7	12	44%	20	74%	9	33%	14	52%	2	7%	7	26%	27
District 8	11	55%	16	80%	8	40%	15	75%	1	5%	4	20%	20

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 4. How does [JURISDICTION] place a value on infrastructure assets? (Check all that apply)

	(Past) constructed value		Current value		(Future) construction value		GASB34		Other		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	159	38%	187	44%	95	22%	130	31%	22	5%	423
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	97	39%	115	47%	61	25%	42	17%	20	8%	247
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	34	33%	49	48%	20	19%	47	46%	2	2%	103
Counties	28	39%	22	31%	13	18%	41	58%	0	0%	71
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>											
Fewer than 5,000 residents	97	39%	115	47%	61	25%	42	17%	20	8%	247
5,000-19,999 residents	18	30%	32	53%	15	25%	27	45%	0	0%	60
20,000-49,999 residents	12	40%	11	37%	4	13%	14	47%	1	3%	30
50,000 or more residents	4	31%	6	46%	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	13
<b>Counties by geography</b>											
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	4	80%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	14%	2	29%	1	14%	5	71%	0	0%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	26	44%	19	32%	10	17%	32	54%	0	0%	59
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>											
District 1	8	31%	12	46%	6	23%	9	35%	3	12%	26
District 2	16	44%	19	53%	7	19%	7	19%	2	6%	36
District 3	18	28%	29	45%	16	25%	17	26%	3	5%	65
District 4	22	47%	20	43%	10	21%	11	23%	4	9%	47
Metro	31	36%	32	37%	17	20%	37	43%	4	5%	87
District 6	15	31%	18	38%	12	25%	19	40%	4	8%	48
District 7	25	46%	27	50%	10	19%	17	31%	2	4%	54
District 8	24	41%	29	50%	16	28%	13	22%	0	0%	58

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 5. What is the gap between your annual infrastructure investment needs and [JURISDICTION]'s available funds?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$750,000,000</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$1,840,439,337</b>	<b>367</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$150,000	\$228,453,751	224
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$0	\$80,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$360,652,000	80
Counties	\$0	\$175,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$501,333,586	61
State agencies (3)	\$0	\$750,000,000	\$375,000,000	\$750,000,000	2
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$150,000	\$228,453,751	224
5,000-19,999 residents	\$0	\$80,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$164,762,000	50
20,000-49,999 residents	\$0	\$15,000,000	\$1,250,000	\$61,890,000	22
50,000 or more residents	\$0	\$50,000,000	\$3,500,000	\$134,000,000	8
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$16,000,000	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	\$2,000,000	\$65,340,000	\$10,000,000	\$126,840,000	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$0	\$175,000,000	\$2,075,000	\$358,493,586	52
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$0	\$11,500,000	\$250,000	\$58,040,000	28
District 2	\$0	\$175,000,000	\$200,000	\$227,362,000	29
District 3	\$0	\$65,340,000	\$500,000	\$123,851,000	61
District 4	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$200,000	\$96,913,551	40
Metro	\$0	\$80,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$273,790,000	66
District 6	\$0	\$50,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$188,649,586	46
District 7	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$74,557,200	50
District 8	\$0	\$7,000,000	\$415,000	\$47,276,000	45

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 10D. Do you know the value of the roads in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all roads		Yes, we know the value of some but not all roads		No, we do not know the value of any roads		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>460</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	19	7%	102	39%	143	54%	264
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	33	28%	65	56%	19	16%	117
Counties	21	27%	44	57%	12	16%	77
State agencies (3)	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	19	7%	102	39%	143	54%	264
5,000-19,999 residents	14	19%	44	61%	14	19%	72
20,000-49,999 residents	10	32%	16	52%	5	16%	31
50,000 or more residents	9	64%	5	36%	0	0%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	13	20%	41	64%	10	16%	64
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	3	9%	12	38%	17	53%	32
District 2	2	6%	19	54%	14	40%	35
District 3	14	19%	35	47%	26	35%	75
District 4	6	12%	21	40%	25	48%	52
Metro	31	31%	44	44%	24	24%	99
District 6	8	15%	24	45%	21	40%	53
District 7	7	12%	28	49%	22	39%	57
District 8	2	4%	28	51%	25	45%	55

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 10E. What is the value of all roads in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$29,360,000,000</b>	<b>\$53,687,081</b>	<b>\$35,285,088,011</b>	<b>61</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$50,000	\$50,000,000	\$5,825,000	\$181,066,714	14
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$3,000,000	\$655,893,641	\$70,000,000	\$3,150,004,215	29
Counties	\$5,450,000	\$556,037,155	\$78,890,192	\$2,594,017,082	17
State agencies (3)	\$29,360,000,000	\$29,360,000,000	\$29,360,000,000	\$29,360,000,000	1
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$50,000	\$50,000,000	\$5,825,000	\$181,066,714	14
5,000-19,999 residents	\$10,315,219	\$86,400,000	\$38,750,000	\$531,379,359	12
20,000-49,999 residents	\$42,000,000	\$185,000,000	\$81,700,000	\$976,601,621	9
50,000 or more residents	\$3,000,000	\$655,893,641	\$164,274,986	\$1,642,023,235	8
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	\$117,000,000	\$556,037,155	\$267,522,933	\$940,560,088	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	\$137,231,163	\$350,000,000	\$180,504,000	\$667,735,163	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$5,450,000	\$400,000,000	\$51,718,000	\$985,721,831	11
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$2,000,000	\$51,300,000	\$26,650,000	\$53,300,000	2
District 2	\$50,000	\$215,773	\$132,887	\$265,773	2
District 3	\$5,000,000	\$350,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$850,778,414	13
District 4	\$600,000	\$400,000,000	\$111,111,111	\$725,711,111	5
Metro	\$3,000,000	\$655,893,641	\$84,050,000	\$3,698,197,611	26
District 6	\$300,000	\$180,504,000	\$61,991,103	\$304,786,206	4
District 7	\$300,000	\$78,818,886	\$35,000,000	\$251,707,268	7
District 8	\$40,341,628	\$40,341,628	\$40,341,628	\$40,341,628	1

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 11D. Do you know the value of the bridges in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all bridges		Yes, we know the value of some but not all bridges		No, we do not know the value of any bridges		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>195</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	6	13%	7	15%	34	72%	47
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	12	17%	30	42%	29	41%	71
Counties	18	24%	42	55%	16	21%	76
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	6	13%	7	15%	34	72%	47
5,000-19,999 residents	4	11%	14	39%	18	50%	36
20,000-49,999 residents	2	9%	12	52%	9	39%	23
50,000 or more residents	6	50%	4	33%	2	17%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	43%	3	43%	1	14%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	13	20%	39	61%	12	19%	64
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	10%	6	60%	3	30%	10
District 2	1	7%	8	53%	6	40%	15
District 3	8	27%	9	30%	13	43%	30
District 4	4	20%	6	30%	10	50%	20
Metro	9	17%	24	44%	21	39%	54
District 6	7	24%	6	21%	16	55%	29
District 7	3	18%	10	59%	4	24%	17
District 8	3	16%	10	53%	6	32%	19

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 11E. What is the value of all bridges in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$6,600,000,000</b>	<b>\$7,000,000</b>	<b>\$7,459,834,445</b>	<b>31</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$500,000	\$4,500,000	\$1,450,000	\$10,760,000	6
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$1,887,923	\$90,641,367	\$10,000,000	\$247,129,290	9
Counties	\$3,251,760	\$214,973,085	\$7,500,000	\$601,945,155	15
State agencies (3)	\$6,600,000,000	\$6,600,000,000	\$6,600,000,000	\$6,600,000,000	1
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$500,000	\$4,500,000	\$1,450,000	\$10,760,000	6
5,000-19,999 residents	\$4,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$4,600,000	\$18,600,000	3
20,000-49,999 residents	\$1,887,923	\$12,000,000	\$6,943,962	\$13,887,923	2
50,000 or more residents	\$9,000,000	\$90,641,367	\$57,500,000	\$214,641,367	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	\$31,000,000	\$214,973,085	\$122,986,543	\$245,973,085	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	\$4,886,096	\$200,000,000	\$32,465,000	\$237,351,096	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$3,251,760	\$36,000,000	\$6,800,000	\$118,620,974	10
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$6,600,000	\$6,600,000	\$6,600,000	\$6,600,000	1
District 2	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	1
District 3	\$500,000	\$7,000,000	\$3,250,000	\$25,246,096	8
District 4	\$7,500,000	\$200,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$219,500,000	3
Metro	\$1,887,923	\$214,973,085	\$43,000,000	\$466,502,375	8
District 6	\$2,000,000	\$32,465,000	\$20,287,534	\$80,602,534	5
District 7	\$5,657,000	\$36,000,000	\$6,474,680	\$48,131,680	3
District 8	\$3,251,760	\$3,251,760	\$3,251,760	\$3,251,760	1



## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 12D. Do you know the value of the transit lines in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all transit lines		Yes, we know the value of some but not all transit lines		No, we do not know the value of any transit lines		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	2	13%	3	19%	11	69%	16
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	0	0%	2	29%	5	71%	7
Counties	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	3
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	3
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 4	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
Metro	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5
District 6	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 8	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 12E. What is the value of all transit lines in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$6,200,000</b>	<b>\$6,200,000</b>	<b>\$6,200,000</b>	<b>\$6,200,000</b>	<b>1</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	1
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	.	.	.	.	0
Counties	.	.	.	.	0
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	1
5,000-19,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
20,000-49,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
50,000 or more residents	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	.	.	.	.	0
District 4	.	.	.	.	0
Metro	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	\$6,200,000	1
District 6	.	.	.	.	0
District 7	.	.	.	.	0
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 13D. Do you know the value of the traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all traffic fixtures		Yes, we know the value of some but not all traffic fixtures		No, we do not know the value of any traffic fixtures		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>323</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	6	4%	37	23%	119	73%	162
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	8	8%	42	42%	50	50%	100
Counties	3	5%	24	41%	32	54%	59
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	6	4%	37	23%	119	73%	162
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	26	44%	33	56%	59
20,000-49,999 residents	3	10%	12	41%	14	48%	29
50,000 or more residents	5	42%	4	33%	3	25%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	4	57%	3	43%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	3	6%	17	36%	27	57%	47
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	6%	6	35%	10	59%	17
District 2	1	4%	4	17%	19	79%	24
District 3	3	6%	17	34%	30	60%	50
District 4	2	6%	10	28%	24	67%	36
Metro	6	8%	30	40%	39	52%	75
District 6	3	8%	14	36%	22	56%	39
District 7	0	0%	11	27%	30	73%	41
District 8	1	3%	11	28%	27	69%	39

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 13E. What is the value of all traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$1,170</b>	<b>\$6,800,000</b>	<b>\$167,000</b>	<b>\$21,459,715</b>	<b>13</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$1,170	\$6,500	\$4,000	\$22,769	6
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$1,000,000	\$6,800,000	\$4,000,000	\$20,769,946	5
Counties	\$167,000	\$500,000	\$333,500	\$667,000	2
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$1,170	\$6,500	\$4,000	\$22,769	6
5,000-19,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
20,000-49,999 residents	\$3,500,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,750,000	\$7,500,000	2
50,000 or more residents	\$1,000,000	\$6,800,000	\$5,469,946	\$13,269,946	3
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$167,000	\$500,000	\$333,500	\$667,000	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$6,500	\$6,500	\$6,500	\$6,500	1
District 2	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	1
District 3	\$1,899	\$500,000	\$5,200	\$507,099	3
District 4	\$3,000	\$4,000,000	\$2,001,500	\$4,003,000	2
Metro	\$1,000,000	\$6,800,000	\$4,484,973	\$16,769,946	4
District 6	\$1,170	\$167,000	\$84,085	\$168,170	2
District 7	.	.	.	.	0
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 14D. Do you know the value of the buildings in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all buildings		Yes, we know the value of some but not all buildings		No, we do not know the value of any buildings		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>388</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	54	24%	95	41%	80	35%	229
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	19	20%	50	53%	25	27%	94
Counties	19	30%	34	54%	10	16%	63
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	54	24%	95	41%	80	35%	229
5,000-19,999 residents	10	17%	30	50%	20	33%	60
20,000-49,999 residents	7	26%	15	56%	5	19%	27
50,000 or more residents	2	29%	5	71%	0	0%	7
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	3
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	4
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	17	30%	31	55%	8	14%	56
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	5	17%	16	53%	9	30%	30
District 2	5	17%	13	43%	12	40%	30
District 3	23	40%	18	31%	17	29%	58
District 4	11	23%	19	40%	18	38%	48
Metro	16	21%	39	52%	20	27%	75
District 6	10	21%	21	45%	16	34%	47
District 7	14	27%	25	48%	13	25%	52
District 8	8	17%	28	61%	10	22%	46

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 14E. What is the value of all buildings in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$500,000,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,883,894,195</b>	<b>79</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$50,000	\$183,440,500	\$2,250,000	\$501,538,258	49
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$2,608,000	\$55,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$342,504,162	15
Counties	\$472,656	\$150,000,000	\$13,750,000	\$539,851,775	14
State agencies (3)	\$500,000,000	\$500,000,000	\$500,000,000	\$500,000,000	1
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$50,000	\$183,440,500	\$2,250,000	\$501,538,258	49
5,000-19,999 residents	\$2,608,000	\$32,700,000	\$7,518,792	\$105,064,518	8
20,000-49,999 residents	\$14,415,644	\$42,250,000	\$32,387,000	\$182,439,644	6
50,000 or more residents	\$55,000,000	\$55,000,000	\$55,000,000	\$55,000,000	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	\$39,000,000	\$39,000,000	\$39,000,000	\$39,000,000	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	\$131,369,000	\$131,369,000	\$131,369,000	\$131,369,000	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$472,656	\$150,000,000	\$11,250,000	\$369,482,775	12
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$150,000	\$13,051,352	\$2,608,000	\$26,209,352	5
District 2	\$287,022	\$2,000,000	\$1,425,000	\$5,137,022	4
District 3	\$50,000	\$50,000,000	\$6,200,000	\$168,022,311	21
District 4	\$325,000	\$68,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$153,916,900	9
Metro	\$500,000	\$183,440,500	\$25,000,000	\$444,650,078	13
District 6	\$375,000	\$131,369,000	\$3,000,000	\$176,352,048	7
District 7	\$400,000	\$75,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$226,456,484	13
District 8	\$100,000	\$150,000,000	\$1,187,500	\$183,150,000	6

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 15D. Do you know the value of the drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all drinking water supply and distribution pipes		Yes, we know the value of some but not all drinking water supply and distribution pipes		No, we do not know the value of any drinking water supply and distribution pipes		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>342</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	22	9%	98	42%	113	48%	233
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	28	27%	55	52%	22	21%	105
Counties	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	22	9%	98	42%	113	48%	233
5,000-19,999 residents	14	21%	36	55%	16	24%	66
20,000-49,999 residents	6	21%	16	57%	6	21%	28
50,000 or more residents	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	2	9%	9	41%	11	50%	22
District 2	2	9%	10	43%	11	48%	23
District 3	12	23%	20	38%	21	40%	53
District 4	2	5%	19	50%	17	45%	38
Metro	23	28%	39	48%	19	23%	81
District 6	5	13%	18	45%	17	43%	40
District 7	4	9%	21	46%	21	46%	46
District 8	1	3%	18	46%	20	51%	39

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 15E. What is the value of all drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$650,000</b>	<b>\$282,000,000</b>	<b>\$11,466,053</b>	<b>\$1,357,510,654</b>	<b>41</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$650,000	\$15,000,000	\$2,600,000	\$58,493,675	17
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$1,500,000	\$282,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$1,274,016,979	23
Counties	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	1
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$650,000	\$15,000,000	\$2,600,000	\$58,493,675	17
5,000-19,999 residents	\$1,500,000	\$105,000,000	\$14,304,142	\$322,320,853	14
20,000-49,999 residents	\$17,504,000	\$162,000,000	\$34,089,267	\$289,593,267	5
50,000 or more residents	\$50,102,859	\$282,000,000	\$165,000,000	\$662,102,859	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	1
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	1
District 2	\$1,092,000	\$1,092,000	\$1,092,000	\$1,092,000	1
District 3	\$650,000	\$18,300,000	\$7,625,000	\$93,906,811	12
District 4	\$900,000	\$3,050,000	\$1,975,000	\$3,950,000	2
Metro	\$1,500,000	\$282,000,000	\$32,044,634	\$1,202,155,313	18
District 6	\$1,580,000	\$3,800,000	\$2,796,834	\$8,176,834	3
District 7	\$1,700,000	\$16,108,283	\$4,621,413	\$22,429,696	3
District 8	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	1



## Value of Infrastructure Assets

**16D. Do you know the value of the waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION]?**

	Yes, we know the value of all waste water collection and treatment assets		Yes, we know the value of some but not all waste water collection and treatment assets		No, we do not know the value of any waste water collection and treatment assets		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>351</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	26	11%	104	44%	104	44%	234
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	29	26%	59	52%	25	22%	113
Counties	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	3
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	26	11%	104	44%	104	44%	234
5,000-19,999 residents	13	19%	37	53%	20	29%	70
20,000-49,999 residents	10	31%	17	53%	5	16%	32
50,000 or more residents	6	55%	5	45%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	3
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	3	12%	8	32%	14	56%	25
District 2	1	4%	13	57%	9	39%	23
District 3	12	22%	23	42%	20	36%	55
District 4	4	11%	18	47%	16	42%	38
Metro	23	29%	40	50%	17	21%	80
District 6	6	15%	21	53%	13	33%	40
District 7	5	11%	21	46%	20	43%	46
District 8	2	5%	19	44%	22	51%	43

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 16E. What is the value of all waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$125,000</b>	<b>\$6,500,000,000</b>	<b>\$11,625,921</b>	<b>\$7,978,413,765</b>	<b>48</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$125,000	\$14,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$86,862,620	22
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$2,000,000	\$300,840,310	\$29,470,397	\$1,356,551,145	24
Counties	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	1
State agencies (3)	\$6,500,000,000	\$6,500,000,000	\$6,500,000,000	\$6,500,000,000	1
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$125,000	\$14,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$86,862,620	22
5,000-19,999 residents	\$2,000,000	\$151,950,000	\$15,694,075	\$367,820,042	12
20,000-49,999 residents	\$12,450,000	\$150,000,000	\$40,000,000	\$489,890,793	9
50,000 or more residents	\$43,000,000	\$300,840,310	\$155,000,000	\$498,840,310	3
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	1
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$350,000	\$810,000	\$580,000	\$1,160,000	2
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	\$1,060,774	\$21,705,919	\$11,450,000	\$128,254,843	12
District 4	\$1,250,000	\$93,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$96,750,000	3
Metro	\$2,000,000	\$300,840,310	\$34,970,397	\$1,035,493,269	18
District 6	\$125,000	\$150,000,000	\$2,800,000	\$160,025,000	5
District 7	\$600,000	\$11,251,842	\$2,543,300	\$19,730,653	5
District 8	\$2,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$18,500,000	\$37,000,000	2

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 17D. Do you know the value of the storm sewers in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all storm sewers		Yes, we know the value of some but not all storm sewers		No, we do not know the value of any storm sewers		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>395</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	11	5%	77	34%	139	61%	227
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	25	22%	56	49%	33	29%	114
Counties	0	0%	17	32%	36	68%	53
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	11	5%	77	34%	139	61%	227
5,000-19,999 residents	10	14%	36	51%	25	35%	71
20,000-49,999 residents	8	25%	16	50%	8	25%	32
50,000 or more residents	7	64%	4	36%	0	0%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	13	30%	30	70%	43
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	4%	10	37%	16	59%	27
District 2	1	4%	7	27%	18	69%	26
District 3	8	12%	22	33%	36	55%	66
District 4	2	5%	13	30%	29	66%	44
Metro	20	22%	41	45%	30	33%	91
District 6	1	2%	17	41%	23	56%	41
District 7	3	6%	21	41%	27	53%	51
District 8	0	0%	19	40%	29	60%	48

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 17E. What is the value of all storm sewers in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$22,670</b>	<b>\$227,000,000</b>	<b>\$15,750,000</b>	<b>\$812,415,455</b>	<b>25</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$22,670	\$4,000,000	\$1,843,909	\$10,658,718	6
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$3,630,835	\$227,000,000	\$25,080,000	\$801,756,737	19
Counties	.	.	.	.	0
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$22,670	\$4,000,000	\$1,843,909	\$10,658,718	6
5,000-19,999 residents	\$3,630,835	\$33,950,000	\$7,631,903	\$96,006,238	8
20,000-49,999 residents	\$10,500,000	\$66,000,000	\$34,227,268	\$247,807,268	7
50,000 or more residents	\$54,415,876	\$227,000,000	\$88,263,678	\$457,943,231	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	\$22,670	\$16,400,000	\$4,292,606	\$40,634,267	7
District 4	\$75,000	\$40,000,000	\$20,037,500	\$40,075,000	2
Metro	\$2,873,230	\$227,000,000	\$34,088,634	\$725,587,535	14
District 6	.	.	.	.	0
District 7	\$2,487,818	\$3,630,835	\$3,059,327	\$6,118,653	2
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 18D. Do you know the value of the storm ponds in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all storm ponds		Yes, we know the value of some but not all storm ponds		No, we do not know the value of any storm ponds		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>262</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	8	7%	34	28%	79	65%	121
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	8	7%	47	44%	53	49%	108
Counties	0	0%	4	13%	27	87%	31
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	8	7%	34	28%	79	65%	121
5,000-19,999 residents	5	8%	24	37%	36	55%	65
20,000-49,999 residents	1	3%	18	56%	13	41%	32
50,000 or more residents	2	18%	5	45%	4	36%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	5
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	2	10%	19	90%	21
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	7%	3	21%	10	71%	14
District 2	1	11%	3	33%	5	56%	9
District 3	3	7%	14	30%	29	63%	46
District 4	1	5%	6	29%	14	67%	21
Metro	5	6%	31	38%	46	56%	82
District 6	2	6%	10	31%	20	63%	32
District 7	3	9%	11	34%	18	56%	32
District 8	0	0%	7	29%	17	71%	24

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 18E. What is the value of all storm ponds in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$2,130</b>	<b>\$7,750,000</b>	<b>\$993,750</b>	<b>\$27,327,879</b>	<b>12</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$2,130	\$636,000	\$279,007	\$1,196,144	4
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$250,000	\$7,750,000	\$2,847,118	\$26,131,735	8
Counties	.	.	.	.	0
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$2,130	\$636,000	\$279,007	\$1,196,144	4
5,000-19,999 residents	\$250,000	\$7,750,000	\$3,000,000	\$15,900,000	5
20,000-49,999 residents	\$6,750,000	\$6,750,000	\$6,750,000	\$6,750,000	1
50,000 or more residents	\$787,500	\$2,694,235	\$1,740,868	\$3,481,735	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	\$8,014	\$3,700,000	\$1,200,000	\$4,908,014	3
District 4	\$550,000	\$550,000	\$550,000	\$550,000	1
Metro	\$250,000	\$7,750,000	\$2,694,235	\$18,231,735	5
District 6	\$2,130	\$2,130	\$2,130	\$2,130	1
District 7	\$636,000	\$3,000,000	\$1,818,000	\$3,636,000	2
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 19D. Do you know the value of the airports in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all airports		Yes, we know the value of some but not all airports		No, we do not know the value of any airports		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>75</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	4	11%	9	25%	23	64%	36
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	5	17%	16	55%	8	28%	29
Counties	0	0%	3	30%	7	70%	10
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	4	11%	9	25%	23	64%	36
5,000-19,999 residents	3	14%	15	68%	4	18%	22
20,000-49,999 residents	2	33%	0	0%	4	67%	6
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	3	33%	6	67%	9
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	4
District 2	0	0%	4	57%	3	43%	7
District 3	3	21%	4	29%	7	50%	14
District 4	2	13%	4	27%	9	60%	15
Metro	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%	4
District 6	1	10%	6	60%	3	30%	10
District 7	0	0%	4	44%	5	56%	9
District 8	3	25%	3	25%	6	50%	12

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 19E. What is the value of all airports in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>	<b>\$15,000,000</b>	<b>\$7,000,000</b>	<b>\$57,966,500</b>	<b>7</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$100,000	\$15,000,000	\$6,080,750	\$27,261,500	4
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$7,000,000	\$14,705,000	\$9,000,000	\$30,705,000	3
Counties	.	.	.	.	0
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$100,000	\$15,000,000	\$6,080,750	\$27,261,500	4
5,000-19,999 residents	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	1
20,000-49,999 residents	\$9,000,000	\$14,705,000	\$11,852,500	\$23,705,000	2
50,000 or more residents	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	\$100,000	\$6,161,500	\$6,000,000	\$12,261,500	3
District 4	\$9,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$24,000,000	2
Metro	.	.	.	.	0
District 6	\$14,705,000	\$14,705,000	\$14,705,000	\$14,705,000	1
District 7	.	.	.	.	0
District 8	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	1



## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 20D. Do you know the value of the ports in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all ports		Yes, we know the value of some but not all ports		No, we do not know the value of any ports		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	8
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
Counties	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
District 4	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Metro	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 6	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 8	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 21D. Do you know the value of the railways in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all railways		Yes, we know the value of some but not all railways		No, we do not know the value of any railways		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	2	5%	4	10%	35	85%	41
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	0	0%	2	8%	23	92%	25
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	0	0%	1	13%	7	88%	8
Counties	1	14%	1	14%	5	71%	7
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	0	0%	2	8%	23	92%	25
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%	4
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	6
District 2	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
District 4	0	0%	0	0%	9	100%	9
Metro	0	0%	2	29%	5	71%	7
District 6	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 7	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 8	0	0%	1	14%	6	86%	7

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 21E. What is the value of all railways in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$26,500,000</b>	<b>\$26,500,000</b>	<b>\$26,500,000</b>	<b>\$26,500,000</b>	<b>1</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	.	.	.	.	0
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	.	.	.	.	0
Counties	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	1
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	.	.	.	.	0
5,000-19,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
20,000-49,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
50,000 or more residents	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	1
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	\$26,500,000	1
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	.	.	.	.	0
District 4	.	.	.	.	0
Metro	.	.	.	.	0
District 6	.	.	.	.	0
District 7	.	.	.	.	0
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 22D. Do you know the value of the electrical systems in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all electrical systems		Yes, we know the value of some but not all electrical systems		No, we do not know the value of any electrical systems		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	5	5%	44	40%	61	55%	110
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	2	3%	20	34%	36	62%	58
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	3	7%	21	50%	18	43%	42
Counties	0	0%	2	22%	7	78%	9
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	2	3%	20	34%	36	62%	58
5,000-19,999 residents	2	8%	11	44%	12	48%	25
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	7	54%	6	46%	13
50,000 or more residents	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	4
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	6
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	5	63%	3	38%	8
District 2	0	0%	3	38%	5	63%	8
District 3	0	0%	3	27%	8	73%	11
District 4	1	11%	5	56%	3	33%	9
Metro	1	4%	11	41%	15	56%	27
District 6	1	6%	4	24%	12	71%	17
District 7	2	10%	9	43%	10	48%	21
District 8	0	0%	3	38%	5	63%	8

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 22E. What is the value of all electrical systems in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$50,000,000</b>	<b>\$7,166,564</b>	<b>\$89,559,421</b>	<b>5</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$3,883,891	\$7,166,564	\$5,525,228	\$11,050,455	2
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$1,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$27,508,966	\$78,508,966	3
Counties	.	.	.	.	0
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$3,883,891	\$7,166,564	\$5,525,228	\$11,050,455	2
5,000-19,999 residents	\$27,508,966	\$50,000,000	\$38,754,483	\$77,508,966	2
20,000-49,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
50,000 or more residents	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	1
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	.	.	.	.	0
District 4	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	1
Metro	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	1
District 6	\$7,166,564	\$7,166,564	\$7,166,564	\$7,166,564	1
District 7	\$3,883,891	\$27,508,966	\$15,696,429	\$31,392,857	2
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 23D. Do you know the value of the solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all solid waste facilities		Yes, we know the value of some but not all solid waste facilities		No, we do not know the values of any solid waste facilities		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>58</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	2	8%	4	16%	19	76%	25
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	2	20%	4	40%	4	40%	10
Counties	2	9%	9	39%	12	52%	23
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	2	8%	4	16%	19	76%	25
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	4	50%	4	50%	8
20,000-49,999 residents	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	1	5%	8	42%	10	53%	19
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	5
District 2	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	6
District 3	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	6
District 4	3	23%	4	31%	6	46%	13
Metro	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	3
District 6	2	18%	6	55%	3	27%	11
District 7	0	0%	1	14%	6	86%	7
District 8	0	0%	3	43%	4	57%	7

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 23E. What is the value of all solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$10,000,000</b>	<b>\$750,000</b>	<b>\$12,061,000</b>	<b>5</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$35,000	\$750,000	\$392,500	\$785,000	2
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$276,000	\$1,000,000	\$638,000	\$1,276,000	2
Counties	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	1
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$35,000	\$750,000	\$392,500	\$785,000	2
5,000-19,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
20,000-49,999 residents	\$276,000	\$1,000,000	\$638,000	\$1,276,000	2
50,000 or more residents	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	1
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	1
District 4	\$35,000	\$1,000,000	\$750,000	\$1,785,000	3
Metro	.	.	.	.	0
District 6	\$276,000	\$276,000	\$276,000	\$276,000	1
District 7	.	.	.	.	0
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 24D. Do you know the value of the natural gas network in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of the entire natural gas network		Yes, we know the value of some but not the entire natural gas network		No, we do not know the value of the natural gas network		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	4	8%	4	8%	41	84%	49
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	4	11%	4	11%	29	78%	37
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	8
Counties	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	4	11%	4	11%	29	78%	37
5,000-19,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	3
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	3
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4
District 2	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	3
District 3	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5
District 4	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	6
Metro	1	9%	0	0%	10	91%	11
District 6	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	6
District 7	1	13%	0	0%	7	88%	8
District 8	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	6



## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 24E. What is the value of all natural gas networks in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$2,728,590</b>	<b>\$3,774,990</b>	<b>\$3,700,000</b>	<b>\$10,203,580</b>	<b>3</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$2,728,590	\$3,774,990	\$3,700,000	\$10,203,580	3
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	.	.	.	.	0
Counties	.	.	.	.	0
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$2,728,590	\$3,774,990	\$3,700,000	\$10,203,580	3
5,000-19,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
20,000-49,999 residents	.	.	.	.	0
50,000 or more residents	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	.	.	.	.	0
District 3	.	.	.	.	0
District 4	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	1
Metro	\$3,774,990	\$3,774,990	\$3,774,990	\$3,774,990	1
District 6	.	.	.	.	0
District 7	\$2,728,590	\$2,728,590	\$2,728,590	\$2,728,590	1
District 8	.	.	.	.	0

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 25D. Do you know the value of the parks in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of all the parks		Yes, we know the value of some but not all the parks		No, we do not know the value of the parks		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>308</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	13	7%	47	26%	121	67%	181
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	5	6%	39	45%	43	49%	87
Counties	6	15%	9	23%	25	63%	40
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	13	7%	47	26%	121	67%	181
5,000-19,999 residents	1	2%	22	43%	28	55%	51
20,000-49,999 residents	1	4%	13	52%	11	44%	25
50,000 or more residents	3	27%	4	36%	4	36%	11
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	3
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	5	15%	9	27%	19	58%	33
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	0	0%	4	25%	12	75%	16
District 2	7	28%	7	28%	11	44%	25
District 3	5	11%	13	28%	28	61%	46
District 4	2	5%	10	25%	28	70%	40
Metro	4	6%	29	42%	36	52%	69
District 6	2	5%	7	19%	28	76%	37
District 7	3	8%	16	40%	21	53%	40
District 8	1	3%	9	26%	25	71%	35

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 25E. What is the value of all parks in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$28,000</b>	<b>\$341,785,283</b>	<b>\$950,000</b>	<b>\$430,729,526</b>	<b>19</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$28,000	\$1,000,000	\$200,000	\$4,445,992	11
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$9,500,000	\$341,785,283	\$25,500,000	\$402,285,283	4
Counties	\$698,251	\$19,300,000	\$2,000,000	\$23,998,251	4
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$28,000	\$1,000,000	\$200,000	\$4,445,992	11
5,000-19,999 residents	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	1
20,000-49,999 residents	\$9,500,000	\$9,500,000	\$9,500,000	\$9,500,000	1
50,000 or more residents	\$38,000,000	\$341,785,283	\$189,892,642	\$379,785,283	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	\$19,300,000	\$19,300,000	\$19,300,000	\$19,300,000	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$698,251	\$3,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,698,251	3
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	.	.	.	.	0
District 2	\$60,000	\$3,000,000	\$200,000	\$3,885,000	5
District 3	\$28,000	\$13,000,000	\$950,000	\$15,010,992	5
District 4	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	1
Metro	\$9,500,000	\$341,785,283	\$19,300,000	\$370,585,283	3
District 6	\$38,000,000	\$38,000,000	\$38,000,000	\$38,000,000	1
District 7	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	\$698,251	\$2,198,251	3
District 8	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	1

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 26D. Do you know the value of the fleet in [JURISDICTION]?

	Yes, we know the value of the entire fleet		Yes, we know the value of some but not the entire fleet		No, we do not know the value of the fleet		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>196</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	12	18%	28	42%	26	39%	66
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	19	26%	44	59%	11	15%	74
Counties	20	37%	23	43%	11	20%	54
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	12	18%	28	42%	26	39%	66
5,000-19,999 residents	7	18%	26	67%	6	15%	39
20,000-49,999 residents	8	31%	14	54%	4	15%	26
50,000 or more residents	4	44%	4	44%	1	11%	9
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	43%	3	43%	1	14%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	16	38%	16	38%	10	24%	42
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	1	11%	6	67%	2	22%	9
District 2	4	40%	4	40%	2	20%	10
District 3	11	35%	13	42%	7	23%	31
District 4	2	11%	10	56%	6	33%	18
Metro	16	28%	35	60%	7	12%	58
District 6	6	29%	9	43%	6	29%	21
District 7	6	22%	11	41%	10	37%	27
District 8	5	25%	7	35%	8	40%	20

## Value of Infrastructure Assets

### 26E. What is the value of all fleet in [JURISDICTION]?

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Sum	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>\$99,000</b>	<b>\$45,000,000</b>	<b>\$3,500,000</b>	<b>\$199,715,758</b>	<b>35</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	\$99,000	\$3,500,000	\$884,230	\$14,660,992	11
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	\$1,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$7,300,000	\$128,025,870	11
Counties	\$544,900	\$9,380,250	\$4,000,000	\$57,028,896	13
State agencies (3)	.	.	.	.	0
<b>Cities by population</b>					
Fewer than 5,000 residents	\$99,000	\$3,500,000	\$884,230	\$14,660,992	11
5,000-19,999 residents	\$1,000,000	\$17,377,584	\$5,101,500	\$28,580,584	4
20,000-49,999 residents	\$2,691,000	\$15,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$37,766,000	5
50,000 or more residents	\$16,679,286	\$45,000,000	\$30,839,643	\$61,679,286	2
<b>Counties by geography</b>					
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	\$3,600,000	\$3,600,000	\$3,600,000	\$3,600,000	1
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	.	.	.	.	0
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	\$544,900	\$9,380,250	\$4,450,000	\$53,428,896	12
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>					
District 1	\$777,000	\$777,000	\$777,000	\$777,000	1
District 2	\$2,000,000	\$2,603,746	\$2,539,667	\$7,143,413	3
District 3	\$234,728	\$7,300,000	\$2,500,000	\$31,161,095	9
District 4	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	1
Metro	\$750,000	\$16,679,286	\$4,700,000	\$62,507,286	9
District 6	\$99,000	\$45,000,000	\$3,345,500	\$51,790,000	4
District 7	\$544,900	\$17,377,584	\$5,750,000	\$43,702,734	6
District 8	\$884,230	\$1,000,000	\$942,115	\$1,884,230	2

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

### 6. Regarding asset management systems, is the goal of [JURISDICTION] to have:

	One asset management system for all assets managed		Two or more asset management systems for assets managed		My jurisdiction does not use systems		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>405</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	66	28%	14	6%	154	66%	234
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	51	52%	32	32%	16	16%	99
Counties	22	31%	30	43%	18	26%	70
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	66	28%	14	6%	154	66%	234
5,000-19,999 residents	32	54%	16	27%	11	19%	59
20,000-49,999 residents	17	61%	7	25%	4	14%	28
50,000 or more residents	2	17%	9	75%	1	8%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%	7
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	16	28%	24	41%	18	31%	58
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	12	48%	2	8%	11	44%	25
District 2	10	31%	2	6%	20	63%	32
District 3	22	35%	8	13%	32	52%	62
District 4	12	26%	11	23%	24	51%	47
Metro	42	48%	20	23%	25	29%	87
District 6	16	36%	12	27%	17	38%	45
District 7	12	23%	13	25%	28	53%	53
District 8	13	25%	8	15%	31	60%	52

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

Tools used by [JURISDICTION] for asset management.

	Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	Counties	State agencies (3)	All survey respondents
	N	N	N	N	N
MS Excel	119	75	55	2	251
Pencil and paper	147	36	42	2	227
CAD / AutoCAD / Microstation	48	68	43	2	161
ESRI GIS	18	65	30	2	115
Arc View	15	49	29	1	94
ESRI GIS database	25	50	15	2	92
Access Database	5	24	18	1	48
Laserfiche	3	32	3	0	38
Other GIS system	2	7	1	0	10
Customized database/spreadsheets	0	2	3	0	5
Dbase	0	0	5	0	5
Oracle	0	2	0	2	4
ACS	0	0	3	0	3
CTAS	3	0	0	0	3
Incode Database	1	2	0	0	3
ArcGIS	0	1	1	0	2
Filemaker pro	0	1	1	0	2
Asset Keeper	1	0	0	0	1
Asyst	1	0	0	0	1
City Link / Data Link	0	1	0	0	1
CostRite	0	0	1	0	1
culvertcost	0	0	0	1	1
GeoMoose	0	1	0	0	1
Georilla	0	0	0	1	1
Helpstar	0	0	1	0	1
MCIS	0	0	1	0	1
Micostation	0	0	1	0	1
New World	0	1	0	0	1
NewRoads	0	0	1	0	1
QGIS	0	0	1	0	1
Quickbooks	1	0	0	0	1
Springbrook	0	1	0	0	1
Swift	0	0	0	1	1
TxBASE	0	0	0	1	1
VFA	0	1	0	0	1
VISUAL	1	0	0	0	1
WinCan	0	1	0	0	1
<b>N of respondents</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>425</b>

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

Software systems used by [JURISDICTION] for asset management.

	Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	Counties	State agencies (3)	All survey respondents
	N	N	N	N	N
MnDOT SIMS	1	15	57	1	74
Icon	0	24	17	0	41
Simple Signs	1	7	31	0	39
Pontis	0	6	31	1	38
Cartegraph	3	25	5	1	34
RTVision	0	3	18	0	21
PASER	8	6	0	0	14
CityWorks	2	7	0	0	9
City Services	6	2	0	0	8
InfraSeek	5	2	0	0	7
SWAMP	1	5	1	0	7
VueWorks	0	3	2	0	5
Beehive	3	1	0	0	4
MapFeeder	0	4	0	0	4
PubWorks	2	2	0	0	4
Asset Works	0	2	1	0	3
Element XS	0	3	0	0	3
FacilityDude Mobile 311	2	1	0	0	3
Inframap	0	3	0	0	3
Manager Plus	0	2	1	0	3
Agile Assets	0	1	0	1	2
Baryon Fixed Asset	2	0	0	0	2
CFA	0	2	0	0	2
Elements	0	2	0	0	2
Famis	1	1	0	0	2
Goodpointe	0	1	1	0	2
Infor EAM	0	1	1	0	2
M4 and M5	0	1	0	1	2
Maximo	0	0	1	1	2
Mpower Innovations	1	1	0	0	2
Plan-IT	1	1	0	0	2
Road Pro	1	0	1	0	2
AFMS Automated Facilities Management System	0	0	0	1	1
Archibus	0	0	1	0	1
Capitol Assets	0	0	1	0	1
Data View	0	1	0	0	1
Dossier	0	1	0	0	1
Element FX	1	0	0	0	1
Fixed Assets CS	1	0	0	0	1
Fleet Maintenance Pro	0	0	1	0	1
Fulcrum	0	1	0	0	1
Hydinfra	0	0	0	1	1
IMaint	0	1	0	0	1
Intelysis	0	1	0	0	1
Jettfleet	0	1	0	0	1
MicroPaver	0	1	0	0	1
Paver	0	1	0	0	1
Precis	0	0	1	0	1
RTA	0	0	1	0	1
Squarerigger	0	1	0	0	1
WSB & Associates Pavement Management System	0	1	0	0	1
<b>N of respondents</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>186</b>



## Asset Management Tools and Systems

Miscellaneous systems used by [JURISDICTION] for asset management.

	Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	Counties	State agencies (3)	All survey respondents
	N	N	N	N	N
MnDOT Annual Inspection	0	3	0	0	3
AFS	0	0	1	0	1
St. Aid RQI/PQI data files	0	0	1	0	1
As-built plans	1	0	0	0	1
Bridge Condition Inventory	1	0	0	0	1
Conditional rating maps	0	1	0	0	1
CPUI	0	0	1	0	1
Engineer drawings	1	0	0	0	1
Highway costing-Xerox	0	0	1	0	1
Logis	0	1	0	0	1
Maintenance Connection	0	0	1	0	1
Maps	0	1	0	0	1
MSAS Needs	0	1	0	0	1
Numerous	0	0	0	1	1
Paper Building Records	1	0	0	0	1
PARIS	0	1	0	0	1
Phoenix	0	1	0	0	1
Qwest Maintenance	0	1	0	0	1
RCA/WOM	0	0	0	1	1
Tribal Knowledge	0	0	1	0	1
<b>N of respondents</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

The total number of different software tools or asset management systems  
[JURISDICTION] uses.

	0 tools and systems		1-2 tools and systems		3-5 tools and systems		6+ tools and systems		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>529</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	151	48%	137	43%	25	8%	3	1%	316
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	10	8%	29	22%	52	40%	38	29%	129
Counties	8	10%	10	12%	33	40%	31	38%	82
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>									
Fewer than 5,000 residents	151	48%	137	43%	25	8%	3	1%	316
5,000-19,999 residents	5	6%	26	33%	31	40%	16	21%	78
20,000-49,999 residents	3	9%	2	6%	20	57%	10	29%	35
50,000 or more residents	2	13%	1	6%	1	6%	12	75%	16
<b>Counties by geography</b>									
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	4	67%	6
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	5	63%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	7	10%	10	15%	29	43%	22	32%	68
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>									
District 1	21	49%	14	33%	6	14%	2	5%	43
District 2	20	49%	12	29%	3	7%	6	15%	41
District 3	23	29%	30	38%	17	21%	10	13%	80
District 4	14	24%	27	47%	11	19%	6	10%	58
Metro	21	19%	25	23%	35	32%	30	27%	111
District 6	21	34%	19	31%	13	21%	8	13%	61
District 7	27	40%	24	36%	10	15%	6	9%	67
District 8	22	33%	25	38%	15	23%	4	6%	66

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

**27. How important is the ease of using the system when deciding which asset management system(s) to use?**

	Extremely important		Somewhat Important		Not at all important		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>437</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	196	79%	40	16%	13	5%	249
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	99	90%	11	10%	0	0%	110
Counties	69	91%	7	9%	0	0%	76
State agencies (3)	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	196	79%	40	16%	13	5%	249
5,000-19,999 residents	62	91%	6	9%	0	0%	68
20,000-49,999 residents	27	90%	3	10%	0	0%	30
50,000 or more residents	10	83%	2	17%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	56	89%	7	11%	0	0%	63
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	27	84%	5	16%	0	0%	32
District 2	25	76%	5	15%	3	9%	33
District 3	58	82%	11	15%	2	3%	71
District 4	46	88%	5	10%	1	2%	52
Metro	81	89%	9	10%	1	1%	91
District 6	37	77%	9	19%	2	4%	48
District 7	44	79%	10	18%	2	4%	56
District 8	46	88%	4	8%	2	4%	52

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

### 27. How important is the cost of the system when deciding which asset management system(s) to use?

	Extremely important		Somewhat Important		Not at all important		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>438</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	207	82%	33	13%	11	4%	251
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	63	58%	45	41%	1	1%	109
Counties	47	62%	28	37%	1	1%	76
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	207	82%	33	13%	11	4%	251
5,000-19,999 residents	43	63%	25	37%	0	0%	68
20,000-49,999 residents	17	59%	11	38%	1	3%	29
50,000 or more residents	3	25%	9	75%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	38%	5	63%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	42	67%	21	33%	0	0%	63
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	24	73%	9	27%	0	0%	33
District 2	28	85%	3	9%	2	6%	33
District 3	56	79%	14	20%	1	1%	71
District 4	43	83%	8	15%	1	2%	52
Metro	57	63%	30	33%	3	3%	90
District 6	32	67%	14	29%	2	4%	48
District 7	41	72%	14	25%	2	4%	57
District 8	36	69%	14	27%	2	4%	52

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

**27. How important is the ability of the system to handle multiple asset types when deciding which asset management system(s) to use?**

	Extremely important		Somewhat Important		Not at all important		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>431</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	107	44%	103	42%	34	14%	244
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	65	59%	43	39%	2	2%	110
Counties	35	47%	38	51%	2	3%	75
State agencies (3)	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	107	44%	103	42%	34	14%	244
5,000-19,999 residents	39	57%	28	41%	1	1%	68
20,000-49,999 residents	18	60%	11	37%	1	3%	30
50,000 or more residents	8	67%	4	33%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	38%	5	63%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	28	45%	32	52%	2	3%	62
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	12	38%	20	63%	0	0%	32
District 2	12	38%	16	50%	4	13%	32
District 3	31	44%	31	44%	8	11%	70
District 4	23	44%	20	38%	9	17%	52
Metro	51	57%	36	40%	3	3%	90
District 6	22	48%	20	43%	4	9%	46
District 7	28	50%	21	38%	7	13%	56
District 8	28	55%	20	39%	3	6%	51

## Asset Management Tools and Systems system when deciding which asset

### 27. How important is the length of time necessary to set up the management system(s) to use?

	Extremely important		Somewhat Important		Not at all important		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>432</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	115	47%	109	44%	21	9%	245
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	37	34%	67	61%	6	5%	110
Counties	42	56%	31	41%	2	3%	75
State agencies (3)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	115	47%	109	44%	21	9%	245
5,000-19,999 residents	21	31%	43	63%	4	6%	68
20,000-49,999 residents	12	40%	16	53%	2	7%	30
50,000 or more residents	4	33%	8	67%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	4	50%	4	50%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	37	60%	23	37%	2	3%	62
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	16	50%	12	38%	4	13%	32
District 2	18	56%	11	34%	3	9%	32
District 3	28	40%	38	54%	4	6%	70
District 4	26	50%	24	46%	2	4%	52
Metro	35	39%	51	57%	4	4%	90
District 6	19	41%	22	48%	5	11%	46
District 7	25	45%	28	50%	3	5%	56
District 8	27	52%	21	40%	4	8%	52

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

**27. How important is whether the system requires the assistance of an outside consultant to implement and/or use when deciding which asset management system(s) to use?**

	Extremely important		Somewhat Important		Not at all important		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>436</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	141	57%	83	33%	24	10%	248
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	31	28%	68	62%	11	10%	110
Counties	41	54%	31	41%	4	5%	76
State agencies (3)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	141	57%	83	33%	24	10%	248
5,000-19,999 residents	18	26%	43	63%	7	10%	68
20,000-49,999 residents	10	33%	20	67%	0	0%	30
50,000 or more residents	3	25%	5	42%	4	33%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	2	25%	5	63%	1	13%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	38	60%	23	37%	2	3%	63
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	18	56%	12	38%	2	6%	32
District 2	20	61%	11	33%	2	6%	33
District 3	30	43%	37	53%	3	4%	70
District 4	34	64%	15	28%	4	8%	53
Metro	28	30%	55	60%	9	10%	92
District 6	24	51%	13	28%	10	21%	47
District 7	28	50%	25	45%	3	5%	56
District 8	31	61%	14	27%	6	12%	51

## Asset Management Tools and Systems

**27. How important is having adequate staff skills and capacity to implement and use the system when deciding which asset management system(s) to use?**

	Extremely important		Somewhat Important		Not at all important		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>438</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	176	70%	60	24%	14	6%	250
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	81	74%	29	26%	0	0%	110
Counties	58	76%	15	20%	3	4%	76
State agencies (3)	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	176	70%	60	24%	14	6%	250
5,000-19,999 residents	47	69%	21	31%	0	0%	68
20,000-49,999 residents	24	80%	6	20%	0	0%	30
50,000 or more residents	10	83%	2	17%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	50	79%	10	16%	3	5%	63
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	33
District 2	26	79%	5	15%	2	6%	33
District 3	48	69%	19	27%	3	4%	70
District 4	38	72%	11	21%	4	8%	53
Metro	61	67%	27	30%	3	3%	91
District 6	34	69%	13	27%	2	4%	49
District 7	45	80%	10	18%	1	2%	56
District 8	35	69%	14	27%	2	4%	51



## Asset Management Tools and Systems databases when deciding which asset

**27. How important is the ability for the system to interact with other management system(s) to use?**

	Extremely important		Somewhat Important		Not at all important		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>430</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	82	33%	116	47%	47	19%	245
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	52	47%	55	50%	3	3%	110
Counties	31	42%	40	54%	3	4%	74
State agencies (3)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>Cities by population</b>							
Fewer than 5,000 residents	82	33%	116	47%	47	19%	245
5,000-19,999 residents	29	43%	37	54%	2	3%	68
20,000-49,999 residents	15	50%	14	47%	1	3%	30
50,000 or more residents	8	67%	4	33%	0	0%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>							
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	3	38%	5	63%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	26	43%	32	52%	3	5%	61
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>							
District 1	15	47%	13	41%	4	13%	32
District 2	13	39%	15	45%	5	15%	33
District 3	20	29%	39	56%	11	16%	70
District 4	18	35%	27	52%	7	13%	52
Metro	34	38%	50	56%	6	7%	90
District 6	16	35%	25	54%	5	11%	46
District 7	25	45%	22	39%	9	16%	56
District 8	24	48%	20	40%	6	12%	50

## Asset Management Reflections

### 1C. What are the primary reasons your jurisdiction practices Asset Management? (Check all that apply)

	Inventory and map infrastructure		Preserve, maintain, and extend infrastructure life		Track infrastructure work orders		Budget infrastructure life cycle; including capital, maintenance, and operational phases		Improve agency efficiency and effectiveness and manage long-term risk		Fulfill GASB34 requirements		Other (please specify)		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	163	65%	228	91%	44	18%	171	68%	100	40%	82	33%	7	3%	250
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	50	46%	98	90%	7	6%	71	65%	20	18%	18	17%	2	2%	109
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	79	90%	82	93%	30	34%	62	70%	50	57%	43	49%	2	2%	88
Counties	33	65%	46	90%	6	12%	36	71%	28	55%	21	41%	2	4%	51
State agencies (3)	1	50%	2	100%	1	50%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	1	50%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>															
Fewer than 5,000 residents	50	46%	98	90%	7	6%	71	65%	20	18%	18	17%	2	2%	109
5,000-19,999 residents	39	87%	42	93%	7	16%	29	64%	22	49%	23	51%	1	2%	45
20,000-49,999 residents	26	90%	27	93%	13	45%	23	79%	17	59%	13	45%	1	3%	29
50,000 or more residents	14	100%	13	93%	10	71%	10	71%	11	79%	7	50%	0	0%	14
<b>Counties by geography</b>															
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	5	100%	5	100%	3	60%	5	100%	2	40%	3	60%	1	20%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	6	75%	6	75%	1	13%	7	88%	6	75%	4	50%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	22	58%	35	92%	2	5%	24	63%	20	53%	14	37%	1	3%	38
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>															
District 1	8	47%	16	94%	3	18%	7	41%	5	29%	4	24%	0	0%	17
District 2	6	43%	10	71%	2	14%	10	71%	4	29%	4	29%	0	0%	14
District 3	26	65%	35	88%	4	10%	27	68%	16	40%	14	35%	2	5%	40
District 4	15	58%	25	96%	3	12%	19	73%	5	19%	4	15%	0	0%	26
Metro	69	95%	68	93%	25	34%	56	77%	38	52%	30	41%	2	3%	73
District 6	12	48%	23	92%	2	8%	18	72%	11	44%	9	36%	0	0%	25
District 7	12	46%	24	92%	3	12%	16	62%	10	38%	10	38%	2	8%	26
District 8	14	52%	25	93%	1	4%	16	59%	9	33%	7	26%	0	0%	27

## Asset Management Reflections

### 3. What are the top 1-2 reasons your jurisdiction does not practice Asset Management?

	Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)		Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)		Counties		All survey respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Limited funds/budget	46	35%	5	31%	4	22%	55	34%
Small jurisdiction	47	36%	3	19%	3	17%	53	32%
Inadequate staff	26	20%	5	31%	6	33%	37	23%
Other	23	18%	3	19%	2	11%	28	17%
Lack of time	10	8%	1	6%	6	33%	17	10%
Not familiar with it	11	8%	1	6%	0	0%	12	7%
What we do now works	5	4%	4	25%	2	11%	11	7%
Unnecessary for a small jurisdiction	8	6%	1	6%	2	11%	11	7%
Resource constraints	7	5%	0	0%	1	6%	8	5%
In progress	5	4%	1	6%	0	0%	6	4%
Lack of software	1	1%	0	0%	3	17%	4	2%
Rural setting	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	1	1%
<b>N of respondents</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Asset Management Reflections

**28. On a scale of 1-5, with “1” being not very effective and “5” being very effective, how would you rate your agency’s Asset Management practices overall?**

	1 - Not very effective		2		3		4		5 - Very effective		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
<b>All survey respondents</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>447</b>
Cities with fewer than 5,000 residents (1)	67	26%	60	23%	91	35%	32	12%	7	3%	257
Cities with 5,000 or more residents (2)	1	1%	21	19%	60	53%	29	26%	2	2%	113
Counties	9	12%	24	32%	24	32%	18	24%	0	0%	75
State agencies (3)	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2
<b>Cities by population</b>											
Fewer than 5,000 residents	67	26%	60	23%	91	35%	32	12%	7	3%	257
5,000-19,999 residents	1	1%	14	20%	38	54%	16	23%	1	1%	70
20,000-49,999 residents	0	0%	7	23%	14	45%	10	32%	0	0%	31
50,000 or more residents	0	0%	0	0%	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	12
<b>Counties by geography</b>											
Seven-county Twin Cities metro (4)	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	5
Greater MN - Counties with 60,000 or more residents (5)	0	0%	3	38%	2	25%	3	38%	0	0%	8
Greater MN - Counties with less than 60,000 residents (6)	9	15%	20	32%	20	32%	13	21%	0	0%	62
<b>Counties and cities by MNDOT district</b>											
District 1	6	18%	8	24%	16	48%	3	9%	0	0%	33
District 2	5	14%	10	28%	14	39%	5	14%	2	6%	36
District 3	14	19%	17	24%	25	35%	14	19%	2	3%	72
District 4	14	26%	10	19%	21	40%	8	15%	0	0%	53
Metro	5	5%	17	18%	40	43%	29	31%	3	3%	94
District 6	10	20%	14	29%	18	37%	7	14%	0	0%	49
District 7	11	20%	15	27%	22	39%	8	14%	0	0%	56
District 8	12	23%	14	27%	19	37%	5	10%	2	4%	52

# Appendix

## 2015 Survey instrument

MN2050

2015 State of the Infrastructure survey

### Email invitation

Hi, [NAME] –

In partnership with the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the City and County Engineer Associations, Minnesota 2050 (MN2050) gathering information about public infrastructure assets, statewide.

The information you provide in this survey regarding the ways in which you manage assets in [JURISDICTION] is critical for understanding current and future infrastructure asset management needs in Minnesota. To answer questions in the survey, you will need information pertaining to:

- Which departments are involved in Asset Management in [JURISDICTION]
- Asset Management software used in [JURISDICTION]
- Whether public infrastructure assets in [JURISDICTION] are mapped, valued, and inventoried

If you are not the right person to answer questions about infrastructure asset management in [JURISDICTION], please forward this email to the right person if you know who it is, or contact Ryan Evans (info below) if you are not sure who the right person is to take this survey for [JURISDICTION]. We only want one completed survey per jurisdiction.

**Click here to complete the survey: (insert URL here). Please complete the survey by Tuesday, June 23.**

MN2050 (MN2050.org) is a coalition of partners comprising engineering and infrastructure professional organizations working in the public, private, and educational sectors and striving to provide Minnesota citizens with dependable infrastructure that meets the needs of the 21st century. The mission of MN2050 is to educate Minnesota citizens about the importance of investing in public infrastructure. Among the goals of MN2050 is gaining up-to-date knowledge from professionals regarding the public infrastructure assets throughout Minnesota.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Ryan Evans at ryan.evans@wilder.org or 651.280.2677.

*For cities (greater than 5k)*

Klayton Eckles

City of Woodbury

City Engineers Association of Minnesota president

*For counties*  
John Welle  
Aitkin County  
Minnesota County Engineers Association president

*For cities (less than 5k)*  
Tom Eggum  
MN2050

## **Survey introduction**

Thank you in advance for completing this survey. If you are completing this survey, you should have a working understanding of how public infrastructure assets are managed in [JURISDICTION]. The intent of this survey is to learn how agencies are managing their assets; however, many agencies in Minnesota effectively manage their public infrastructure assets without a formal asset management plan or using asset management software.

If you are not the right person to answer questions about infrastructure asset management in [JURISDICTION], please forward the email with the survey invitation and link to the right person if you know who it is, or contact Ryan Evans from Wilder Research at [ryan.evans@wilder.org](mailto:ryan.evans@wilder.org) if you are not sure who the right person is to take this survey for [JURISDICTION]. We only want one completed survey per jurisdiction.

For this survey, “public infrastructure assets” refers to roads, bridges, transit lines, traffic fixtures, buildings, water pipes, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, storm ponds, airports, ports, railways, electrical systems, solid waste facilities, and natural gas networks.

For this survey, Asset Management is a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving physical assets, with a focus on engineering and economic analysis based upon quality and quantitative information, to identify a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that will achieve and sustain a desired state of good repair over the lifecycle of the assets at minimum practicable cost.

An Asset Management Plan (AMP) is a strategy developed to cost-effectively manage all of an agency’s infrastructure to an agreed level of performance over the life cycle of the assets.

Because our mission is to educate the public, aggregated results of this survey will be made available on the MN2050 website. We also will use survey results in a research project involving MnDOT, MN2050, the University of Minnesota, and interested state agencies.

You can stop the survey and start again at any time. By clicking on the link your email it will pick up right where you left off.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Ryan Evans at [ryan.evans@wilder.org](mailto:ryan.evans@wilder.org) or 651.280.2677. If you are having technical problems with this web survey, please contact Dan Swanson at [dan.swanson@wilder.org](mailto:dan.swanson@wilder.org) or 651-280-2712.

Please only use the buttons below to move through the survey, not your browser's Forward or Back buttons.

## INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW

1. Does your organization use Asset Management practices to operate, maintain, and extend the life of infrastructure assets in [JURISDICTION]?

For this survey, Asset Management is a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving physical assets, with a focus on engineering and economic analysis based upon quality and quantitative information, to identify a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that will achieve and sustain a desired state of good repair over the lifecycle of the assets at minimum practicable cost.

☐<sup>1</sup> Yes

☐<sup>2</sup> No (SKIP TO Q3)

- 1A. From [JURISDICTION], who participates at any level in Asset Management? Mark all that apply.

☐<sup>1</sup> Engineering personnel

☐<sup>2</sup> Finance personnel

☐<sup>3</sup> GIS personnel

☐<sup>4</sup> Data Processing personnel

☐<sup>5</sup> Planning personnel

☐<sup>6</sup> Other personnel – please specify department: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1B. Which department leads Asset Management at [JURISDICTION]?

☐<sup>1</sup> Engineering

☐<sup>2</sup> Finance

☐<sup>3</sup> GIS

☐<sup>4</sup> Data Processing

☐<sup>5</sup> Planning

☐<sup>6</sup> Other – please specify department: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1C. What are the top 1-2 reasons that your jurisdiction practices Asset Management?

---

---

2. Does [JURISDICTION] have an Asset Management Plan?

☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we have completed a plan

☐<sup>2</sup> We have started a plan, but it is not completed

☐<sup>3</sup> No, but we are currently looking considering implementing a plan

☐<sup>4</sup> No, we have not considered or started a plan

3. Does [JURISDICTION] use the GASB34 (Government Accounting Standards Board No. 34) to report infrastructure assets?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No (At survey completion, provide this link: <http://www.gasb.org/st/summary/gstsm34.html>)
- ☐<sup>-8</sup> I don't know and/or am not familiar with the GASB34
4. Does [JURISDICTION] use the ISO 55000 (International Organization for Standardization 55000) to provide a lifecycle management of infrastructure assets?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No (At survey completion, provide this link: [http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue\\_detail?csnumber=55088](http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail?csnumber=55088))
- ☐<sup>-8</sup> I don't know and/or am not familiar with the ISO 55000
5. Are you aware of the MAP-21 asset management requirements? MAP-21 stands for "Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century," and refers to the Federal Highway System requirement for each state to develop a risk-based asset management plan for improvement of state assets and infrastructure system.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No (At survey completion, provide this link: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/qandas/qaassetmgmt.cfm>)
- ☐<sup>-8</sup> I don't know and/or am not familiar with the MAP-21
6. Does [JURISDICTION] create as-built drawings after infrastructure construction or repair projects?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, for **all** construction and repair projects
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, for **some** construction and repair projects
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No
7. Does [JURISDICTION] participate in an Asset Management countywide or other consortium?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No



## INDIVIDUAL ASSET INVENTORY TYPES

8. Which of the following infrastructure assets do you have in [JURISDICTION]?

Please select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Roads
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Bridges
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Transit lines
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Traffic fixtures (signs, signals, lights, etc.)
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Buildings
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Water supply and distribution pipes (water pipes)
- ☐<sup>7</sup> Waste water collection and treatment (sanitary sewers)
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Storm sewers
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Storm ponds
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Airports
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Ports (i.e., for watercraft)
- ☐<sup>12</sup> Railways (for freight or transit)
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Electrical systems
- ☐<sup>14</sup> Solid waste facilities
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Natural gas network

9A. Are there any other types of public infrastructure assets that are managed by [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No (SKIP TO Q10B)

9B. What other type of public infrastructure assets are included in [JURISDICTION]? Please specify:

---

*NOTE: The following series of questions (i.e., Q10B-10G) are asked for each asset type selected in Q8. For instance, if a respondent selects "Bridges" in Q8, Q11B will read: "Are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped?"*

### **Roads**

This section of the survey focuses on roads in [JURISDICTION].

Mapped

10B. Are roads in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, roads are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, roads are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, roads are not mapped (SKIP TO Q10D)

10C. In what software program are roads in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

## Value

10D. Do you know the value of roads in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** roads
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** roads (SKIP TO Q10F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any roads (SKIP TO Q10F)

10E. What is the value of all roads in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

## Inventory

10F. Which other information about roads is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about roads. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

10G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve roads in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for roads in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Bridges**

This section of the survey focuses on bridges in [JURISDICTION].

### **Mapped**

11B. Are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, bridges are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, bridges are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, bridges are not mapped (SKIP TO Q11D)

11C. In what software program are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

### **Value**

11D. Do you know the value of bridges in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** bridges
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** bridges (SKIP TO Q11F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any bridges (SKIP TO Q11F)

11E. What is the value of all bridges in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

### **Inventory**

11F. Which other information about bridges is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of bridges in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of bridges in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of bridges in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of bridges in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about bridges. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### **System**

11G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve bridges in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for bridges in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks

- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Transit lines***

This section of the survey focuses on transit lines in [JURISDICTION].

#### **Mapped**

12B. Are transit lines in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, transit lines are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, transit lines are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, transit lines are not mapped (SKIP TO Q12D)

12C. In what software program are transit lines in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

#### **Value**

12D. Do you know the value of transit lines in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** transit lines
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** transit lines (SKIP TO Q12F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any transit lines (SKIP TO Q12F)

11E. What is the value of all transit lines in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

## Inventory

12F. Which other information about transit lines is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about transit lines. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

12G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve transit lines in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for transit lines in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Traffic fixtures

This section of the survey focuses on traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

13B. Are traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, traffic fixtures are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, traffic fixtures are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, traffic fixtures are not mapped (SKIP TO Q13D)

13C. In what software program are traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

#### Value

13D. Do you know the value of traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** traffic fixtures
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** traffic fixtures (SKIP TO Q13F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any traffic fixtures (SKIP TO Q13F)

13E. What is the value of all traffic fixtures in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

#### Inventory

13F. Which other information about traffic fixtures is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about traffic fixtures. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

#### System

13G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs

- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Buildings**

This section of the survey focuses on buildings in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

- 14B. Are buildings in [JURISDICTION] mapped?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, buildings are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, buildings are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, buildings are not mapped (SKIP TO Q14D)
- 14C. In what software program are buildings in [JURISDICTION] mapped?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

### Value

- 14D. Do you know the value of buildings in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** buildings
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** buildings (SKIP TO Q14F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any buildings (SKIP TO Q14F)
- 14E. What is the value of all buildings in your jurisdiction?
- \$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

### Inventory

- 14F. Which other information about buildings is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about buildings. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

14G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve buildings in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for buildings in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## ***Water supply and distribution pipes***

This section of the survey focuses on water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION].

## Mapped

15B. Are water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, water supply and distribution pipes are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, water supply and distribution pipes are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, water supply and distribution pipes are not mapped (SKIP TO Q15D)

15C. In what software program are water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)



## Value

- 15D. Do you know the value of water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** water supply and distribution pipes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** water supply and distribution pipes (SKIP TO Q15F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any water supply and distribution pipes (SKIP TO Q15F)
- 15E. What is the value of all water supply and distribution pipes in your jurisdiction?  
\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

## Inventory

- 15F. Which other information about water supply and distribution pipes is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about water supply and distribution pipes. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

- 15G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs

- ☐ <sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐ <sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐ <sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐ <sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Waste water and treatment assets**

This section of the survey focuses on waste water and treatment assets in [JURISDICTION].

#### **Mapped**

- 16B. Are waste water and treatment assets in [JURISDICTION] mapped?
- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, waste water and treatment assets are **fully** mapped
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, waste water and treatment assets are **partially** mapped
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, waste water and treatment assets are not mapped (SKIP TO Q16D)
- 16C. In what software program are waste water and treatment assets in [JURISDICTION] mapped?
- ☐ <sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

#### **Value**

- 16D. Do you know the value of waste water and treatment assets in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.
- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** waste water and treatment assets
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** waste water and treatment assets (SKIP TO Q16F)
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any waste water and treatment assets (SKIP TO Q16F)
- 16E. What is the value of all waste water and treatment assets in your jurisdiction?  
\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

#### **Inventory**

- 16F. Which other information about waste water and treatment assets is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.
- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Condition of waste water and treatment assets in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Age of waste water and treatment assets in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> Material of waste water and treatment assets in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>4</sup> Size of waste water and treatment assets in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about waste water and treatment assets. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

16G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve waste water and treatment assets in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for waste water and treatment assets in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Storm sewers

This section of the survey focuses on storm sewers in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

17B. Are storm sewers in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, storm sewers are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, storm sewers are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, storm sewers are not mapped (SKIP TO Q17D)

17C. In what software program are storm sewers in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

## Value

17D. Do you know the value of storm sewers in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** storm sewers
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** storm sewers (SKIP TO Q17F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any storm sewers (SKIP TO Q17F)

17E. What is the value of all storm sewers in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

## Inventory

17F. Which other information about storm sewers is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about storm sewers. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

17G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve storm sewers in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for storm sewers in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Storm ponds

This section of the survey focuses on storm ponds in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

18B. Are storm ponds in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, storm ponds are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, storm ponds are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, storm ponds are not mapped (SKIP TO Q18D)

18C. In what software program are storm ponds in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

### Value

18D. Do you know the value of storm ponds in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** storm ponds
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** storm ponds (SKIP TO Q18F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any storm ponds (SKIP TO Q18F)

18E. What is the value of all storm ponds in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

### Inventory

18F. Which other information about storm ponds is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about storm ponds. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### System

18G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve storm ponds in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for storm ponds in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX

- ☐ <sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐ <sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐ <sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐ <sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐ <sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐ <sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐ <sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐ <sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐ <sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐ <sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐ <sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐ <sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐ <sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐ <sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Airports**

This section of the survey focuses on airports in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

19B. Are airports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, airports are **fully** mapped
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, airports are **partially** mapped
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, airports are not mapped (SKIP TO Q19D)

19C. In what software program are airports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

### Value

19D. Do you know the value of airports in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** airports
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** airports (SKIP TO Q19F)
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any airports (SKIP TO Q19F)

19E. What is the value of all airports in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

## Inventory

19F. Which other information about airports is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about airports. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

19G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve airports in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for airports in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Ports

This section of the survey focuses on ports in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

20B. Are ports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, ports are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, ports are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, ports are not mapped (SKIP TO Q20D)

20C. In what software program are ports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)

☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

#### Value

20D. Do you know the value of ports in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** ports

☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** ports (SKIP TO Q20F)

☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any ports (SKIP TO Q20F)

20E. What is the value of all ports in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

#### Inventory

20F. Which other information about ports is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of ports in our jurisdiction

☐<sup>2</sup> Age of ports in our jurisdiction

☐<sup>3</sup> Material of ports in our jurisdiction

☐<sup>4</sup> Size of ports in our jurisdiction

☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about ports. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

#### System

20G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve ports in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for ports in [JURISDICTION].

☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets

☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph

☐<sup>4</sup> City Services

☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks

☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX

☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database

☐<sup>8</sup> Icon

☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM

☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek

☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder

☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo

☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS

☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations

☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks

☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs



- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Railways**

This section of the survey focuses on railways in [JURISDICTION].

### **Mapped**

21B. Are railways in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, railways are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, railways are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, railways are not mapped (SKIP TO Q21D)

21C. In what software program are railways in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

### **Value**

21D. Do you know the value of railways in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** railways
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** railways (SKIP TO Q21F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any railways (SKIP TO Q21F)

21E. What is the value of all railways in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

### **Inventory**

21F. Which other information about railways is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about railways. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## System

21G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve railways in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for railways in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Electrical systems**

This section of the survey focuses on electrical systems in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

22B. Are electrical systems in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, electrical systems are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, electrical systems are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, electrical systems are not mapped (SKIP TO Q22D)

22C. In what software program are electrical systems in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

## Value

22D. Do you know the value of electrical systems in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** electrical systems
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** electrical systems (SKIP TO Q22F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any electrical systems (SKIP TO Q22F)

22E. What is the value of all electrical systems in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

## Inventory

22F. Which other information about electrical systems is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about electrical systems. Please specify:  
\_\_\_\_\_

## System

22G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve electrical systems in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for electrical systems in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel

☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper

☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Solid waste facilities**

This section of the survey focuses on solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION].

#### Mapped

23B. Are solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, solid waste facilities are **fully** mapped  
☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, solid waste facilities are **partially** mapped  
☐<sup>3</sup> No, solid waste facilities are not mapped (SKIP TO Q23D)

23C. In what software program are solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)  
☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

#### Value

23D. Do you know the value of solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** solid waste facilities  
☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** solid waste facilities (SKIP TO Q23F)  
☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any solid waste facilities (SKIP TO Q23F)

23E. What is the value of all solid waste facilities in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

#### Inventory

23F. Which other information about solid waste facilities is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>2</sup> Age of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>3</sup> Material of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>4</sup> Size of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about solid waste facilities. Please specify:  
\_\_\_\_\_

## System

23G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Natural gas network

This section of the survey focuses on natural gas network in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

24B. Are natural gas network in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, natural gas network are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, natural gas network are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, natural gas network are not mapped (SKIP TO Q24D)

24C. In what software program are natural gas network in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> GIS (Geographic Information System software)
- ☐<sup>2</sup> CAD (Computer-aided design software)

## Value

24D. Do you know the value of natural gas network in [JURISDICTION]? We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** natural gas network
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** natural gas network (SKIP TO Q24F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any natural gas network (SKIP TO Q24F)

24E. What is the value of all natural gas network in your jurisdiction?

\$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

## Inventory

24F. Which other information about natural gas network is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about natural gas network. Please specify:  
\_\_\_\_\_

## System

24G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve natural gas network in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all the apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for natural gas network in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks

☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel

☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper

☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## REFLECTIONS ON ASSET MANAGEMENT

26A. (SKIP IF R DOES NOT USE A SYSTEM – SEE: Q10G-24G) Thinking of the asset management system(s) that you currently use, how important were the following factors when deciding to use that system?

	Extremely important	Somewhat Important	Not at all important
Ease of using the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Cost of the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Ability of the system to handle multiple asset types	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Length of time necessary to set up the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Whether the system required the assistance of an outside consultant to implement and/or use	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Having adequate staff skills and capacity to implement and use the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
The ability for the system to interact with other databases	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>

26B. On a scale of 1-5, with “1” being not very effective and “5” being very effective, how would you rate your agency’s Asset Management practices overall?

Not very effective

Very effective

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

27. Is there anything that we didn’t ask about in this survey that you think is critical for implementing and using Asset Management?

29A. What is the gap between your annual infrastructure investment needs and your available funds? \$ 0000000 (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

30. In the past two years, have you completed any other Asset Management surveys?

☐<sup>1</sup> Yes

☐<sup>2</sup> No (SKIP TO Q31)

- 30A. Would you be willing to share a copy of the Asset Management survey you completed in the past two years or connect us with someone who can send us a copy?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes → After you complete this survey, please email the other survey you took to Ryan Evans at [ryan.evans@wilder.org](mailto:ryan.evans@wilder.org) or send any information to him about the survey.
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No

31. Would you be willing to have a short follow-up phone conversation with someone from MN2050 to talk more about this survey and [JURISDICTION]'s Asset Management practices?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No

Thank you for completing this survey!



## MN 2050 Codebook

Q1A. From [JURISDICTION], who participates at any level in Asset Management? Mark all that apply.  
(CODE – 3)

Precoded responses:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Engineering personnel
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Finance personnel
- ☐<sup>3</sup> GIS personnel
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Data Processing personnel
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Planning personnel
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Other personnel – please specify department: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

- 10. Public Works
- 11. Maintenance
- 12. Administration
- 13. Utilities
- 14. Streets
- 15. Parks
- 16. City Council/Clerk
  
- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

Q1B. Which department leads Asset Management at [JURISDICTION]? (CODE – 1)

Precoded responses:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Engineering
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Finance
- ☐<sup>3</sup> GIS
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Data Processing
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Planning
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Other – please specify department: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

- 10. Public Works
- 11. Administration
- 12. Split up by individual departments
- 13. City Council/Clerk/Manager

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

Q1C. What are the top 1-2 reasons that your jurisdiction practices Asset Management? (CODE – 2)

Coded responses:

- 10. Planning (non-specific)
- 11. Budgeting/cost-effectiveness/Capital Improvement Planning
- 12. Prioritizing maintenance/efficiency/better maintenance
- 13. Operational needs (non-specific)
- 14. Asset preservation/maintain infrastructure/extend life of assets
- 15. Tracking/mapping/documentation of assets and asset condition
- 16. Audit requirements/reporting

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

Q9B. What other type of public infrastructure assets are included in [JURISDICTION]? Please specify:  
(CODE – 3)

[Response options from Q8 for back coding]

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Airports
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Bridges
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Transit lines
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Traffic fixtures (signs, signals, lights, etc.)
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Buildings
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Water supply and distribution pipes (water pipes)
- ☐<sup>7</sup> Waste water collection and treatment (sanitary sewers)
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Storm sewers
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Storm ponds
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Airports
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Ports (i.e., for watercraft)
- ☐<sup>12</sup> Railways (for freight or transit)
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Electrical systems
- ☐<sup>14</sup> Solid waste facilities
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Natural gas network

Coded responses:

20. Parks/Park assets & facilities

21. Trails

22. Fiber Optics

-2. Nothing/None/No

-3. Other

-5. Non-response answer

-6. Missing

-7. Refused

-8. Don't know

-9. Not applicable

Q10F-Q24F.

Which other information about \_\_\_\_\_ is included in your asset inventory? Mark all that apply.  
(CODE – 3)

Precoded responses:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of \_\_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of \_\_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of \_\_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of \_\_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about \_\_\_\_\_. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

10. Maintenance history/records
11. Utilities
12. Inspection records
13. Location
14. Valves
15. Hydrants
16. Pressure
17. Water main breaks
18. Flow direction

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

Q10G-Q24G.

Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve \_\_\_\_\_ in [JURISDICTION]. Mark all that apply. (CODE – 3)

Precoded responses:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for \_\_\_\_\_ in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>4</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>5</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>7</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>11</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>12</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>14</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>16</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>18</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>19</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>21</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here.

Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

30. Archibus

31. Oracle
32. CAD/AutoCAD
33. Element XS
34. Beehive
35. Arc View
36. Access database
37. Dbase
38. IMaint
39. Laserfiche
40. Other GIS system
41. PASER
42. Road Pro
43. RTVision
44. SWAMP
45. Pontis
46. Famis

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

Q27. Is there anything that we didn't ask about in this survey that you think is critical for implementing and using Asset Management? (CODE – 3)

Coded responses:

10. Connect capital to maintenance operations
11. Challenges with staffing
12. Challenges with cost/lack of resources
13. Coordinate/share information/data

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

## 2016 Survey instrument

MN2050

2016 State of the Infrastructure survey

### Survey introduction

Thank you in advance for completing this 2016 State of the Infrastructure survey.

This information will be used by MN2050 to update our 2015 survey in order to provide a more complete picture of Minnesota infrastructure for professional engineering associations and engineers, state agencies, and others to address infrastructure asset management needs and gaps in Minnesota.

**Please note:** You can stop the survey and re-start again at any time. By clicking on the link in your email it will pick up right where you left off. The survey takes about 20 minutes depending on your responses. You may choose to email yourself a summary of your survey responses at the end of the survey.

If you completed this survey in 2015, your answers to some of the more difficult questions will be provided for your reference. These include questions regarding the value of each asset type in your jurisdiction and the gap between your annual infrastructure investment needs and your available funds.

Because our mission is to educate the public, results of this survey will be made available on the MN2050 website at [mn2050.org/survey](http://mn2050.org/survey). We also will use survey results in a research project involving MnDOT, MN2050, the University of Minnesota, and interested state agencies.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Anna Bartholomay at [anna.bartholomay@wilder.org](mailto:anna.bartholomay@wilder.org) or 651.280.2701. If you are having technical problems with this web survey, please contact Dan Swanson at [dan.swanson@wilder.org](mailto:dan.swanson@wilder.org) or 651-280-2712.

### INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW

1. Does your organization use Asset Management practices to operate, maintain, and extend the life of infrastructure assets in [JURISDICTION]?

For this survey, Asset Management is a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving physical assets, with a focus on engineering and economic analysis based upon quality and quantitative information, to identify a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that will achieve and sustain a desired state of good repair over the lifecycle of the assets at minimum practicable cost.

☐<sup>1</sup> Yes

☐<sup>2</sup> No (SKIP TO Q3)

- 1A. From [JURISDICTION], who participates at any level in Asset Management? (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Engineering/Public Works personnel
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Finance personnel
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> GIS personnel
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Data Processing personnel
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Planning personnel
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> Other personnel – please specify department: \_\_\_\_\_
- 1B. Which department leads Asset Management at [JURISDICTION]? (Pick one)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Engineering/Public Works
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Finance
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> GIS
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Data Processing
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Planning
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> Other – please specify department: \_\_\_\_\_
- 1C. What are the primary reasons your jurisdiction practices Asset Management? (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Inventory and map infrastructure
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Preserve, maintain, and extend infrastructure life
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> Track infrastructure work orders
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Budget infrastructure life cycle; including capital, maintenance, and operational phases
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Improve agency efficiency and effectiveness and manage long-term risk
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> Fulfill GASB34 requirements
  - ☐<sup>7</sup> Other – please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does [JURISDICTION] have an Asset Management Plan?

An Asset Management Plan (AMP) is a strategy developed to cost-effectively manage all of an agency's infrastructure to an agreed level of performance over the life cycle of the assets.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we have completed a plan
- ☐<sup>2</sup> We have started a plan, but it is not completed
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, but we are currently considering implementing a plan
- ☐<sup>4</sup> No, we have not considered or started a plan

3. [SKIP if answered yes to Q1] What are the top 1-2 reasons that your jurisdiction does not practice Asset Management?

---



---

4. How does [JURISDICTION] place a value on infrastructure assets? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> (Past) constructed value
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Current value
- ☐<sup>3</sup> (Future) construction value
- ☐<sup>4</sup> GASB34
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Other – please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

5. What is the gap between your annual infrastructure investment needs and [JURISDICTION]'s available funds?

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the gap between your annual infrastructure investment need and your available funds.*

6. Regarding asset management systems, is the goal of [JURISDICTION] to have:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> One asset management system for all assets managed
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Two or more asset management systems for assets managed
- ☐<sup>3</sup> My jurisdiction does not use systems

7A. Does [JURISDICTION] create as-built drawings after infrastructure construction or repair projects?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, for **all** construction and repair projects
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, for **some** construction and repair projects
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No

7B. Does [JURISDICTION] participate in an Asset Management countywide or other consortium?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No

7C. [If yes to Q7B] Does your consortium share electronic base maps, i.e., property aerials, planimetrics, topos?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Don't know

7D. [If yes to Q7B] Does your consortium share asset management systems?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Don't know

7E. [If yes to Q7B] Does your consortium share personnel?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes
- ☐<sup>2</sup> No
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Don't know



## INDIVIDUAL ASSET INVENTORY TYPES

8. Which of the following infrastructure assets do you have in [JURISDICTION]?

Please select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Roads
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Bridges
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Transit lines
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Traffic fixtures (signs, signals, lights, pedestrian ramps, etc.)
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Buildings
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Drinking water supply and distribution pipes (water pipes)
- ☐<sup>7</sup> Waste water collection and treatment (sanitary sewers)
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Storm sewers (pipes, culverts, drainage ditches)
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Storm ponds
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Airports
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Ports (for watercraft)
- ☐<sup>12</sup> Railways (for freight or transit)
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Electrical systems (including fiber optics)
- ☐<sup>14</sup> Solid waste facilities (including recycling)
- ☐<sup>15</sup> Natural gas network
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Parks (trees, trails, buildings, furniture)
- ☐<sup>17</sup> Fleet

9. What software tools does your [JURISDICTION] use to manage assets?

Please select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Access database
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Arc View
- ☐<sup>3</sup> CAD/AutoCAD
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Dbase
- ☐<sup>5</sup> ESRI GIS
- ☐<sup>6</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>7</sup> Georilla
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Laserfiche
- ☐<sup>9</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Oracle
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>12</sup> We are using an asset management tool not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

*NOTE: The following series of questions are asked for each asset type selected in Q8. For instance, if a respondent selects "Bridges" in Q8, Q10 will read: "Are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped?"*

## Roads

10A. This section of the survey focuses on roads in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

10B. Are roads in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, roads are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, roads are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, roads are not mapped (SKIP TO Q10D)

10C. In what software tools are roads in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

### Value

10D. Do you know the value of roads in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** roads
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** roads (SKIP TO Q10F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any roads (SKIP TO Q10F)

10E. What is the value of all roads in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of roads in your jurisdiction.*

### Inventory

10F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about roads? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of roads in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about roads. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about roads

## System

10G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve roads in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for roads in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Bridges

11A. This section of the survey focuses on bridges in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

11B. Are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, bridges are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, bridges are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, bridges are not mapped (SKIP TO Q11D)

- 11C. In what software tools are bridges in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### Value

- 11D. Do you know the value of bridges in [JURISDICTION]?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** bridges
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** bridges (SKIP TO Q11F)
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any bridges (SKIP TO Q11F)

- 11E. What is the value of all bridges in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of bridges in your jurisdiction.*

#### Inventory

- 11F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about bridges? Select all that apply.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of bridges in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of bridges in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of bridges in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of bridges in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about bridges. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about bridges

#### System

- 11G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve bridges in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for bridges in [JURISDICTION].
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
  - ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
  - ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX

- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Transit lines***

12A. This section of the survey focuses on transit lines in [JURISDICTION].

#### **Mapped**

12B. Are transit lines in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, transit lines are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, transit lines are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, transit lines are not mapped (SKIP TO Q12D)

12C. In what software tools are transit lines in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### **Value**

12D. Do you know the value of transit lines in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** transit lines
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** transit lines (SKIP TO Q12F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any transit lines (SKIP TO Q12F)

12E. What is the value of all transit lines in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of transit lines in your jurisdiction.*

## Inventory

12F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about transit lines? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of transit lines in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about transit lines. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about transit lines

## System

12G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve transit lines in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for transit lines in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks

- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Traffic fixtures***

13A. This section of the survey focuses on traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION].

#### **Mapped**

13B. Are traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, traffic fixtures are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, traffic fixtures are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, traffic fixtures are not mapped (SKIP TO Q13D)

13C. In what software tools are traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### **Value**

13D. Do you know the value of traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** traffic fixtures
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** traffic fixtures (SKIP TO Q13F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any traffic fixtures (SKIP TO Q13F)

13E. What is the value of all traffic fixtures in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of traffic fixtures in your jurisdiction.*

#### **Inventory**

13F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about traffic fixtures? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of traffic fixtures in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about traffic fixtures. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about traffic fixtures

## System

13G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for traffic fixtures in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_



## **Buildings**

14A. This section of the survey focuses on buildings in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

14B. Are buildings in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, buildings are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, buildings are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, buildings are not mapped (SKIP TO Q14D)

14C. In what software tools are buildings in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

### Value

14D. Do you know the value of buildings in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** buildings
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** buildings (SKIP TO Q14F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any buildings (SKIP TO Q14F)

14E. What is the value of all buildings in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of buildings in your jurisdiction.*

### Inventory

14F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about buildings? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of buildings in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about buildings. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about buildings

### System

14G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve buildings in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for buildings in [JURISDICTION].

☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets

☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus

☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive

☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph

☐<sup>6</sup> City Services

☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks

☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX

☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS

☐<sup>10</sup> Famis

☐<sup>11</sup> Icon

☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint

☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM

☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek

☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder

☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo

☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS

☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations

☐<sup>19</sup> PASER

☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis

☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks

☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro

☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision

☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs

☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP

☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks

☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Drinking water supply and distribution pipes***

15A. This section of the survey focuses on drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION].

Mapped

15B. Are drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, drinking water supply and distribution pipes are **fully** mapped

☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, drinking water supply and distribution pipes are **partially** mapped

☐<sup>3</sup> No, drinking water supply and distribution pipes are not mapped (SKIP TO Q15D)

15C. In what software tools are drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software  
☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software  
☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

## Value

- 15D. Do you know the value of drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION]?  
☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** drinking water supply and distribution pipes  
☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** drinking water supply and distribution pipes (SKIP TO Q15F)  
☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any drinking water supply and distribution pipes (SKIP TO Q15F)

- 15E. What is the value of all drinking water supply and distribution pipes in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of drinking water supply and distribution pipes in your jurisdiction.*

## Inventory

- 15F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about drinking water supply and distribution pipes? Select all that apply.  
☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of drinking water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>2</sup> Age of drinking water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>3</sup> Material of drinking water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>4</sup> Size of drinking water supply and distribution pipes in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about drinking water supply and distribution pipes. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about drinking water supply and distribution pipes

## System

- 15G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)  
☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for drinking water supply and distribution pipes in [JURISDICTION].  
☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets  
☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus  
☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive  
☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph

- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Waste water collection and treatment***

16A. This section of the survey focuses on waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION].

Mapped

16B. Are waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, waste water collection and treatment are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, waste water collection and treatment are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, waste water collection and treatment are not mapped (SKIP TO Q16D)

16C. In what software tools are waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

## Value

- 16D. Do you know the value of waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION]?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** waste water collection and treatment
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** waste water collection and treatment (SKIP TO Q16F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any waste water collection and treatment (SKIP TO Q16F)
- 16E. What is the value of all waste water collection and treatment in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of waste water collection and treatment in your jurisdiction.*

## Inventory

- 16F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about waste water collection and treatment? Select all that apply.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of waste water collection and treatment in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of waste water collection and treatment in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of waste water collection and treatment in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of waste water collection and treatment in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about waste water collection and treatment. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about waste water collection and treatment

## System

- 16G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for waste water collection and treatment in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis

- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Storm sewers**

17A. This section of the survey focuses on storm sewers in [JURISDICTION].

#### Mapped

17B. Are storm sewers in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, storm sewers are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, storm sewers are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, storm sewers are not mapped (SKIP TO Q17D)

17C. In what software tools are storm sewers in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### Value

17D. Do you know the value of storm sewers in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** storm sewers
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** storm sewers (SKIP TO Q17F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any storm sewers (SKIP TO Q17F)

17E. What is the value of all storm sewers in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of storm sewers in your jurisdiction.*

#### Inventory

17F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about storm sewers? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of storm sewers in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about storm sewers. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about storm sewers

#### System

17G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve storm sewers in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for storm sewers in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks

- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Storm ponds**

18A. This section of the survey focuses on storm ponds in [JURISDICTION].

#### **Mapped**

18B. Are storm ponds in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, storm ponds are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, storm ponds are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, storm ponds are not mapped (SKIP TO Q18D)

18C. In what software tools are storm ponds in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### **Value**

18D. Do you know the value of storm ponds in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** storm ponds
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** storm ponds (SKIP TO Q18F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any storm ponds (SKIP TO Q18F)

18E. What is the value of all storm ponds in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of storm ponds in your jurisdiction.*



## Inventory

18F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about storm ponds? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of storm ponds in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about storm ponds. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about storm ponds

## System

18G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve storm ponds in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for storm ponds in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Airports**

19A. This section of the survey focuses on airports in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

19B. Are airports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, airports are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, airports are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, airports are not mapped (SKIP TO Q19D)

19C. In what software tools are airports in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

### Value

19D. Do you know the value of airports in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** airports
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** airports (SKIP TO Q19F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any airports (SKIP TO Q19F)

19E. What is the value of all airports in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of airports in your jurisdiction.*

### Inventory

19F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about airports? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of airports in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about airports. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about airports

## System

19G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve airports in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for airports in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## Ports

20A. This section of the survey focuses on ports in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

20B. Are ports in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, ports are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, ports are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, ports are not mapped (SKIP TO Q20D)

- 20C. In what software tools are ports in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### Value

- 20D. Do you know the value of ports in [JURISDICTION]?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** ports
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** ports (SKIP TO Q20F)
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any ports (SKIP TO Q20F)

- 20E. What is the value of all ports in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of ports in your jurisdiction.*

#### Inventory

- 20F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about ports? Select all that apply.
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of ports in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of ports in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of ports in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of ports in our jurisdiction
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about ports. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about ports

#### System

- 20G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve ports in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for ports in [JURISDICTION].
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
  - ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks

- ☐ <sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐ <sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐ <sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐ <sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐ <sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐ <sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐ <sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐ <sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐ <sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐ <sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐ <sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐ <sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐ <sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐ <sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐ <sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐ <sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐ <sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐ <sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐ <sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐ <sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Railways**

21A. This section of the survey focuses on railways in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

21B. Are railways in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, railways are **fully** mapped
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, railways are **partially** mapped
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, railways are not mapped (SKIP TO Q21D)

21C. In what software tools are railways in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> We don't use software

### Value

21D. Do you know the value of railways in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** railways
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** railways (SKIP TO Q21F)
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any railways (SKIP TO Q21F)

21E. What is the value of all railways in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of railways in your jurisdiction.*

#### Inventory

21F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about railways? Select all that apply.

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Condition of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Age of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> Material of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>4</sup> Size of railways in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about railways. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ <sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about railways

#### System

21G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve railways in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for railways in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐ <sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐ <sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐ <sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐ <sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐ <sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐ <sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐ <sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐ <sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐ <sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐ <sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐ <sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐ <sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐ <sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐ <sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐ <sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐ <sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐ <sup>20</sup> Pontis

- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Electrical systems***

22A. This section of the survey focuses on electrical systems in [JURISDICTION].

Mapped

22B. Are electrical systems in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, electrical systems are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, electrical systems are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, electrical systems are not mapped (SKIP TO Q22D)

22C. In what software tools are electrical systems in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

Value

22D. Do you know the value of electrical systems in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** electrical systems
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** electrical systems (SKIP TO Q22F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any electrical systems (SKIP TO Q22F)

22E. What is the value of all electrical systems in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of electrical systems in your jurisdiction.*

## Inventory

22F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about electrical systems? Select all that apply.

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Condition of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Age of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> Material of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>4</sup> Size of electrical systems in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about electrical systems. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ <sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about electrical systems

## System

22G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve electrical systems in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for electrical systems in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐ <sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐ <sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐ <sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐ <sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐ <sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐ <sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐ <sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐ <sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐ <sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐ <sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐ <sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐ <sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐ <sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐ <sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐ <sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐ <sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐ <sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐ <sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐ <sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐ <sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐ <sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐ <sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐ <sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐ <sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_



## ***Solid waste facilities***

23A. This section of the survey focuses on solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

23B. Are solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, solid waste facilities are **fully** mapped  
☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, solid waste facilities are **partially** mapped  
☐<sup>3</sup> No, solid waste facilities are not mapped (SKIP TO Q23D)

23C. In what software tools are solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software  
☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software  
☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

### Value

23D. Do you know the value of solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** solid waste facilities  
☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** solid waste facilities (SKIP TO Q23F)  
☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any solid waste facilities (SKIP TO Q23F)

23E. What is the value of all solid waste facilities in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of solid waste facilities in your jurisdiction.*

### Inventory

23F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about solid waste facilities? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>2</sup> Age of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>3</sup> Material of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>4</sup> Size of solid waste facilities in our jurisdiction  
☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about solid waste facilities. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about solid waste facilities

## System

- 23G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)
- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for solid waste facilities in [JURISDICTION].
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
  - ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
  - ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
  - ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
  - ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
  - ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
  - ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
  - ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
  - ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
  - ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
  - ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
  - ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
  - ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
  - ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
  - ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
  - ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
  - ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
  - ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
  - ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
  - ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
  - ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
  - ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
  - ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
  - ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
  - ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Natural gas network**

24A. This section of the survey focuses on natural gas network in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

- 24B. Are natural gas network in [JURISDICTION] mapped?
- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, natural gas network are **fully** mapped
  - ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, natural gas network are **partially** mapped
  - ☐<sup>3</sup> No, natural gas network are not mapped (SKIP TO Q24D)

24C. In what software tools are natural gas network in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### Value

24D. Do you know the value of natural gas network in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** natural gas network
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** natural gas network (SKIP TO Q24F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any natural gas network (SKIP TO Q24F)

24E. What is the value of all natural gas network in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of natural gas network in your jurisdiction.*

#### Inventory

24F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about natural gas network? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of natural gas network in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about natural gas network. Please specify:  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about natural gas network

#### System

24G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve natural gas network in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for natural gas network in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services

- ☐ <sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐ <sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐ <sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐ <sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐ <sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐ <sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐ <sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐ <sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐ <sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐ <sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐ <sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐ <sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐ <sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐ <sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐ <sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐ <sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐ <sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐ <sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐ <sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐ <sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐ <sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Parks**

25A. This section of the survey focuses on parks in [JURISDICTION].

### Mapped

25B. Are parks in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, parks are **fully** mapped
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, parks are **partially** mapped
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, parks are not mapped (SKIP TO Q25D)

25C. In what software tools are parks in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> We don't use software

### Value

25D. Do you know the value of parks in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** parks
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** parks (SKIP TO Q25F)
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any parks (SKIP TO Q25F)

25E. What is the value of all parks in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of parks in your jurisdiction.*

#### Inventory

25F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about parks? Select all that apply.

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of parks in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of parks in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of parks in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of parks in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about parks. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about parks

#### System

25G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve parks in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for parks in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER

- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Fleet**

26A. This section of the survey focuses on fleet in [JURISDICTION].

#### Mapped

26B. Are fleet in [JURISDICTION] mapped?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, fleet are **fully** mapped
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, fleet are **partially** mapped
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, fleet are not mapped (SKIP TO Q26D)

26C. In what software tools are fleet in [JURISDICTION] mapped? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Any GIS (Geographic Information System) software
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Any CAD (Computer-Aided Design) software
- ☐<sup>3</sup> We don't use software

#### Value

26D. Do you know the value of fleet in [JURISDICTION]?

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Yes, we know the value of **all** fleet
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Yes, we know the value of **some but not all** fleet (SKIP TO Q26F)
- ☐<sup>3</sup> No, we do not know the value of any fleet (SKIP TO Q26F)

26E. What is the value of all fleet in your jurisdiction?

We understand that this information may not be readily available, and appreciate your efforts to obtain this information.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Please provide your answer as an exact dollar amount, not a range, even if it is just an estimate.)

*Last year you estimated \_\_\_\_\_ as the value of fleet in your jurisdiction.*

## Inventory

26F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about fleet? Select all that apply.

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> Condition of fleet in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Age of fleet in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> Material of fleet in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>4</sup> Size of fleet in our jurisdiction
- ☐ <sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about fleet. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ <sup>6</sup> We do not track any information about fleet

## System

26G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve fleet in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply)

- ☐ <sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for fleet in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐ <sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐ <sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐ <sup>4</sup> Beehive
- ☐ <sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐ <sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐ <sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐ <sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐ <sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐ <sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐ <sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐ <sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐ <sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐ <sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐ <sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐ <sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐ <sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐ <sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐ <sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐ <sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐ <sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐ <sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐ <sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐ <sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐ <sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐ <sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐ <sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

## REFLECTIONS ON ASSET MANAGEMENT

27. How important are the following factors when [JURISDICTION] is deciding which asset management tool(s) or system(s) to use?

	Extremely important	Somewhat Important	Not at all important
Ease of using the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Cost of the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Ability of the system to handle multiple asset types	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Length of time necessary to set up the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Whether the system required the assistance of an outside consultant to implement and/or use	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
Having adequate staff skills and capacity to implement and use the system	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>
The ability for the system to interact with other databases	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <sup>3</sup>

28. On a scale of 1-5, with “1” being not very effective and “5” being very effective, how would you rate your agency’s Asset Management practices overall?

Not very effective

Very effective

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

29. Is there anything that we didn’t ask about in this survey that you think is critical for implementing and using Asset Management?

---



---



---

Thank you for completing this survey!



## 2016 Analysis codebook

1a. From [JURISDICTION], who participates at any level in Asset Management? (Check all that apply) (CODE – 3)

1b. Which department leads Asset Management at [JURISDICTION]? (CODE – 1)

Precoded responses:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Engineering/Public Works personnel
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Finance personnel
- ☐<sup>3</sup> GIS personnel
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Data Processing personnel
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Planning personnel
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Other personnel – please specify department: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

- 10. City Council
- 11. Administration
- 12. City Clerk

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

1c. What are the primary reasons that your jurisdiction practices Asset Management? (Check all that apply) (CODE – 2)

Precoded responses:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Inventory and map infrastructure
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Preserve, maintain, and extend infrastructure life
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Track infrastructure work orders
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Budget infrastructure life cycle; including capital, maintenance, and operational phases
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Improve agency efficiency and effectiveness and manage long term risk
- ☐<sup>6</sup> Fulfill GASB34 requirements
- ☐<sup>7</sup> Other – please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

3. What are the top 1-2 reasons that your jurisdiction does not practice Asset Management?

Coded responses:

- 10. Resource constraints
- 11. Inadequate staff
- 12. Lack of time
- 13. Limited funds/budget
- 20. Small jurisdiction
- 21. Unnecessary for a small jurisdiction
- 22. Rural setting
- 30. What we do now works
- 40. Lack of software
- 50. Not familiar with it
- 60. In progress

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

4. How does [JURISDICTION] place a value on infrastructure assets? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> (Past) constructed value
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Current value
- ☐<sup>3</sup> (Future) construction value
- ☐<sup>4</sup> GASB34
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Other – please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

- 10. We do not place a value on infrastructure assets
- 11. Insurance estimates
- 12. Annual audit

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

6. Regarding asset management systems, is the goal of [JURISDICTION] to have:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> One asset management system for all assets managed
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Two or more asset management systems for assets managed
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Other – please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sup>4</sup> My jurisdiction does not use systems

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

9. What software tools does your [JURISDICTION] use to manage assets?

(Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Access database
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Arc View
- ☐<sup>3</sup> CAD/AutoCAD
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Dbase
- ☐<sup>5</sup> ESRI GIS
- ☐<sup>6</sup> ESRI GIS database
- ☐<sup>7</sup> Georilla
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Laserfiche
- ☐<sup>9</sup> MS Excel
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Oracle
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Pencil and paper
- ☐<sup>12</sup> We are using an asset management tool not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

- 13. Infor Eam
- 14. InfraSeek
- 15. MapFeeder
- 16. Maximo
- 17. MnDOT SIMS
- 18. Mpower Innovations
- 19. PASER
- 20. Pontis
- 21. PubWorks
- 22. Road Pro
- 23. RTVision
- 24. Simple Signs
- 25. SWAMP
- 26. VueWorks
- 28. Plan-IT
- 29. ArcGIS
- 30. AFMS Automated Facilities Management System
- 31. Inframap
- 32. Elements
- 33. Data View
- 34. Goodpointe
- 35. Facilitiy Dude Mobile 311
- 36. Incode Database
- 37. Asset Works
- 38. MicroPaver

39. Condition rating maps
40. MCIS
41. QGIS
42. Other GIS system
43. Customized system/database/spreadsheet
44. St. Aid RQI/PQI data files
45. Tribal Knowledge
46. Highway costing-Xerox
47. Engineer drawings
48. VISUAL
49. Banyon Fixed Asset
50. Hydinfra
51. culvertcost
52. RCA/WOM
53. MnDOT Annual Inspection
54. Bridge Condition Inventory
55. TXBase
56. City Link
57. MSAS Needs
58. Filemaker Pro
59. Fulcrum
60. Helpstar
61. VFA
62. Paper Building Records
63. As-built plans
64. Asset Keeper
65. Maps
66. Intelysis
67. WinCan
68. Micostation
69. PARIS
70. Fleet Maintenance Pro
71. RTA
72. CPUI
73. AFS
74. NewRoads
75. CostRite
76. ACS
77. Precis
78. Manager Plus
79. Qwest Maintenance
80. CFA
81. Springbrook
82. Phoenix
83. Squarerigger
84. Maintenance Connection
85. Capital Assets
86. Dossier
87. Jetfleet
88. M4
89. m5
90. Swift

- 91. WSB & Associates Pavement Management System
- 92. Paver
- 93. Fixed Assets CS
- 94. CTAS
- 95. Quickbooks
- 96. Asyst
- 97. New World
- 98. GeoMoose
- 99. Numerous
- 100. Logis

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

10F-26F. Which other information does [JURISDICTION] track about \_\_\_\_? (Check all that apply)

- ☐<sup>1</sup> Condition of \_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Age of \_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Material of \_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Size of \_\_\_\_ in our jurisdiction
- ☐<sup>5</sup> Our inventory includes other information about \_\_\_\_\_. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

- 10. Maintenance history/records
- 11. Type of sign
- 12. Location
- 13. Break history

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable

10G-26G. Please indicate any asset management system you use to operate, maintain, and improve in [JURISDICTION]. (Check all that apply) (CODE – 3)

Precoded responses:

- ☐<sup>1</sup> We are not using any asset management system for roads in [JURISDICTION].
- ☐<sup>2</sup> Agile Assets
- ☐<sup>3</sup> Archibus
- ☐<sup>4</sup> Beehive

- ☐<sup>5</sup> Cartegraph
- ☐<sup>6</sup> City Services
- ☐<sup>7</sup> CityWorks
- ☐<sup>8</sup> Element FX
- ☐<sup>9</sup> Element XS
- ☐<sup>10</sup> Famis
- ☐<sup>11</sup> Icon
- ☐<sup>12</sup> IMaint
- ☐<sup>13</sup> Infor EAM
- ☐<sup>14</sup> InfraSeek
- ☐<sup>15</sup> MapFeeder
- ☐<sup>16</sup> Maximo
- ☐<sup>17</sup> MnDOT SIMS
- ☐<sup>18</sup> Mpower Innovations
- ☐<sup>19</sup> PASER
- ☐<sup>20</sup> Pontis
- ☐<sup>21</sup> PubWorks
- ☐<sup>22</sup> Road Pro
- ☐<sup>23</sup> RTVision
- ☐<sup>24</sup> Simple Signs
- ☐<sup>25</sup> SWAMP
- ☐<sup>26</sup> VueWorks
- ☐<sup>27</sup> We are using an asset management system not listed here. Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Coded responses:

- 28. Plan-IT
- 29. ArcGIS
- 30. AFMS Automated Facilities Management System
- 31. Inframap
- 32. Elements
- 33. Data View
- 34. Goodpointe
- 35. Facilityy Dude Mobile 311
- 36. Incode Database
- 37. Asset Works
- 38. MicroPaver
- 39. Condition rating maps
- 40. MCIS
- 41. QGIS
- 42. Other GIS system
- 43. Customized system/database/spreadsheet
- 44. St. Aid RQI/PQI data files
- 45. Tribal Knowledge
- 46. Highway costing-Xerox
- 47. Engineer drawings

48. VISUAL
49. Banyon Fixed Asset
50. Hydinfra
51. culvertcost
52. RCAWOM
53. MnDOT Annual Inspection
54. Bridge Condition Inventory
55. TXBase
56. City Link
57. MSAS Needs
58. Filemaker Pro
59. Fulcrum
60. Helpstar
61. VFA
62. Paper Building Records
63. As-built plans
64. Asset Keeper
65. Maps
66. Intelysis
67. WinCan
68. Micostation
69. PARIS
70. Fleet Maintenance Pro
71. RTA
72. CPUI
73. AFS
74. NewRoads
75. CostRite
76. ACS
77. Precis
78. Manager Plus
79. Qwest Maintenance
80. CFA
81. Springbrook
82. Phoenix
83. Squarerigger
84. Maintenance Connection
85. Capitol Assets
86. Dossier
87. Jetfleet
88. M4
89. m5
90. Swift
91. WSB & Associates Pavement Management System
92. Paver

- 93. Fixed Assets CS
- 94. CTAS
- 95. Quickbooks
- 96. Asyst
- 97. New World
- 98. GeoMoose
- 99. Numerous
- 100. Logis

- 2. Nothing/None/No
- 3. Other
- 5. Non-response answer
- 6. Missing
- 7. Refused
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Not applicable