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Section 1. Executive Summary
1.1: 2024 BIA Asset Management Plan Introduction

The five BIAs infrastructure analyzed (Argyle, Hamilton Road, Hyde Park, London Downtown Business Association, and Old East Village) represent critical assets that enhance local business support, economic development, beautification, and community engagement.

This Asset Management Plan (AMP) is designed to enhance the management of BIA’s infrastructure assets in a way that connects strategic BIA, City of London, and community objectives to day-to-day and long-term infrastructure investment decisions. This is accomplished by:

- Aligning with the regulatory landscape, by meeting the requirements of Ontario Regulation 588/17 – Asset Management Planning for Municipal Infrastructure (O. Reg. 588/17), and positioning BIA for capital grant funding applications.
- Understanding the current state of the infrastructure systems (value, quantity, age, condition, etc.).
- Measuring and monitoring levels of service (LOS) to quantify how well infrastructure systems are meeting expectations.
- Communicating asset lifecycle management activities (e.g., how infrastructure is operated, maintained, rehabilitated, and replaced).
- Determining the optimal costs and reinvestment rates of the asset lifecycle activities split between those that maintain current LOS and those that achieve proposed LOS;
- If necessary, establishing an infrastructure gap financing strategy to fund the expenditures that are required to meet the respective BIAs Board approved LOS and associated lifecycle activities.

Key findings of the 2024 BIA AMP are:
- There are $582.5 thousand dollars of infrastructure assets under BIA management;
- Overall, these assets are in Good condition;
- No cumulative 10-year maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS infrastructure gaps have been identified; and
- The recommended average maintain current LOS reinvestment rate is 10.4% and based on an analysis of approved 2023 and 2024 BIA operating budgets, this level of infrastructure investment can be managed within existing budgets.

A summary of these results is presented in the following tables and figures:
- Table 1.1 summarizes the infrastructure gaps and presents them as a percentage of BIA’s infrastructure assets replacement value;
- Figure 1.1 summarizes the overall condition distribution of the assets between those that are in Very Good to Very Poor condition;
- Figure 1.2 shows the optimal maintain current LOS expenditures compared to planned operating budget, and the resulting infrastructure gap, if any;
- Table 1.2 presents the reinvestment rates for planned budget, maintain current LOS, and achieve proposed LOS.
Table 1.1 2024 AMP Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Information</th>
<th>Maintain Current LOS</th>
<th>Achieve Proposed LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Value ($Thousands)</td>
<td>$582.5</td>
<td>$582.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Year Infrastructure Gap ($Thousands)</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Gap as a Percentage of Replacement Value</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1 Overall Condition

Table 1.2 Approved Budget, Maintain Current LOS, and Achieve Proposed LOS Annual Reinvestment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Annual Reinvestment Rate (Planned Budget)</th>
<th>Maintain Current LOS Recommended Annual Reinvestment Rate</th>
<th>Achieve Proposed LOS Recommended Annual Reinvestment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2024 BIA AMP
1.2: Summary of Asset Management Plan Structure
The AMP is designed to provide the reader with a strong functional knowledge of the basis of this report along with the process and data behind the development and results. This is achieved through the following report structure:

- **Introduction** section provides an overview of the provincial and municipal policies that govern asset management reporting requirements and the City’s Corporate Asset Management (CAM) Program as well as a summary of the various components of the AMP that culminate together to provide meaningful information that supports asset and budget decisions.

- **Detailed Asset Management Plan** section summarizes the existing asset inventory, its replacement value, condition, age distribution, and how BIA stores its asset data. This section then explores the LOS delivered by the assets, the associated lifecycle management strategies, and activities, and concludes with an analysis of the identified infrastructure gaps and supporting financing strategies.

- **Conclusion and Recommendations** section outlines the findings and observations made throughout the AMP development and reporting process and establishes the recommendations that will be used to guide future asset management activities, subject to Board approval.

- **Appendix A. O.Reg.588/17 Asset Management Plan Requirements** section encompasses a detailed mapping of the legislated requirements to the various sections and/or sub-sections of this AMP.

1.3: Executive Summary Conclusion and Recommendations

**Conclusion**
Based on BIA staff input and asset data, the BIA AMP is a tactical outcome of the City’s CAM Program, outlining BIA’s plan to manage its $582.5 thousand worth of infrastructure, and the required investments to expand the asset portfolio to meet maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS objectives. There are no easy solutions to how the entire infrastructure system works together to achieve an optimal delivery of community and economic enhancements. But this AMP, among other BIA strategic documents, help identify the efforts required to ensure appropriate infrastructure funding.

There are no identified cumulative 10-year maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS gaps. If they were to arise in the future, choices are available as to how BIAs manage the infrastructure gaps. These choices include:

- BIAs can continue to deliver services at their current or proposed levels by committing to make required investments thereby mitigating or even eliminating the infrastructure gaps. However, funding sources are limited, thus, BIAs must continue to manage its services in an affordable manner with due regard to member, community, and staff impacts.

Overall, the BIAs have a long-standing practice of pursuing all possible means to achieve service delivery goals and have been reasonably successful delivering quality services. In effect the BIAs adopt a blend of the three approaches outlined and are continuously seeking to improve these strategies.
**Recommendations**

The City’s CAM Program is founded on the principle of continuous improvement with the object of increasing line-of-sight quality of data/information and the tools and techniques that are used to inform services and asset management decision-making. This increased quality will lead to greater confidence in the analysis documented and decisions formed through the AMP and supporting processes.

The Recommendations section of this AMP outlines administrative projects that will enhance the management of and reporting against BIAs $582.5 thousand worth of infrastructure assets. These recommendations are structured to address short- and long-term asset management objectives and are categorized according to distinct asset management knowledge areas.

Each of these recommendations will be completed with leading support from the City’s CAM staff. At this time, there are no additional funding needs associated with the completion of these administrative projects (i.e., initial projects will be completed leveraging existing staff and other resources).
Section 2. Introduction
2.1: Supporting BIA Goals Through the Corporate Asset Management Program

London’s BIA entities (Argyle, Hyde Park, Hamilton Road, Old East Village, and London Downtown Business Association) infrastructure systems support a range of services that enable residents, businesses, City of London tourists and community partners to have an engaging community experience in the City while enhancing economic prosperity. These service delivery results are based on BIA strategic mandates that guide the BIAs in a way that aligns with the core values of our community. The respective BIA websites and staff feedback summarizes these mandates as follows:

**Argyle BIA Mandate:**
Works to beautify and promote the area while fostering a sense of community for businesses and customers alike. It is the mission of the organization to build community between residents and the businesses to restore wellness, beautify and add value to the commercial area.

Argyle BIA collaboratively works to fulfill the three Strategic Areas of the Strategic Plan, which is to enhance community wellness, street improvements and positively impact the community by celebrating life in East London.

**Hamilton Road BIA Mandate:**
Will develop, advocate, promote and invest in our unique community in areas of Economic Development, Beautification and Marketing and Promotion while simultaneously honouring the rich history and diversity of the Hamilton Road area.

**Hyde Park BIA Mandate:**
Help bring new and exciting business opportunities to Hyde Park, while ensuring the development reflects the needs of the existing businesses.

The draft 2024-2027 strategic directions include a **Vision** of Businesses working together to foster a vibrant and connected community; a **Mission** of The Hyde Park BIA enriches and cultivates a thriving community by celebrating and promoting Hyde Park businesses and **Values** of Integrity, Fearless Innovation, Collaboration, Inclusive, Informed, Playful.

Strategic priorities include member engagement, business growth, community collaboration, and vibrant environment.

**LDBA Mandate:**
Exists to represent the interests of member businesses, ensure retention, and maintain the public realm.

LDBA’s mission is to steward the levy paid by member businesses by leading and championing programs and investments that make London’s downtown a destination of choice and an economic centre that supports the entire community.

The Downtown London Strategy for calendar years 2021-2025 was created to build on the success of the past and plan to adapt and recover from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**OEV BIA Mandate:**
Create a vibrant, diverse, and sustainable commercial corridor, at the heart of an inclusive community, where people live, work, shop, play, and produce.

---

2. https://www.hamroad.com/
3. https://www.downtownlondon.ca/about-downtown-london-bia/why-we-exist/
It is also noted that Council’s 2023 to 2027 Strategic Plan for the City of London identifies “Economic Growth, Culture, and Prosperity” as a strategic area of focus. These involve working better together for economic growth with Business Improvement Areas (BIA’s) of London and continuing to build strong working relationships with such community partners.

The City’s CAM Program is designed to enhance the management of the infrastructure assets (both City of London and Agencies, Boards, and Commissions assets) in a way that connects strategic objectives to day-to-day decisions related to when, why, and how investments are made into infrastructure systems. Like the strategic planning and budgeting processes, this is an iterative process that continuously improves through each cycle. For further information regarding the CAM Program refer to the City’s CAM Policy 7.

This AMP was developed through the City’s CAM Program and associated business processes and systems. By following this development process the AMP achieves the following:

- Sets out the plan for managing the infrastructure assets to ensure they can provide services at levels that meet the communities, members, and Board approved objectives.
- Forecasts the expected impact that the average annual operating budgets, inclusive of projected operating budgets for 2023-2032 (hereon referred to as “planned budget” or “projected operating budget”), will have on the state of the infrastructure assets.
- Understanding of the changes in lifecycle strategies and associated risks if there are funding gaps between the planned budget and the expenditures required to maintain current LOS or achieve proposed LOS.
- Fulfill O. Reg. 588/17 mandated requirements and maintain eligibility for current and future other levels of government capital funding programs.

2.2: Provincial Asset Management Planning Requirements

This AMP builds upon existing BIA asset management activities and leverages others that have been developing since the establishment of the City’s CAM department and CAM Program. London’s legislated asset management journey began in 2008 when Canada’s Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) established new requirements for municipalities to practice tangible capital asset (TCA) accounting. This accounting process resulted in the development of the first comprehensive inventory of all assets owned by the City (both directly and non-directly owned assets). In 2012, the Province then published ‘Building Together: Guide for Municipal Asset Management Plans’ to encourage and support municipalities in Ontario to develop AMPs in a consistent manner.

Building Together outlines the information and analysis that municipal asset management plans are to include and was designed to provide consistency across the province for asset management. To encourage the development of AMPs, the Provincial and Federal governments began to frequently make AMPs a prerequisite to accessing capital funding programs.

In 2015, Ontario passed the ‘Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act’, which affirmed the role that municipal infrastructure systems play in supporting the vitality of local economies. After a year-long industry review process, the Province created O. Reg. 588/17 under the Infrastructure for...
Jobs and Prosperity Act. O. Reg. 588/17 further expands on the Building Together guide, mandating specific requirements for municipal asset management policies and AMPs.

Among others, these requirements mandated:

- Municipalities to complete Council approved and publicly available AMPs for all assets presented on the consolidated financial statements, excluding Joint Water Boards. It is noted BIA financials are consolidated within the City’s financial statements. The following dates are provincially required:
  - By July 1, 2024, the O. Reg. 588/17 requires an AMP that documents the current LOS being provided, the costs to maintain them, and the financing strategy to fund the expenditures necessary to maintain current LOS for all infrastructure systems in the City.
  - By July 1, 2025, the O. Reg. 588/17 requires an AMP that documents the current LOS being provided and the costs to maintain them, the proposed LOS, and the costs to achieve them, and the financial strategies to fund the expenditures necessary to maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS for all infrastructure systems in the City.
- That these AMPs be updated annually and comprehensively reviewed and updated every 5-years.

For a complete reconciliation and mapping of how this AMP complies with all O. Reg. 588/17 requirements (both July 1, 2024, and July 1, 2025, requirements) see Appendix A. O.Reg.588/17 Asset Management Plan Requirements.

2.3: Developing the Asset Management Plan
This AMP is the culmination of efforts from staff across the BIAs who are involved with managing infrastructure assets.

Through this collaborative development process the AMP addresses the following questions:

- What do we own and why?
- What is it worth?
- What condition is it in?
- What are its current and proposed service levels?
- What activities do we employ to manage the assets?
- What does it all cost?

A more modern asset management question is also to ask, “Is this asset providing the community the service it expects and is willing to pay for?”

To answer these questions as best as possible, the CAM Program and this AMP are structured based on several interdependent development strategies that support answering or providing insight into the responses to these questions.

These development strategies and processes (steps) are categorized as:

- State of Local Infrastructure
- Levels of Service
- Asset Lifecycle Management Strategy
- Forecasted Infrastructure Gaps and Financing Strategies
- Discussion and Conclusion

To enhance readers understanding of the data and information presented, the following explanations are provided regarding each development strategies purpose, processes, and results.
2.3.1: State of Local Infrastructure

The State of Local Infrastructure is the initial building block of the AMP and is intended to provide the following information:

- Inventory of assets – What do we own?
- Valuation of assets (replacement value) – What is it worth?
- Age and expected useful life of assets – How old is it and when does it need to be replaced?
- Condition of assets – What Condition is it in?

This information is a fundamental building block of an AMP and inform future management of infrastructure assets based on individual and collective needs.

It is important to note replacement values seek to utilize best available information to identify all asset costs associated with replacing assets. As such this AMP reflects financing needs that go beyond historical costs, and where possible include replacement values that are inclusive of:

- Inflation - the rising cost of goods and services can put additional strain on the budget for infrastructure projects to maintain current LOS,
- Climate – addressing the impact of climate change and implementing climate-related initiatives can require significant financial resources,
- Achieve Proposed LOS – meeting the desired LOS may require additional investments in existing or new infrastructure, and
- Aging Infrastructure – the need to upgrade or replace versus rehabilitating aging assets can contribute to capital financing pressures.

By acknowledging financing pressures and considering both current and future challenges, the AMP sets the foundation for strategic infrastructure planning and helps BIAs to prioritize and address infrastructure needs effectively.

2.3.2: Levels of Service

Asset related LOS are specific parameters that describe the extent and quality of asset related services; they are not an exhaustive presentation of all service levels provided to the community. These LOS link an asset's performance to target performance goals associated with BIA mandates, budgets, and other relevant policies and reports. Additionally, in accordance with O. Reg. 588/17 requirements, these LOS are quantified and reported between the costs to maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS, which are defined as:

- Maintain Current LOS – is defined as the persistent efforts of an organization to manage its assets through comprehensive lifecycle activities and effectively allocating necessary financial resources with the aim of consistently delivering its services at the current established service levels.
- Achieve Proposed LOS – is defined as the strategic initiatives undertaken by an organization to modify its service levels represented in a new proposed standard of service provision. This could involve modifying the condition, scope, or accessibility of the services beyond their current levels, based on strategic goals (e.g., regulatory requirements, master plans, other Board approved targets, etc.). The achievement of these proposed service levels may require changes in quantity of assets and/or frequency and scope of asset related lifecycle activities.

LOS metrics are organized in a hierarchical manner. At the forefront are the direct LOS metrics, which serve as the primary benchmarks. From these, we can provide clear lines-of-sight to
determine the cost to maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS. Next in line are the related LOS metrics. These are closely tied to the direct LOS metrics due to their primarily formal relationship. However, pinpointing their associated costs can be more intricate.

Overall, BIAs strive to provide services to the community and members that are accessible, cost efficient, provide customer satisfaction, demonstrate environmental stewardship, reliability, and safety, with suitable scope. As shown in Figure 2.1, to obtain a desired LOS, BIAs face a complex trade-off challenge, which includes three parameters: Cost, LOS, and Risk.

Figure 2.1 Trade-off Cost, Risk, and LOS

2.3.3: Asset Lifecycle Management Strategy and Activities
The asset lifecycle management strategies are the set of planned actions that will enable the assets to provide the approved LOS in a sustainable way, while managing risk, at the lowest lifecycle cost possible.

This part of the AMP describes the asset lifecycle activities applied to the assets. This includes the typical practices and actions, and risks associated with each asset activity. From here three scenarios that forecast the condition profile of the asset portfolio based on planned budgets, the required budgets to maintain current LOS, and the required budgets to achieve proposed LOS are provided.

2.3.4: Forecasted Infrastructure Gaps and Financing Strategies
In this part of the AMP identified infrastructure gaps, if any, are summarized and illustrated in both table and figure format. The infrastructure gaps are a dollar amount based on the difference between:

- The amount of money that needs to be spent on assets to maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS for the community, and
- The amount of funding presently identified in the planned operating budgets of 2023 and 2024.

In other words, what BIAs plan to spend versus what the asset needs are. Should infrastructure gaps be identified, the objective is that they decline over time as greater investments are made to replace older infrastructure, to improve the condition of infrastructure, to minimize the risks associated with failing assets, and to acquire new infrastructure.

Next, a typical AMP presents infrastructure gap financing strategies, which set out the approach to ensuring that appropriate funds are available to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure dependent services. These strategies are meant to strengthen current budgeting processes by reinforcing a long-term perspective on the impact of providing various asset-related LOS and the required investments versus the affordability to the community and members.
2.3.5: Discussion and Conclusion
The discussion part of the AMP looks at current and future opportunities and challenges associated with asset lifecycle management scenarios and the potential need to address future infrastructure cost pressures. This discussion includes opportunities and challenges that are both in and outside of the control of BIAs and Boards. Among others, this includes consideration of the following:

- Service delivery characteristics,
- Cost pressures, and
- Growth and service improvement planning.

The final element of the detailed AMP is the conclusion section. In this section the results are summarized and to facilitate interpretation of the AMP data accuracy and data reliability ratings with supporting commentary are provided. The goal is to transparently provide the reader with knowledge of the validity and limitations of the information provided and to highlight continuous data improvement plans.

2.4: Assumptions and Limitations
As previously stated, this AMP is designed to enhance the management of BIA infrastructure assets in a way that connects strategic objectives to day-to-day decisions related to when, why, and how investments are made into infrastructure systems. However, all AMPs are developed within the context of various assumptions and limitations.

The following points summarize the assumptions and limitations of this AMP:

- The scope of this AMP covers the assets directly owned by BIAs as of December 31, 2023, and associated planned budgets approved for 2023 and 2024. Thus, timing differences may exist between when this AMP was developed versus current asset inventories and budget approvals beyond 2024. Based on O. Reg. 588/17 requirements these differences are permissible and are minimized through the AMP annual update process as well as the CAM Program continues to explore opportunities to limit such timing differences.
- This AMP is compliant with the July 2024 and July 2025 requirements of O. Reg. 588/17 in that it encompasses both maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS as well as associated forecasted infrastructure gaps and supporting financing strategies.
- The AMP addresses condition information in two ways:
  - Condition may be assumed based on age and estimated useful life; and
  - Condition may be based on the expert opinion of staff using the asset.
- Unexpected events (e.g., severe storms attributed to climate change, etc.) will not disrupt infrastructure replacement and renewal projects over the period of analysis.
- No capital budgets relating to lifecycle renewal, service improvement, and growth are identified, and the 2021 Development Charges Background Study does not apply to BIAs.
- There are no identified reserve funds.
- The forecasted planned budget will occur as planned over the period of analysis and be representative to finance infrastructure purchases as they arise.
- The AMP assumes current reinvestment rate in 2023 equals maintain current recommended reinvestment rate.
Section 3. Asset Management Plan
3.1: State of Local Infrastructure
3.1.1: Asset Inventory and Valuation

The concept of a community and member base rallying to advocate, beautify, and enhance prosperity of a specific geographic area is a concept that has existed for an indefinite period. However, a more formal, municipally recognized Business Improvement Area (BIA) was a world-leading concept first legislated in 1970, in Ontario, with many refinements in the subsequent decades\(^8\). It is a notion that allows local business people and commercial property owners and tenants to join and, with the support of the municipality, to organize, finance, and carry out physical improvements and promote economic development in their district.

A BIA is run by a volunteer Board of Management elected from its members. The Board is nominated at an Annual General Meeting and once approved by City Council, serves a four-year term concurrent with the term of Council.

The Board, as well as BIA specific employees hired by the Board, work on behalf of its BIA and meets regularly to develop budgets, set priorities, implement improvements, plan festivals, and promote its business area.

Once BIA’s members approve the budget and City Council ratifies it, funds are raised through a levy on all commercial and industrial properties within the BIA’s boundary (maps are disclosed in Figures 3.1 through 3.6). Calculation of this levy is based on the proportionate value of each property’s commercial and/or industrial assessment. Once the City collects the levy, it returns the funds to the BIA to manage.


\(^9\)https://opendata.london.ca/datasets/c627bb303c664a04ae7225960be761b4_11/explore?location=42.998065%2C-81.191698%2C15.00

Figure 3.1 provides a map of each BIA\(^9\). They are listed alphabetically in this AMP:
- Argyle Business Improvement Area (Argyle BIA);
- Hamilton Road Business Improvement Area (Hamilton Road BIA);
- Hyde Park Business Improvement Association (Hyde Park BIA);
- London Downtown Business Association (LDBA); and
- Old East Village Business Improvement Area (OEV BIA).

While each BIA has its distinct presence, there are unifying themes of creating a sense of community, organizing, and hosting themed events, growing local economies, and beautification. Additionally, in support of public health and wellbeing, BIAs presence encompass the concept of coordinated informed responses on how to best assist those in distress, experiencing homelessness, and safety practices surrounding discarded sharps or drug-using equipment.

Typical events include Santa Claus Parades, promoting local businesses with loyalty cards and discounts, and hosting live events such as music festivals.
Table 3.1 summarizes the asset types and replacement values, for all BIAs. Table 3.2 lists each BIAs assets by asset type, inventory, and replacement values. The asset replacement values have been identified using different BIA databases including their respective accounting software systems and internal expert opinion. These replacement values aim to capture current market prices for the fully replacement of identified assets. For further information regarding costing refer to State of Local Infrastructure. Lastly, Figure 3.1 provides a map outlining where BIAs are geographically located within the City of London.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Replacement Value (Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five BIA Entities (Argyle, Hamilton Road, Hyde Park, LDBA, Old East Village)</td>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$137.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Hardware and Software</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engaging Assets</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$326.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$582.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1 Map Outlining City of London Business Improvement Areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Replacement Value (Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle BIA</td>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Hardware and Software</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engaging Assets</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road BIA</td>
<td>Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Hardware and Software</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engaging Assets</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$135.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$142.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park BIA</td>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Hardware and Software</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engaging Assets</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$131.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDBA</td>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Hardware and Software</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engaging Assets</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$222.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV BIA</td>
<td>Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Hardware and Software</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engaging Assets</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$582.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Argyle BIA**

With assets valued at over $42 thousand, Argyle BIA was founded in 2011. Figure 3.2 lists its boundaries approximating 85 hectares and cover the approximate geographic location from Wavell St to Clark St and Highbury Ave N and Dundas St with approximately 200 businesses having Argyle BIA membership.

Argyle BIA is the nucleus of community life in East London. It is building to the social memory of Argyle area and adding value to those who do business in the area. Argyle BIA invests in youth, which then invests in the future workforce and customers, which further builds and positively impacts the community.

Examples of Argyle BIA-hosted events:
- Argyle Santa Claus parade,
- Canada Day activities,
- Halloween in Argyle,
- Scavenger Hunt within 12 businesses in the Argyle area,
- Window Display Decorating Contest.

Other services examples include biannual graffiti cleanup, contracting a local on-call security officer, and launching a commercial collection and recycling green bin pilot program.

Argyle Community Initiatives include:
- Dundas Streetscape Master Plan,
- Argyle Currency Program,
- Friends of Argyle business networking opportunities,
- Streetscape/Beautification including plant hangers, banners, and slogan signs;
- Clean Streets, which supplements City cleaning with additional work 1 to 2 times a week;
- Student Discounts, and
- Community Wellness Program – BIA lists personnel to contact if someone is in distress or if sharps are found.

**Hamilton Road BIA**

With a replacement value of approximately $142 thousand, the Hamilton Road BIA geographic area approximates 42 hectares as shown in Figure 3.3. Hamilton Road district extends along Hamilton Rd. from Adelaide to Highbury.

Hamilton Road BIA has 62 members and has a variety of residential construction styles dating back to the 1800s. It boasts of Tree Trunk Sculptures and a variety of murals. Tree trunk tours are offered to view carvings from the East of Adelaide (EOA) Sasquatch, a Bucky Beaver, a sporting lion, the Stihl Band Tree-O, and many more. Murals range from a Visitor Spot Donut Mural, a Casa Cubana Mural, and the recent GrapeLady mural. The variety of displayed art brings depth and history to this area.

Hamilton Road BIA also supports the concept of ‘HamBucks’ which are promotional initiatives to support local businesses. Other services examples include supporting individuals wishing to organize a business in the Hamilton Road BIA area, organizing graffiti cleanup, and providing beautification services such as banners.
Figure 3.2 Argyle BIA Location

Figure 3.3 Hamilton Road BIA Location
**Hyde Park BIA**
With assets valued at approximately $122 thousand, Hyde Park BIA was founded in 1979 and designated as a BIA in 2017. Its legacy goes back to 1818 when the Hyde Park Corner was established.

Figure 3.4 shows its geographic area approximates 270 hectares. The boundaries include:
- Just north of Fanshawe Park Road
- East to Dalmagarry Road
- Sarnia Road to the South; and
- West taking in North Routledge Park Road.

Working with Hyde Park BIA members and with the support of the municipality, the Hyde Park BIA serves as an economic and social anchor within its boundaries in Uptown London, the northwest corner of the City, while helping stabilize and add vitality to the local community.

Hyde Park BIA supports and advocates for local businesses, does business recruitment, beautification initiatives, host and support special events, and provide marketing initiatives. These efforts benefit business operators, property owners, and the community at large.

With over three hundred and ninety member businesses, the Hyde Park BIA works to beautify and promote the Hyde Park corridor fostering a sense of community for residents, businesses and visitors while attracting people and customers from across London and neighbouring counties. Events and beautification work together to encourage tourism as Hyde Park BIA work to create a vibrant community that people love to visit.

These initiatives also support the mandate of business recruitment & retention, sustaining existing retail while bringing new and exciting business opportunities to Hyde Park, while ensuring that new development reflects the needs of the existing businesses and the community.

Major events include:
- Uptown Market,
- Pondfest,
- Picnic on the Pond,
- Hyde Park Santa Parade,
- Breakfast With Santa,
- Christmas Market.

Community concepts include loyalty cards, Hyde Park dollars, student, and senior discounts, and coordinated informed response.

The Hyde Park Garden of reflection is a rezoned environmental space that can host community events. It was revitalized in 2022 and 2023 to include a plaza space, enhanced pathways, site furniture and additional trees.

**LDBA**
It is noted that LDBA is one of two complementary organizations to make up the ‘Downtown London’ entity; the other entity being MainStreet London\(^{10}\). Assets relating to LDBA and reflected in the City’s consolidated financial statements are analyzed and commented on. The replacement value of LDBA’s assets approximate $223 thousand.

10https://www.londontourism.ca/downtown-london#:~:text=LDBA%20exists%20to%20represent%20the,core%2C%20including%20recruitment%20and%20revitalization.
Figure 3.5 lists the downtown London geographic area, which approximates 193 hectares, from approximately Oxford St W and Richmond Street to approximately York St and Colborne St. There are approximately 1,000 to 1,100 private sector employer business locations in the Downtown London area.

Downtown London is the catalyst and connector for a shared community vision of London’s downtown, on behalf of members, in partnership with the City of London and in support of major economic development, cultural, educational, and private sector stakeholders.

Downtown London and LDBA is committed to overseeing the improvements, beautification, and maintenance beyond what the municipality is responsible for in the BIA district. This includes implementing flower programs, investing in public art, attracting feet to the street through street activations and events, and addressing downtown cleanliness matters, such as litter pickup and graffiti removal. Downtown London also sets out to market and promote the BIA as a business, tourist, and shopping area.

There is continuous adaptation and expansion of programs and services to help businesses address the ongoing issues and concerns impacting downtown London. This includes removing needles and human waste from public areas and vestibules, navigating, and deploying City and community resources to address the health and homelessness impacts on our businesses, establishing and administering new property damage grants to help our members cover costs related to vandalism repairs, and information sharing or assisting members connect to opportunities and other sources of funding.
OEV BIA

OEV BIA has roots as a community since the original London East incorporation in 1874. The replacement value of OEV BIA assets approximates $44 thousand.

Figure 3.6 displays OEV BIA’s geographic range which is approximately 0.5 hectares from Elizabeth St to Dundas St to Florence St and Egerton St.

OEV BIA’s extensive research regarding the area’s economic drivers include:

- One-of-a-Kind Shopping,
- Food & Beverages, and
- Arts & Culture.

Features partner events to support the district, such as various artistic events from live music, abstract painting night, challah, and brioche classes.

OEV BIA is proud to represent the unique businesses and property owners on our commercial corridor. They work with small and large-scale developments and business models ranging from sole proprietorships to worker-owned cooperatives and corporations. They encourage all current and potential OEV businesses to contact us to discuss BIA assistance.

It also acts as a resource for businesses from graffiti cleanup to liaising with grant opportunities.

Other noted events include:

- OEV Dumpling Trail Libation District,
- Culture Cruise, and
- OEV Fridays.

There are also OEV murals, permanent and temporary and mosaics.
3.1.2: Age Summary

Figure 3.7 shows each BIA’s average asset age as a proportion of the average expected useful life. This comparison provides a visual representation of how close assets are to the ends of their lifecycle, which demonstrates BIA’s ability to replace such assets on-time. Overall, the data affirms that BIA assets are within their expected useful life, noting that lifecycle activities must continue over a 10-year period to ensure the age distribution would remain under expected useful life, or possibly be enhanced. Figure 3.8 expands this analysis by presenting the average age versus expected useful life comparison to include BIA performance by asset type.

Leasehold Improvements

These improvements generally occurred when the BIAs took over leased space and converted to their workspace needs. It is noted that LDBA expects to move into new leased space in June 2024. Given the AMP relates to data as of December 31, 2023, this change in leased space is consistent with expected useful life, noting LDBA is maximizing assets that can be transferred to the new location. It is noted Hamilton Road BIA and OEV BIA do not have leasehold improvements. Leasehold Improvements generally have a 10 to 15-year expected useful life, which suggests fewer needs over the shorter term. However, each BIA should regularly monitor these assets to ensure it is meeting modern workspace needs, which may go beyond a typical condition assessment. Further details and financial impacts of these assessments and industry best practices are provided in Asset Lifecycle Management Strategy – Maintaining Current and Achieving Proposed Levels of Service.
Furniture and Fixtures and Computer Hardware and Software

Furniture and Fixtures are approximately halfway through their expected useful life and include typical office related items such as filing cabinets, chairs, tables, etc. Assets that support the delivery of a live event like speakers, microphones, etc. are included as fixtures.

Computer hardware and software are approximately halfway through their expected useful life. They include office items such as cameras, printers, computer laptops, and desktops. The exception is OEV BIA computers which are on average 8-years old, and well past their expected useful lives of 5-years. OEV BIA furniture is also nearing its end of useful life.

Community Engaging Assets

Community engaging assets are intended to cover a broad range of assets that are intended to appeal to the public or support the delivery of a live event. This could include Christmas trees, metal banners, planters. The banners are generally new to maintain appeal and keep to current designs while the banner bracket can last approximately 10 years. Assets relevant to each BIA are commented on.

Argyle BIA

There are new banners, while the banner bracket and plant hangers were purchased several years ago.

Hamilton Road BIA

The tree trunk sculptures and murals are unique BIA assets. There murals were created several years ago, while the sculptures age range from several years to approximately 11-years old. With proper maintenance the sculptures should last approximately 15 years, while murals and banners have a shorter expected useful life.

Hyde Park BIA

Relevant assets include items intended for entertainment like a sunsail, tents, campfire setup, assets needed to host a Christmas parade, metal banners, hanging baskets, and planters.

LDBA

Assets include entertainment related items such as chalkboards, A-frame signs, large games such as Connect Four and bean bag toss, a hedgewall display, banners, metal planter covers, and a storage wagon.

OEV BIA

Has some original art hangings at the office space and mosaic sidewalk panels, banners and pole banners, A-frame signs, and tents.
Figure 3.7 Summary Average Age and Expected Useful Life By BIA
Figure 3.8 Age and Expected Useful Life By BIA and Asset Type
3.1.3: Asset Condition
The condition of the assets was determined using one of the two methods below based on data availability and accuracy:
1. Estimated based on age and the remaining expected useful life of the assets, and
2. Estimated based on expert opinion, where there was low confidence that age and expected useful life appropriately represented the asset condition.

Based on these methodologies, asset conditions are recorded on a ratings scale of 1 to 5. Table 3.2 provides the definitions of each condition scale used in the CAM Program and in this AMP.

Table 3.3 Condition and Scale Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Good Fit for the future</td>
<td>The infrastructure in the system or network is generally in very good condition, typically new or recently rehabilitated. A few elements show general signs of deterioration that require attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good Adequate for now</td>
<td>The infrastructure in the system or network is in good condition; some elements show general signs of deterioration that require attention. A few elements exhibit significant deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair Requires attention</td>
<td>The infrastructure in the system or network is in fair condition; it shows general signs of deterioration and requires attention. Some elements exhibit significant deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poor At risk</td>
<td>The infrastructure in the system or network is in poor condition and mostly below standard, with many elements approaching the end of their service life. A large portion of the system exhibits significant deterioration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Poor Unfit for sustained service</td>
<td>The infrastructure in the system or network is in unacceptable condition with widespread signs of advanced deterioration. Many components in the system exhibit signs of imminent failure, which is affecting service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
<td>This category is reserved for assets where data is either missing, not updated, or cannot be considered reliable. Flagging this data for BIA to identify where gaps in information exist and may allow for the development of assessment plans to improve future data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.9 presents the condition distribution of all BIA assets. It shows that approximately 99% of the assets are in Very Good to Fair condition. However, it is important to note this condition profile is only a snapshot in time and not indicative of condition profiles over the next 10 years. It is also relevant to consider many of these assets have expected useful lives lesser than 10 years and thus could be replaced or rehabilitated at least once over the next 10 years, particularly Community Engaging Assets (such as Banners).

Pressures do exist and further described in Asset Lifecycle Management and Forecasted Infrastructure Gaps and Financing Strategy. In addition, there are industry best practices to consider in maintaining assets intended to create a welcoming public atmosphere with a tasteful aesthetic. For example, banners have been described as short lasting, particularly if a design is considered dated. This is indirectly accounted for by having a shorter expected useful life (as described in State of Local Infrastructure).

Figure 3.10 provides a condition distribution at a consolidated BIA level. Then, Figure 3.11 provides a detailed condition distribution for each BIA asset type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIA</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>Furniture and Fixtures</th>
<th>Computer Hardware and Software</th>
<th>Community Engaging Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle BIA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road BIA</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park BIA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDBA</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV BIA</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.11 BIA Asset Condition Detail
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Leasehold Improvements
All BIAs except OEV and Hamilton Road BIA have leasehold improvements. They are generally in at least Good condition and have a greater than 10-year expected useful life, which suggests fewer needs over the shorter term. The exception is LDBA which is primarily in Fair condition, noting there is an expected location change in June 2024. Each BIA should regularly monitor these assets to ensure it is meeting modern workspace needs, which may go beyond a typical condition assessment. For example, if a more accessible layout or a different location is required it could result in further investment, regardless of leasehold condition. It is noted that not all leasehold improvements would be slated for replacement at the end of expected useful life; assessments whether rehabilitations for only a select few of assets would be required.

Furniture and Fixtures
Assets are approximately 96% in Fair or better condition, however there is a greater condition distribution. One exception is with LDBA where several chairs are assessed in Poor condition. It is common to receive donations in this asset base where the condition is inherited by the BIA. Such donations offset asset replacement needs calculated. However, because future donations are unclear, they are not accounted within this AMP.

Computer Hardware and Software
Generally, for all BIAs these assets are in Fair or better condition. Certain OEV computers are older and thus are in Poor or Very Poor condition. These assets have shorter expected useful lives which suggests multiple replacements over a 10-year period. However, BIAs historically have had donations which offset replacement needs.

Community Engaging Assets
Argyle BIA
100% of assets are considered in Fair or better condition. While banners are in Very Good condition, it is noted that they could be replaced four or five times over a 10-year time frame given their limited expected useful life.

Hamilton Road BIA
Consultants were hired to assess the sculpture market values and staff internal assessments were used to assess condition and comment on lifecycle needs. It is noted that the sculptures were assessed not simply as an overall condition, but split assessment into as much readily detail as known to assess if parts of the sculpture were in better condition than other parts. For example, the T-Rex sculpture has an assessment range which should drive maintenance program needs and focus treatments typically involving varnish or lacquering.

Hyde Park BIA
100% of assets are considered in Fair or better condition. Tents and firepit assets are within the Good to Fair range.

LDBA
Approximately 97% of assets are in Fair or better condition. A few A-frames are considered in Poor condition.

OEV BIA
Approximately 96% of assets are in Fair or better condition. Street Pole banners are considered in Poor condition.
3.2: Levels of Service
Asset management LOS link strategic plans and budget service delivery objectives to corresponding asset performance metrics. As such this AMP strives for LOS performance measures linked to:

- Relevant BIA Strategic Plans or mandates;
- 2023-2027 City of London Strategic Plan, and
- 2023 Approved Budgets.

These LOS foundations guide the establishment of customer service deliver values (herein referred to as “customer values”), which in turn guide the development of overarching AMP LOS objectives. Informed by these objectives, BIA and CAM staff collaborate to formulate effective metrics that can be linked to asset performance. Table 3.4 lists the LOS customer value definitions created through this development process.

The selection and development of meaningful LOS linked to decision making and cost, requires a long-term continuous improvement methodology. Thus, the LOS used in the 2024 BIA AMP are focused on traditional asset management metrics like reinvestment rate and condition. Continuous effort will be made towards expanding costed LOS as part of future BIA AMP development processes and practices.

Table 3.4 Customer Values Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Value</th>
<th>Corporate Definition and Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Efficiency</td>
<td>Presents service area budgets, and where possible measures financial performance in terms of providing the maximum service outcomes (more output for less cost) out of the available operating and capital budgets. Examples include annual cost to provide the service, asset lifecycle budget as a percentage of current replacement value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Service is fit for its purpose. Includes metrics related to the reliability of services such as condition of assets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direct and Related LOS
Selected LOS metrics are organized in a hierarchical manner. Direct LOS metrics are the primary benchmarks. These can readily determine the cost to maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS. Next are the related LOS metrics, which are closely tied to the direct LOS metrics but in some cases cannot be readily costed.

After review with BIA staff, direct LOS considered most representative of asset-based services and able to be costed over a 10-year projected period (2023-2032) are documented as in Table 3.5. No related LOS have been documented for this AMP; however, future BIA AMP continuous improvement projects will seek to identify and capture such LOS.

3.2.1: Direct Levels of Service
Table 3.5 Direct Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Value</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Service Performance Measure</th>
<th>2023 Performance</th>
<th>Proposed Target (2023 to 2032)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Efficiency</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Argyle BIA overall reinvestment rate</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Efficiency</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Hamilton Road BIA overall reinvestment rate</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Efficiency</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Hyde Park BIA overall reinvestment rate</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Efficiency</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>LDBA overall reinvestment rate</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Efficiency</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>OEV BIA overall reinvestment rate</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of Argyle BIA assets in Fair or better condition</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of Hamilton Road BIA assets in Fair or better condition</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of Hyde Park BIA assets in Fair or better condition</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of LDBA BIA assets in Fair or better condition</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of Argyle BIA assets within expected useful life</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of Hamilton Road BIA assets within expected useful life</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of Hyde Park BIA assets within expected useful life</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of LDBA assets within expected useful life</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Percentage of OEV BIA assets within expected useful life</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>Maintain current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3: Asset Lifecycle Management

3.3.1: Asset Lifecycle Management Activities

The asset lifecycle management activities are the range of actions funded through the operating and capital budgets that are practiced on the assets. Asset lifecycle activities are generally grouped into the categories shown in Table 3.7.

### Table 3.6 Definitions for Lifecycle Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Infrastructure Solutions</td>
<td>Actions or policies that can lower costs or extend useful lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Including regularly scheduled inspection and maintenance or more significant repairs and activities associated with unexpected events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal/Rehab</td>
<td>Significant repairs designed to extend the life of the asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement/Construction</td>
<td>Activities that are expected to occur once an asset has reached the end of its useful life and renewal/rehab is no longer an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>Activities associated with disposing of an asset once it has reached the end of its useful life or is otherwise no longer needed by the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Improvement</td>
<td>Planned activities to improve an asset’s capacity, quality, and system reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Planned activities required to extend services to previously unserved areas – or expand services to meet growth demands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2: Asset Lifecycle Management Strategy

The BIAs employ a combination of lifecycle management activities to maintain current LOS while striving to optimize costs based on defined risks. This strategy includes activities for maintenance, rehabilitation, replacement, and disposal, while continuing to prepare for growth and introduce service improvements.

When feasible, BIA also strives to further optimize these lifecycle activities by coordinating and synchronizing work across multiple assets, which can result in cost and service efficiencies. Additionally, BIAs seek to optimize asset use and redundant capacity, often achieved through risk benefit cost analyses and cost effectiveness analyses.

This strategy is not static. Certain selected lifecycle activities are reviewed and modified based on staff training, online reviews, consultant recommendations. Each BIA is also committed to climate change adaptation and mitigation planning through engagement with membership and City of London staff, which may trigger additional asset investment needs.

Table 3.8 lists specific asset management practices or planned actions BIAs conduct for each lifecycle activity associated with the leasehold improvements, furniture and fixtures, computer hardware and software, and community engaging assets.

Table 3.9 lists specific risks associated with asset management practices or planned actions by lifecycle activity for all asset types.
Table 3.7 Current Asset Management Practices or Planned Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Specific Asset Management Practices or Planned Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Non-Infrastructure Solutions** | **Leasehold improvements**  
• Facilities are maintained and renewed through the relevant commercial entity which a BIA pays rent. Leasehold improvements generally occur when an entity converts an existing space to their needs. Periodic review and update of space may occur which could spur further investment.  
**Other BIA Assets**  
• Various controls and approval processes to safeguard assets.  
• Financial planning strategies to control costs.  
• Ongoing search for additional funding.  
• Operational continuous improvements.  
• Improvements to employee capabilities, communications, training, etc.  
• Public involvement practices including posters, and website.  
• Changes to current and proposed LOS.  
• Developing asset management program.  
• Networks with peers through conferences and committees to learn from other’s experiences. |
| **Maintenance**            | **Leasehold improvements**  
• Planned inspections and regular general maintenance schedules ensure the facility is fit for service.  
**Community Engaging Assets (Hamilton Road BIA)**  
Staff internal assessments used to assess range of lifecycle needs which typically involves re-varnishing or lacquering.  
**Other BIA Assets**  
• Scheduled preventative maintenance programs for most assets.  
• Scheduled inspection programs for key assets, particularly Community Engaging Assets.  
• Maintenance also triggered by public/community partners feedback (when applicable). |
| **Renewal/Rehabilitation** | **Leasehold improvements**  
Results of planned inspections used to determine cost and timing of renewal requirements for portion of leasehold improvements BIAs are responsible for maintaining and replacing.  
**Other BIA Assets**  
• Adopt the latest technology that maintains the current LOS. |
| **Replacement/Construction** | **Leasehold improvements**  
• Assessments to ensure assets are meeting modern workspace needs, which may go beyond a typical condition assessment, used to identify, and trigger complete replacement or construction of new leasehold improvements.  
**Other BIA Assets**  
• Adopt the latest technology that maintains the current LOS. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Specific Asset Management Practices or Planned Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Disposal             | **All BIA Assets**  
• Appropriate and proper disposal occur when assets are replaced or renewed.  
• Dispose of assets under the applicable regulation and environmental standards. |
| Service Improvement  | **Leasehold Improvements**  
• Consultation with community partners and users of facilities determines service improvement needs.  
**Other BIA Assets**  
• Based on strategic service review results, implement service deliver changes that improve asset performance, cost, and risk.  
• Adopt the latest technology that enhances current or achieves proposed LOS. |
| Growth               | • Continuously monitor the impacts of growth on service delivery and develop strategies to manage and service realized growth. |
Activity | Specific Risks Associated with Asset Management Practices or Planned Actions
--- | ---
Renewal/Rehabilitation | • Incorrect assumptions regarding improved expected useful life after rehabilitation.
Replacement/Construction | • Cost over-runs during significant leasehold improvement projects.
 | • Minimizing service and repairs at end of life increases the chance of failures.
Disposal | • Disposal incorrectly performed or cost overruns resulting from increase disposal requirements compared to initial estimates.
 | • Timing for replacements has an operational impact. Delaying or holding inventory requires storage and can adversely affect the function and value of the retiring asset.
Service Improvement | • Service improvement is either not required or incorrectly assessed.
Growth | • Risk of insufficient funding to construct/acquire or maintain new assets.
 | • Potential insufficient knowledge of and supporting policies for new asset types.

3.3.3: Lifecycle Management Scenario Forecasts – Planned Budget, Maintain Current LOS, and Achieve Proposed LOS

**General Approach**
The general approach to forecasting the cost of the lifecycle activities that are required to maintain the current performance of the LOS metrics is to ensure that the proportion of assets in Poor or Very Poor condition remains relatively stable. Staff then consider the optimal blend of each lifecycle activity to achieve the lowest lifecycle cost management strategy that balances costs with the forecasted change in the condition profile of each asset type. To present these infrastructure needs, three different lifecycle management scenarios and their associated funding requirements are presented. Typically, each scenario lists the operating, renewal (inclusive of replacement, rehabilitation, and disposal), service improvement, and growth funding requirements. However, to align with BIAs budget structure, only operating budget funding requirements are presented in this AMP.

These scenarios are defined as:
1. Projected Funding Scenario – Presents the budget constrained to 2023 and 2024 annual budget approvals.
2. Maintain Current LOS Scenario – Forecasts the level of investment required to maintain current LOS performance.
3. Achieve Proposed LOS Scenario – Forecasts the level of investment required to achieve proposed LOS. The approach considers the desired infrastructure LOS documented in BIA’s strategic plans, if any.

The Forecasted Infrastructure Gap and Financing Strategy section provides an overview of the results along with the short- and long-term financing strategies for identified gaps, if any. Each scenario is further explained in the following sections.

**A. Scenario One: Planned Funding**
The BIA average annual activity and projected funding is summarized in Table 3.10. This scenario presents the average annual activity based on 2021 and 2022 approved budgets. Projected operating budgets are constrained to the current level of planned expenditures approved in the 2023 and 2024
budgets. If there is insufficient budget in any particular year to complete a rehabilitation or replacement activity on an asset that has reached its expected useful life age trigger, then the asset remains in a Poor or Very Poor condition state until there is sufficient budget in a future year to complete the lifecycle activity. For this scenario no infrastructure gaps are assessed.

Table 3.9 Scenario One – Average Annual Activity and Project Asset Related Operating Budget ($Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Average Annual Activity for 2021 and 2022</th>
<th>Projected Operating Budget</th>
<th>Average Annual Activity for 2021 and 2022 Asset Related Operating Budget</th>
<th>Projected Asset Related Operating Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Argyle BIA</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Hamilton Road BIA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Hyde Park BIA</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating LDBA</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating OEV BIA</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Scenario Two: Maintain Current LOS

The cost to maintain current LOS are summarized in Table 3.11. Based on this analysis, Table 3.11 identifies no 10-year infrastructure gap if the BIAs maintain current LOS through their respective projected asset related operating budgets. No additional reserve fund exists, life cycle renewal, service improvement and growth fund capital budgets requirements are identified.

Table 3.10 Scenario Two - Average Annual Cost to Maintain Current LOS ($Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIA Entity</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Projected Asset Related Operating Budget</th>
<th>Cost to Maintain Current LOS</th>
<th>Maintain Current LOS Infrastructure Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle BIA</td>
<td>Operating Related to Renewal and Replacement</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road BIA</td>
<td>Operating Related to Renewal and Replacement</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park BIA</td>
<td>Operating Related to Renewal and Replacement</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDBA</td>
<td>Operating Related to Renewal and Replacement</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV BIA</td>
<td>Operating Related to Renewal and Replacement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Scenario Three: Achieve Proposed LOS
This scenario typically forecasts the enhanced lifecycle and service improvement activities that are required to achieve the proposed LOS. For the first iteration of the BIAs AMP no achieve proposed LOS investments are identified. However, as part of asset management continuous improvement projects, completed with the support of City staff, enhanced LOS will be considered, and if applicable reported on in future AMPs.
3.4: Forecasted Infrastructure Gaps and Financing Strategy

3.4.1: Forecasted Infrastructure Gaps

Infrastructure gaps are a dollar amount based on the difference between:

- the amount of money that needs to be spent on BIA assets required to provide services, and
- the amount of funding presently identified in recent approved operating budgets 2023 and 2024.

In other words, what each BIA plans to spend versus what the assets need. Ideally, if infrastructure gaps exist, they would decline over time as greater investments are made to replace older infrastructure, to improve the condition of infrastructure and to minimize risks associated with failing assets and insufficient asset complements.

Table 3.13 and Figure 3.12 illustrate no infrastructure gaps have been assessed over the 10-year analysis period.

Rehabilitation and replacement investments, primarily for Hamilton Road BIA sculptures, are based on consultant assessments. The remainder are based on expected useful life and considering industry best practices to maintain individual facilities current leasehold improvements.

Additional maintain current LOS pressures of note include maintaining investment for Furniture and Equipment, and Community Engaging Assets to ensure BIAs can continue providing infrastructure that engages the community.

Table 3.11 Average Annual Budget and Gap Analysis ($Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Projected Operating Budget Related to Assets</th>
<th>Investment to Maintain Current LOS</th>
<th>Incremental Investment to Achieve Proposed LOS</th>
<th>Infrastructure Gap to Maintain Current LOS</th>
<th>Infrastructure Gap to Achieve Proposed LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle BIA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road BIA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park BIA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDBA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV BIA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All BIAs</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2: Infrastructure Gap Financing Strategy

At present, Canada lacks a defined standard or guidance for assessing the acceptability of municipal infrastructure gaps. Nevertheless, the fundamental objective of asset management is that BIA actions are collectively (both financial and non-financial) anticipated to tackle projected infrastructure gaps, if identified. Typically, the infrastructure gap financing strategies supports this objective by setting out the approach to ensuring that appropriate funds are available to support the delivery of infrastructure dependent services. This is done by completing the AMP in advance of budgeting processes so that its results help inform the requested operating budgets.

3.5: Discussion

3.5.1: Lifecycle Management Scenarios

The lifecycle management section included three scenarios – project budget, maintain current LOS, and achieve proposed LOS.

Scenario One project budget is identified to have sufficient investments to effectively maintain infrastructure.

Scenario Two maintain current LOS funding is identified to have sufficient investments to effectively maintain infrastructure. This scenario acknowledges the need for continual investment in assets to maintain their current state.

Scenario Three has no identified achieve proposed LOS investments.

In future AMPs these three scenarios may result in different LOS depending on the funding provided for asset lifecycle renewal and service improvement actions. Thus, the choices made may one day have an implication for asset condition and BIA operational effectiveness.
3.5.2: Current and Future Challenges

General

BIAs face a dynamic collection of opportunities and challenges that impact service delivery and infrastructure. For example, some of these conditions and trends include:

- Economic (e.g., budget pressures/inflation, post pandemic industry recovery)
- Organizational (e.g., continued community engagement and partnerships)
- Technology (e.g., digital strategy to support hybrid meetings and online presence)
- Political/Legal (e.g., governmental and business partnerships)
- Environmental (e.g., sustainability, climate change)

To help navigate these factors the BIA mandates provides a framework for the development of proactive, leading-edge strategies designed to ensure the changing needs of our community, and our members, are supported through meaningful engagement and collaboration, investment in our people and infrastructure, and effective and efficient service delivery.

The following commentary summarizes the main current and future challenges impacting infrastructure needs and costs.

Pandemic Disruption and Inflation

Pandemic disruption impacted BIAs and the community engagement aspect of BIAs. Examples include loss of sales revenue, reduced foot traffic due to cancelled, increased operating and asset costs, etc. As we emerge from the pandemic, inflationary pressures beyond those accounted for within approved operating budgets emerged due to COVID-19 induced supply chain disruptions and supply-demand imbalances. As of 2023, these higher input costs have been incorporated into the 2024 BIA AMP and are a material component of the infrastructure replacement values.

Technology

Engaging with the BIA communities are performed through various mediums. However, continuing with modern advancements, whether hybrid meetings or connecting online, are a mainstay in managing a BIA. Monitoring and enhancing technology to ensure best connectivity is a continuous pressure.

Climate Change

In 2019, London City Council declared a climate emergency. In alignment with this declaration, BIAs have implemented green pilots to reduce commercial-level food waste through composting. Future AMP analysis could include leasehold improvements energy efficiency and GHG reduction investments (i.e., green for like lifecycle renewal and green service improvement costs), assessing the sustainability of Community Engaging Assets, or impact of BIA on local businesses greening efforts.

Growth

London is experiencing steady to above average population and employment growth. From a City-wide perspective this growth triggers a surge of City-wide service and asset capacity needs, resulting in a proportional boom in new and/or enhanced infrastructure construction and acquisition. While BIAs are not listed within the City Development Charges Background Study, other City infrastructure located in these geographics could be, and coupled with the notion that a growing and vibrant City suggests a welcoming environment and potentially a greater geographic area for individual BIAs to represent, or perhaps new BIAs to add to City scope.
Valued at over $582.5 thousand, the BIA assets are overall in Good condition, indicating that historically there has been sufficient investment in sustaining these assets to maintain current LOS. There are no identified cumulative 10-year maintain current LOS and achieve proposed LOS gaps (2023-2032). It is also noted that if supply chain issues and rising costs continue, the timely rehabilitation, replacement, and acquisition of BIA assets may be impacted and could result in increased costs of the services ultimately delivered. Table 3.14 presents the summary of the State of Local Infrastructure, Infrastructure Gap, and Reinvestment Rates for BIA assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Replacement Value</th>
<th>Current Condition</th>
<th>Infrastructure Gap Maintain Current LOS</th>
<th>Infrastructure Gap Achieve Proposed LOS</th>
<th>Current Annual Reinvestment Rate</th>
<th>Recommended Annual Reinvestment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle BIA</td>
<td>$42.0</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road BIA</td>
<td>$142.3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park BIA</td>
<td>$131.6</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDBA</td>
<td>$222.9</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV BIA</td>
<td>$43.7</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All BIA entities</td>
<td>$582.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>None Identified</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability and Accuracy Commentary
Figure 3.13 visually presents BIA and CAM staff assessment of AMP data reliability and accuracy. Data reliability and accuracy is rated moderate. Inventories are based on internal expert opinion and an amalgamation of data sources. Majority of valuation, condition, and investment actuals and forecasts are primarily based on expert opinion. Further processes, systems, and controls are required to improve these data sets.

A review of systems and processes that support BIA asset registries is recommended over the 2024-2027 timeframe, and beyond. Such investments will raise the reliability and accuracy of the data.

11 Source: Reinvestment rates based on expected useful life.
Section 4. Conclusion and Recommendations
4.1: Conclusions

4.1.1: Key Findings

BIA infrastructure systems are an integral piece of social engagement and economic prosperity services and play a key role in achieving BIA objectives and goals.

This AMP is a strategic document that describes the state of BIA infrastructure and the approach to managing assets over their lifecycle to maintain current LOS at the lowest lifecycle cost possible, noting no achieve approved LOS are identified. It was produced through extensive efforts of BIA and City CAM staff leveraging the City’s CAM Policy and Program as well as knowledge gained from the City’s 2014, 2019, 2023 CAM Plans. Over time, each successive AMP will play a larger role in informing infrastructure and service decision-making.

The key findings of the AMP are:

- There is $582.5 thousand worth of infrastructure under the direct ownership and control of BIAs. This infrastructure represents an array of assets including leasehold improvement, furniture and fixtures, computer hardware and software, and community engaging assets.
- The overall condition of BIA assets is rated as Good.
- Good condition indicates some elements show general signs of deterioration that require attention, and a few elements exhibit significant deficiencies.
- Based on the existing BIA projected funding, no cumulative 10-year infrastructure gaps are assessed.
- The BIAs have an annual operating budget process separate from the 2024-2027 MYB. CAM and BIA staff have to make a projected estimate of available operating budget funding based on recent approved operating budgets and internal expert opinion.
- For the purposes of timing consistency with other City services, future AMPs will be brought forward to align with the development of City’s MYBs and will present financing strategies to mitigate any identified infrastructure gaps while balancing the impact of taxation affordability on members.

4.1.2: Ontario Regulations 588/17 Compliance

O. Reg 588/17 has a phased approach with two timelines of July 1, 2024, and July 1, 2025, that are applicable to the City’s agencies, boards, and commissions (ABCs). The July 1, 2024, timeline is where all City infrastructure assets, including those of ABCs, will have an AMP documenting maintain current LOS and financial strategies to fund these expenditures. The final deadline of July 1, 2025, builds on the July 1, 2024, deadline with the additional requirement to document achieve proposed LOS and financial strategies to fund these expenditures for all types of municipal infrastructure assets.

This AMP is compliant with the July 1, 2024, and July 1, 2025, O.Reg. 588/17 requirements. A detailed reconciliation of this AMP’s compliance with the O. Reg. 588/17 requirements is contained in Appendix A. O.Reg.588/17 Asset Management Plan Requirements.

4.2: Recommendations

The City’s CAM Program is founded on the principle of continuous improvement with the object of increasing line-of-sight quality of data/information and the tools and techniques that are used to inform services and asset management decision-making. This increased quality will lead to greater confidence in the analysis documented and decisions formed through the AMP.
Based on these objectives, Table 4.1 recommendations will ensure that this process and AMP continues to help BIAs manage their combined $582.5 thousand asset portfolio to provide affordable and sustainable service delivery and keep compliant with the regulatory requirements. These recommendations are structured to address short- and long-term objectives and are categorized according to distinct asset management knowledge areas, considering the current state, future needs, and overall BIA strategic objectives and goals. Short-term objectives are those that are recommended for completion over the 2024-2027 MYB period. Long-term objectives are those that are recommended for completion beyond the 2024-2027 MYB period. Each of these recommendations will be completed with leading support from the City’s CAM staff.

Table 4.1 2024 BIA AMP Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Improvement Initiative details</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Inventory/Knowledge</td>
<td>Enhance data attributes and data accuracy of existing asset registries (asset inventory databases).</td>
<td>• Provides a sound basis for decision making on the asset base and enables more efficient reporting.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By asset type, develop a standardized methodology for determining asset conditions.</td>
<td>• Enables consistency of asset management practices across BIA assets and improves decision-making.</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>Develop more asset related LOS metrics and their performance targets.</td>
<td>• Ensuring the consistent delivery of services at expected standards, thereby aligning operational performance with customer expectations and strategic objectives.</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifecycle Management and Decision Making</td>
<td>Develop and implement investment strategies for BIA infrastructure based on asset registries and strategic plans.</td>
<td>• Enables a clear understanding of the investment priorities for each asset type and investment period.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate and align the AMP into BIA strategic planning exercises to better reflect asset and service delivery capability.</td>
<td>• Strategic plans developed on a sound basis reflecting the actual capability of the asset base and required capital investments to achieve desired LOS.</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and implement a Maintenance Management Strategy incorporating enhanced maintenance practices.</td>
<td>• Lifecycle cost savings, and productivity and LOS improvements.</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Improvement Initiative details</td>
<td>Key Benefits</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Risk Management               | Enhance BIA asset risk framework in line with the City’s CAM Risk Management Strategy.          | • Better targeted asset interventions.  
• Increased ability to sustain service levels.                                                      | Long Term   |
| Financial Management         | Improve infrastructure funding through appropriate alignment of operating and capital budgets. | • Clarity in financial planning and reporting.  
• Enhanced investment strategies.                                                                   | Short Term  |
|                              | Explore opportunities to address the infrastructure gap through various financing strategies.    | • Achieve service and financial sustainability.                                                        | Long Term   |
| Systems and Technology       | Leveraging either City or BIA software solutions, implement centralized asset registry technology.| • Implementation will streamline asset management, enhancing operational efficiency, decision-making accuracy, and compliance. |
|                              |                                                                                                |                                                                                                       | Long Term   |
| People and Staff             | Enhance asset management governance within each BIA service area.                                | • Enhances oversight of asset interventions and reporting.                                             | Long Term   |
|                              | Add asset management duties in relevant positions job description.                              | • Proactive identification of staff, skills, and qualifications.                                       | Long Term   |
| Monitoring and Reporting     | Develop a comprehensive AMP every 4-years aligned with the City’s multi-year budget process.   | • Informed budget decision-making.  
• Regulatory compliance.                                                                              | Short Term  |
|                              | Annually the progress of this AMP. The annual progress review will address implementation of the recommendations and any factors impeding completion progress. | • Regulatory compliance.                                                                              | Short Term  |
|                              | With the support of City CAM staff, when possible incorporate infrastructure related data and public feedback opportunities in existing BIA public engagement practices. | • Enhanced adaptability to changing operational environments and community needs.  
• Improved customer satisfaction and engagement.  
• Increased efficiency and effectiveness in asset management operations.                         | Short Term  |
Appendix A. O.Reg.588/17 Asset Management Plan Requirements
## A1. O.Reg.588/17 Asset Management Plan Compliance Reconciliation

### Table A1.0.1 O.Reg.588/17 July 1, 2024, Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.Reg.588/17 Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Mapping to AMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Summary of assets in each category</td>
<td>Sections - #3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 3.</td>
<td>Replacement cost of assets in each category</td>
<td>Sections - #3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 3.</td>
<td>Average age of assets in each category</td>
<td>Sections - #3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 3.</td>
<td>Condition of assets in each category</td>
<td>Sections - #3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 3.</td>
<td>Description of municipality’s approach to assessing condition of assets in each category</td>
<td>Sections - #3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 1.</td>
<td>Current levels of service</td>
<td>Sections - #3.2.1 and #3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 2.</td>
<td>Current performance measures of assets in each category based on established metrics</td>
<td>Sections - #3.2.1 and #3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 4.</td>
<td>Lifecycle activities needed to maintain current levels of service for 10 years</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 4.</td>
<td>Costs of providing lifecycle activities needed to maintain current LOS, based on assessment of lifecycle, options, risks, lower cost</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 4.</td>
<td>Link or description of assessment of current LOS lifecycle, options, risks, lower cost</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 5.</td>
<td>For population &lt;25K, description of population or economic forecast assumptions, and how these connect to lifecycle cost projections for current LOS</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 6.i.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, population and employment forecasts</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 6.ii.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, lower tier in Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH), Sched 7 or portion of upper tier growth plan forecast, or assumptions</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 6.iii.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, upper/single tier outside GGH, population and employment forecasts, or assumptions</td>
<td>See City of London 2023 CAM Plan 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 6.iv.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, lower tier outside GGH, portion of upper tier growth plan forecast</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(2) 6.vi.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, capital, and significant operating costs for each of 10 years, to maintain LOS to accommodate increase in demand cause by growth</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.(1)</td>
<td>Date of review and update of AMP - within 5 years</td>
<td>Include once finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Endorsement of AMP by executive lead</td>
<td>Include once finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Approval of AMP by municipal Council resolution</td>
<td>Include once finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.(1)</td>
<td>Date of municipal Council review of AM progress - before July 1, every year</td>
<td>Include once finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.(2)</td>
<td>Annual municipal Council review includes progress, factors impeding implementation, strategy to address factors</td>
<td>Include once finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Website availability of policy and AMP, copy provided if requested</td>
<td>Include once finalized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table A1.0.2 O.Reg.588/17 July 1, 2025, Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.Reg.588/17 Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Mapping to AMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 1.</td>
<td>Proposed levels of service for each of 10 years</td>
<td>Sections - #3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 2.</td>
<td>Explanation of why proposed LOS are appropriate, based on options, delta, achievability, affordability</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 2.</td>
<td>Link or description of assessment of proposed LOS options, delta, achievability, affordability</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 3.</td>
<td>Proposed performance measures of assets based on metrics established by the municipality (e.g., measures for energy usage, operating efficiency, etc.)</td>
<td>Sections - #3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4.</td>
<td>Lifecycle management strategy: Identification of lifecycle activities needed to provide proposed levels of service for a 10-year period, based on assessment of full lifecycle, options, risks, lowest cost</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4. i.</td>
<td>Link or description of assessment of proposed LOS lifecycle, options, risks, lower cost</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4. ii.</td>
<td>An estimate of annual costs for undertaking identified lifecycle activities over a 10-year period.</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4. iii.</td>
<td>Projections for annual funding to be available to undertake identified lifecycle activities over a 10-year period.</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4. iii.</td>
<td>Explanation of the options examined to maximize the funding projected to be available</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3 and #3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4. iv.</td>
<td>Identification of funding shortfalls for lifecycle activities over a 10-year period</td>
<td>Sections - #3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4. iv.</td>
<td>Identification of lifecycle activities that will be undertaken if there is a shortfall</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 4. iv.</td>
<td>Explanation of how risks associated with not undertaking any of the lifecycle activities will be managed.</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 5.</td>
<td>For population &lt;25K, description of population or economic forecast assumptions, and how these connect to lifecycle cost projections for proposed LOS</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 6.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, capital, and significant operating costs for each of 10 years, to achieve proposed LOS to accommodate increase in demand caused by growth</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 6. ii.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, funding projected to be available, by source, due to growth</td>
<td>Sections - #3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 6. iii.</td>
<td>For population 25K or more, overview of the risks associated with implementation of the AMP</td>
<td>Sections - #3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.(1) 7.</td>
<td>Explanation of other key assumptions</td>
<td>Sections - #2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary
Definitions
Achieve Proposed Levels of Service: is defined as the strategic initiatives undertaken by an organization to modify its service levels represented in a new proposed standard of service provision. This could involve modifying the condition, scope, or accessibility of the services beyond their current levels, based on strategic goals (e.g., Regulation Requirements, Master Plans or Strategic Plan Targets). The achievement of these proposed service levels may require changes in frequency and/or scope of asset lifecycle activities.

Asset: Non-financial assets having physical substance that are acquired, constructed, or developed and:
• are held for use in the production or supply of goods and services for rental to others, for administrative purposes or for the development, construction, maintenance, or repair of other tangible assets;
• have useful economic lives extending beyond an accounting period of one year;
• are to be used on a continuing basis; and
• are not for resale in the ordinary course of operations.

For the BIAs, capital assets have the following characteristics:
• Beneficial ownership and control clearly rests with BIAs, and
• The asset is utilized to achieve BIA plans, objectives, and services with the intention of being used on a continuous basis and is not intended for sale in the ordinary course of business.

Asset Management: is an integrated approach, involving all organization departments, to effectively manage existing and new assets to deliver services to customers. The intent is to maximize benefits, reduce risks and provide satisfactory levels of service to the community in a sustainable manner.

AMP: The BIAs Asset Management Plan which combines multi-disciplinary management techniques (technical and financial) over the life cycle of infrastructure assets to provide a specific level of service in the most cost-effective manner and manage risks associated with municipal infrastructure assets. This typically includes plans to invest, design, construct, acquire, operate, maintain, renew, replace, and decommission assets.

CAM Program: A set of interrelated or interacting components of the City and its agencies, boards, and commissions that establishes asset management policies and objectives and the processes needed to achieve those objectives. An asset management program also includes the organization structure, roles, responsibilities, business processes, plans, and operations of asset management practices.

Capitalization Threshold: The threshold represents the minimum cost an individual asset must have before it is to be recorded as a capital asset on the statement of financial position.

City: The Corporation of the City of London.

Consequence of Failure: A measure of the direct and indirect impacts on the city in the event of an asset failure.

Core Municipal Infrastructure Asset: Defined by O.Reg 588/17, any municipal infrastructure asset that is a, Water asset that relates to the collection, production, treatment, storage, supply or distribution of drinking water; Wastewater asset that relates to the collection, transmission, treatment or disposal of...
wastewater, including any wastewater asset that from time to time manages stormwater; Stormwater management asset that relates to the collection, transmission, treatment, retention, infiltration, control or disposal of stormwater; Road; or Bridge or culvert.

**Critical Asset:** An asset for which the financial, business, or service level consequences of failure are sufficiently severe to justify proactive inspection, rehabilitation, or replacement, and is considered a municipal infrastructure asset.

**Customer:** Any person or entity who from the municipal infrastructure asset or service, is affected by it or has an interest in it either now or in the future.

**Direct Levels of Service:** Levels of service that are most representative of a municipal service and can be costed over a 10-year projected period.

**Green Infrastructure Asset:** Defined by O.Reg. 588/17, means an infrastructure asset consisting of natural or human-made elements that provide ecological and hydrological functions and processes and includes natural heritage features and systems, parklands, stormwater management systems, street trees, urban forests, natural channels, permeable surfaces, and green roofs.

**Infrastructure Asset:** All or part of physical structures and associated facilities that form the foundation of development, and by or through which a public service is provided to the city, such as highways, bridges, bicycle paths, drinking water systems, social housing, hospitals, courthouses, and schools, as well as any other thing by or through which a public service is provided to the city.

**Maintain Current Levels of Service:** is defined as the persistent efforts of an organization to manage its assets through comprehensive lifecycle activities and effectively allocating necessary financial resources with the aim of consistently delivering its services at the current established service levels.

**Metrics:** Information than supplements levels of service (whether direct, related, or required under Ontario Regulation 588/17). Considered useful but a lagging indicator, meaning they do not readily provide strategic insight or can be easily costed to a municipal service.

**Municipal Infrastructure Asset:** An infrastructure asset (core and non-core municipal infrastructure assets), including a green infrastructure asset, directly owned by a municipality, or included on the consolidated financial statements of a municipality, but does not include an infrastructure asset that is managed by a joint municipal water board.

**Public:** Residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional partners, and any other party that rely on municipal infrastructure assets.

**Related Levels of Service:** Levels of service that have a causal relationship with direct levels of service but cannot be easily costed over 10-year projected period.

**Replacement Value:** The cost BIA would incur to completely replace a municipal infrastructure asset, at a selected point in time, at which a similar level of service would be provided. This definition can also be referred to as ‘Replacement Cost’.

**Tangible Capital Assets (TCA):** A legislative reporting requirement specified by Section PS 3150 in the Public Sector Accounting Board Handbook to identify asset inventories, additions, disposals, and amortization on an annual basis.
Acronyms

ABC: Agencies, Boards, and Commissions
AMP: Asset Management Plan
AODA: Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act
Argyle BIA: Argyle Business Improvement Area
BIA: Business Improvement Areas/Associations
CAM: Corporate Asset Management
CAM Plan: Corporate Asset Management Plan
CEAP: Climate Emergency Action Plan
DC: Development Charges
Hamilton Road BIA: Hamilton Road Business Improvement Area
Hyde Park BIA: Hyde Park Business Improvement Association
IT: Information Technology
LCR: Lifecycle Renewal
LDBA: London Downtown Business Association
Board: Board of Management or Board of Directors, as applicable to entity
LOS: Levels of Service
MESL: Maintain Existing Service Levels
MYB: Multi-Year Budget
OEV BIA: Old East Village Business Improvement Area
O. Reg.: Ontario Regulation
RV: Replacement Value
TCA: Tangible Capital Asset
For more information visit london.ca/CAM or contact
Corporate Asset Management Phone: 519-661-CITY (2489) Email: CAM@london.ca