APPENDICES

REPORT TO THE ONTARIO MINISTER OF EDUCATION

REGARDING THE

TORONTO DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
Contents

Appendix I  Special Assistance Team Terms of Reference 3
Appendix II Summary Report to the Ministry of Education RE: TDSB Capital Issues 5
Appendix III  TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan 10
Appendix IV  Reorganization of the TDSB Capital Planning, Design and Construction Services 25
Appendix V  Implementation of Full-Day Kindergarten Program 34
Appendix VI Development and Implementation of TDSB Capital Planning Process 42
Appendix VII Report to the Ministry Re: TDSB Major Capital Projects 48
Appendix I
Special Assistance Team Terms of Reference

Bill Hogarth’s mandate:

- Work cooperatively and transparently with TDSB to provide special assistance on implementing the recommendations contained in PwC’s Resource Allocation Review. Specifically, support the senior administrative team in addressing the school board’s structural deficit by:
  
  o Assisting the school board in developing a transformation program based on three core values: leadership, accountability and controls
  
  o Working with the school board to develop a detailed implementation plan with key activities, dates/milestones, and key roles, responsibilities and accountability requirements
  
  o Supporting the school board in:
    
    ▪ Managing all aspects of the transformation strategy, including steering committee meetings, project management and communication plans
    
    ▪ Identifying resources and mobilizing the implementation program team
    
    ▪ Aligning operational efficiencies and savings strategies with the 2013-14 budget

- Provide coaching and strategic advice to senior board staff related to decision making, operational and capital issues at the TDSB.

Ralph Benson’s Capital Management mandate:

- Provide alternative options to address the board’s capital deficit including a viability assessment of the capital deficit recovery plan

- Address the capital management reorganization requirements detailed in the PwC report, including reviewing partnership and contracts between TDSB and the Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC)

- Review and prepare a report on recommendations for improvement of TDSB’s accommodation planning process (strategic capital planning, setting capital priorities, identification and disposal of surplus properties, proceeding with capital projects to address full-day kindergarten (FDK) accommodation needs)
• Review TDSB’s new Project Charter and prepare a report on how TDSB’s capital processes and policies can be improved to ensure effective management of construction projects.
• Review current major capital projects and provide advice on any measures TDSB should adopt to ensure projects are built on-budget and in a timely manner
• Review existing scope of the Bendale/David and Mary Thompson replacement secondary school project
• Identify opportunities for revenue generation (i.e. land severances, property redevelopments)
• Review TDSB’s current school renewal priorities to identify priority projects that should be addressed
SUMMARY REPORT TO THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
RE: TDSB CAPITAL ISSUES

I have prepared the following five reports to the Ministry regarding TDSB capital issues.

- TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan  
  20 March 2013

- The Reorganization of the TDSB Capital Planning, Design and Construction Services  
  9 April 2013

- The Implementation of Full-Day Kindergarten Program  
  18 April 2013

- The Development and Implementation of TDSB Capital Planning Process  
  30 April 2013

- TDSB Major Capital Projects (Cost and Timing)  
  31 May 2013

**TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan**

I recommended that the Board remove both proposed expenditures for capital projects that have not been approved by the Ministry, and projected revenue from the sale of land that has not been approved by the Board, from the board’s Deficit Recovery Plan.
I also recommended that the TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan should reflect the Board’s actual expenditures and revenues for the current fiscal year 2012-2013, and that it should include the Board’s debenture loan.

I further recommended that the board demonstrate an explicit commitment that the Board would not undertake any capital expenditures without identifying a source of revenue to offset such capital expenditure.

The Board has accepted and implemented all these recommendations. The TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan for 2012-2013 was approved by the Board on May 8, 2013 and has been submitted to the Ministry.

**The Reorganization of the TDSB Capital Design and Construction Services**

The shared dual reporting relationship between the TDSB and the Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC) has been eliminated. All capital services provided by TLC with respect to planning, design and construction have been transferred to TDSB staff.

I worked with Facility Services and Strategy and Planning to help design their specific departments to integrate the staff repatriated from TLC.

I worked with the Director to establish a new capital management process. A Capital Strategy Committee has been established, chaired by the Director, to integrate the capital planning, design and construction functions within the TDSB. The Capital Strategy Committee is also providing leadership in developing the Board’s capital strategy, serving as an accountability framework for planning and facilities, and monitoring the development and implementation of all major capital projects.

**The Implementation of Full-Day Kindergarten Program**

I have worked with TDSB staff:

- To reduce the cost of year four and year five kindergarten additions by changing the technical specifications to more closely reflect the norms applied by other school boards in Ontario.

- To reduce the number of year four and year five kindergarten additions by implementing a number of non-capital solutions such as internal school reorganization, use of portables and boundary changes.

- To plan for the implementation of all remaining year four and year five kindergarten additions within the Ministry allocation.
The program described above has been approved by TDSB Administrative Council and is in the process of being implemented.

**The Development and Implementation of TDSB Capital Planning Process**

The Board is implementing a new capital planning process under the leadership of the Capital Strategy Committee, chaired by the Director. One of the goals of establishing the Capital Strategy Committee was to elevate the stature of the planning process and its efficacy.

The new planning process is in its early stages and is attempting to focus on program needs as well as enrolment growth needs. The development of a new three year capital plan is currently underway with the Trustee Seminars in April and May being amongst the first steps in the process.

The building blocks of the new capital plan include facility needs (growth), FDK, portable reductions, redevelopment projects, facility renewal and program elements. The major revenue sources for the new capital plan are severances and the sale of surplus sites.

The recommendations of the TLC regarding severances and surplus sites are being incorporated in the new three year capital plan.

The new capital plan is scheduled for discussion at the Planning and Priorities Committee on June 12, 2013, with it going to Board on June 19, 2013.

The new three year capital plan is intended to be the first major step in a much longer process related to the development and implementation of a long term capital plan

**TDSB Major Capital Projects (Cost and Timing)**

The report focuses on the TDSB capital planning, design and construction processes, and presents a set of recommendation for the consideration of the Board.

Eighteen specific recommendations under the following headings: Project Identification/Due Diligence, Project Lead Time, Third Party Consultants, Project Charter, Community Consultation and Ministry Benchmarks, have been developed.

The recommendations have been developed to assist the TDSB in designing and building capital projects based on Ministry benchmarks, and having the schools ready to be occupied based on their projected schedules.
Recommendations:

R1. A budget should be made available to Planning and Facility Services to carry out the necessary due diligence procedures prior to a capital project being submitted for approval by the Board.

R2. Planning and Facility Services should conduct the appropriate due diligence procedures prior to submitting a capital project for the approval of the Board.

R3. There should be adequate time provided for the design and construction of all capital projects, subject to the nature and scope of a project.

R4. Winter construction should be avoided to the extent possible, to help control the cost of capital projects.

R5. Cost consultants should be appointed by the Board, rather than the architect, and should provide costs estimates prior to completion of schematic drawings and at 80% project completion.

R6. Commissioning agents should be appointed by the Board, rather than the architect, and should be appointed early in the design and construction process (pre-design stage).

R7. The Board should enhance its Project Charter by including earlier steps in the planning, design and construction process.

R8. The Project Charter should serve as a major vehicle in the overall project management process.

R9. Community consultation which is critical to the development and approval of a capital project, should be designed to expedite project implementation and allow the Board to function within Ministry benchmarks, to the extent possible.

R.10 The Board should change its practice with respect to architect selection and utilize experienced school architects that have demonstrated the capacity to build schools within Ministry benchmarks.

R11. The Board should be more aggressive in negotiating the fees it pays to its architects.

R12. Design schools that are functional in meeting student needs, with creative design being a secondary consideration.

R13. Design schools that are less expensive to build by having more compact designs, and avoiding elements such as curved walls that are more expensive to construct.
R14. Integrate the design and construction functions within Facility Services to a greater extent, to ensure that all the expertise with Facility Services is brought to bear at all stages of the design and construction processes.

R15. Adopt a more rigorous planning review process to help reduce the number of change orders being experienced by the Board.

R16. Based on the Altus Group analysis of the cost premium between TDSB technical specifications and those in the Report of the Expert Panel on Capital Standards, particularly those with respect to mechanical and electrical, review the technical specifications to identify potential savings.

R17. Give more respect and consideration to the Report from the Expert Panel on Capital Standards – Building our Schools, Building our Future (click here for a link to this document). This report is based on the experience of school boards that have built the vast majority of new schools in Ontario in the last ten years, and is the underpinning of the Ministry capital approval process.

R18. Standardize school designs to the extent possible, in that unique designs result in higher tender prices in that the contractors have to include an amount in their bids for the greater risk they are undertaking.

The first four reports described above have been addressed by the TDSB. The specific recommendations have been implemented by either staff or the Board itself, or are in the process of being implemented.

The fifth report, TDSB Major Capital Projects (Cost and Timing) has not been shared with the TDSB staff or the Board. The Ministry needs to address how these recommendations ought to be presented to the TDSB. If deemed appropriate, I would be pleased to share them with the Board.

Ralph Benson

Special Assistance Team
Appendix III
TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan

20 March 2013

REPORT TO THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
RE: TDSB DEFICIT RECOVERY PLAN

I have been working with the TDSB staff on the development of the Board’s Deficit Recovery Plan since January 2013. Attached is a copy of a letter from myself to Donna Quan that reflects that involvement and the recommendations I made to the TDSB.

I recommended that the Board remove both proposed expenditures for capital projects that have not been approved by the Ministry, and projected revenue from the sale of land that has not been approved by the Board, from the board’s Deficit Recovery Plan.

I also recommended that the TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan should reflect the Board’s actual expenditures and revenues for the current fiscal year 2012-2013, and that it should include the Board’s debenture loan.

I further recommended that the board demonstrate an explicit commitment that the Board would not undertake any capital expenditures without identifying a source of revenue to offset such capital expenditure.

Attached as well, is a memorandum from Donna Quan to the SAT with a revised deficit recovery plan that reflects the acceptance of the recommendations presented to TDSB staff. Attached as an appendix to the Donna Quan memorandum is a resolution from the Board that requires that the costs of capital projects not exceed the capital revenue available to the Board.

Donna Quan has also provided a copy of a proposed capital planning and approval process designed to meet Ministry of Education requirements. This process should be viewed as preliminary and I will be working with the Board to develop a more comprehensive capital planning and approval process.
I think it would be appropriate, as a next step, for Vidyia Rego to meet with ministry staff to discuss the details of the Board’s proposed capital deficit recovery plan. I will leave it with ministry staff to arrange the meeting with Vidyia Rego, and I would be pleased to attend if necessary.

Ralph Benson

Special Assistance Team
15 March 2013

Donna Quan
Director of Education
Toronto District School Board
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8

Dear Donna Quan:

Thank you for providing me with your memorandum of March 8, 2013 regarding the TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan.

As per discussions in January and February with yourself, Vidyia Rego and Administrative Council, I am pleased to note the following changes you have made to the previous iteration of the TDSB Deficit Recovery Plan (DRP):

- The removal of both projected expenditures for capital projects that have not been approved by the Ministry, and projected revenue from the sale of land that has not been approved by the Board.

- Basing the DRP on actual expenditures and revenues for the current fiscal year 2012-2013.

It is also important that you have included the Board’s debenture loan in the DRP notwithstanding your reservations in this regard.

The commitment that the Board has made that it will not undertake any capital expenditures without identifying a source of revenue to offset such expenditure, is imperative to the Ministry. I would note that in the case of revenue from the sale of land, the revenue should be received within the fiscal year that the expenditure is undertaken.

The proposed Capital Planning and Approval process that is an appendix to your memorandum, should be somewhat more comprehensive and I would be pleased to work with you and Daryl Sage in this regard.

I will be recommending to the Ministry that as a next step, Ministry staff should set up a meeting with Vidyia Rego to discuss the details of the Board’s proposed Deficit Recovery Plan.

Sincerely,

Ralph Benson
Special Assistance Team

cc: Bill Hogarth
    Special Assistance Team
Date: 8 March 2013

To: Special Assistance Team
    Bill Hogarth
    Ralph Benson

From: Donna Quan
    Director of Education

Re: Capital Deficit Elimination and Long Term Capital Planning

As you are aware, Board staff held a seminar for Trustees on 25 February 2013 to discuss the Board’s planning for 2013-2013 for both its operating budget and capital needs.

At that seminar, staff presented an overview of the Board’s capital deficit elimination plan, the Board’s urgent renewal needs, as well as the parameters and a planning process to be used by the Board for developing its Long Term Capital Plan.

I understand that you will be having discussions with Ministry staff regarding the progress made to address the concerns the Ministry raised in its letter to the Board received 3 October 2012. In order to assist in those discussions, we are providing some documentation.

Attached, you will find the capital deficit recovery plan, which will eliminate the TDSB’s capital deficit as of 31 August 2013. It is slated to be presented to the Board in April 2013.

The Board is using a phased approach to the Board’s capital planning which will reflect Ministry of Education requirements.

- The first phase is to adopt a capital planning process which mirrors the Ministry of Education’s requirements.
- The second phase is a one year plan which addresses the need for the Board to eliminate its capital deficit.
The third phase will be a longer term capital plan which will reflect strategies for addressing the Board’s accommodation pressures and renewal needs and which will reflect the capital planning parameters approved by the Board in December 2012.

The capital planning process, being developed by the Board mirrors the Ministry of Education requirements to assist the Board on a go-forward basis and is attached as Appendix A.

The Board has also passed a resolution at its 12 December 2012 meeting that requires that the costs of capital projects not exceed the capital revenue available to the Board. That motion is attached as Appendix B.

The Board anticipates developing a longer term capital plan for June 2013. The plan will include capital projects to reflect growth, year five full day kindergarten projects, projects that complete the pupil accommodation reviews previously undertaken, and renewal projects. This longer term plan will include sources of revenue to offset the proposed expenditure.

The one year 2012-2013 Capital Deficit Recovery Plan meets the criteria of the Board motion from the 12 December 2012 Board meeting in that the capital deficit recovery plan approved projects do not exceed the approved capital revenue available to the Board from all sources.

This one year plan, Appendix C, will unlock $13 M in renewal dollars to be used to address urgent and high priority backlog needs.

The supporting proceeds of disposition are from properties previously approved by the Board.

A longer term capital strategy will be developed and presented to the Board in June. That plan, in accordance with the Board motion, will identify the accommodation priorities as well as the source of the additional dollars to be allocated to support the additional projects.

Appendix C outlines the current capital deficit recovery plan. The plan reflects expenses approved by both the Board and the Ministry and reflects the funding sources approved by the Board and Ministry.

Appendix C summarizes the two components of the Board’s current capital deficit of $36.4 M, which includes the renewal debenture loan of $29.4 M and $7 M of internal capital deficit where previous expenses exceeded revenues.

The next section of Appendix C outlines capital projects approved in previous years and which are being completed in 2012-2013 as well as any new capital commitments approved by the Board and the Ministry in 2012-2013. These approved capital expenses of $135 M reflect the following projects which were approved prior to 2012-2013:

- New Construction Costs
- Full Day Kindergarten Projects
- Renewal
As well, there is approximately another $26.8 M in projects approved and started in prior fiscal years and these projects will be completed in 2012-2013.

Each of these projects has received individual Board approval through the Board’s internal process and has received Ministry approval.

There are only two exceptions: the first is the additional $13 M to support urgent renewal needs and the second is the approximately $9.2 M which was spent to complete the Nelson Mandela project. In the Capital Plan presented to the Board in November 2012, the Nelson Mandela additional funding and a renewal amount of $16 M was presented for approval. However, the Board did not approve that Capital Plan. These two elements will be presented to the Board for approval in April 2013.

The plan reflects the almost $124.5 M capital funding provided by the Ministry through full day kindergarten funding and capital priorities funding, as well as approximately $72 M in revenues generated through Board approved proceeds of disposition.

Appendix D provides the capital projects approved and started in prior years which are expected to be completed in 2012-2013 as well as the revenues from the proceeds of disposition approved by the Board previously. This appendix ties back to the $26.8 M on Appendix C - Existing Capital Program and Proceeds of Disposition.

Appendix E provides the projects resulting from Program Accommodation Reviews (PARC) and includes the revenues, particularly Full Day Kindergarten funding, to support related projects tied to PARC’s. Those revenues are part of the $124 M in Ministry funding on Appendix C, Capital Projects funded by Ministry Grants.

Appendix F provides the details for approved capital costs for 2012-2013. It includes FDK projects, water quality and structural projects and $13M to address urgent renewal work. It provides the details to the $135 M line on Appendix C - New Capital Programs.

The Board will finish the 2012-2013 in a balanced capital position.

Appendix G provides both a chronology of the Board and Ministry decision regarding previous submissions from the Board, as well as the next steps leading to a Long Term Capital Plan, which will be presented to the Board in June. This plan will identify future capital priorities as well as the required Board funding sources.
I trust that the capital deficit recovery plan which eliminates the TDSB’s capital deficit by 31 August 2013 reflects the Ministry’s requirements as outlined in Ministry correspondence to the Board dated 3 October 2012.

Sincerely,

Donna Quan
Director of Education
## Capital Planning and Approval Process

### September - April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identification</th>
<th>Ministry Support</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Other Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> identifies and quantifies the need for more facility space to address student enrolment pressures</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> shares identified enrolment and accommodation pressures within a planning area</td>
<td><strong>The Board</strong> approves the list of capital priorities</td>
<td><strong>The Board’s capital plan is presented to the Ministry supported by Board-approved funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project budgets are based on Ministry approval letter “Notice to Proceed”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential alternatives are reviewed and discussed with Superintendent of Education and School Trustee</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> identifies accommodation approach to address the pressure</td>
<td><strong>Proposed solutions and costs are included as part of the Board’s capital planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Staff proceeds with the development of project business cases as part of Ministry submission</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ministry approval is required to issue construction tenders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary information is shared with the community e.g. ward forums</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> provides analysis of non-capital solutions</td>
<td><strong>The source of funding for all solutions is included and requires Board approval</strong></td>
<td><strong>Staff completes the Ministry space templates that results in the identification of required classrooms and accommodation needs and benchmark costing</strong></td>
<td><strong>If no Ministry approval is given, re-design of the project may be required or additional funding will have to be identified and approved by the Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential solutions are identified</td>
<td><strong>The estimated cost of each solution is included</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Board reviews the development of project business cases as part of Ministry submission</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goal is to receive Ministry approval to proceed with capital projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project tenders are approved by the Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Education brings forward the accommodation review analysis to the Central Accommodation Team (CAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community engagement regarding project scope and benchmark funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Any major capital project exceeding $250,000 requires formal Ministry approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Board Motion 12 December 2012

Whereas, the Board is required under current Ministry of Education capital funding rules to meet the accommodation needs of its current and future students by raising capital, if necessary, through the sale of either whole or partial school board sites, despite the fact that such sales might reduce the Board’s ability to respond to future student needs as demographic changes occur in Toronto over the coming decades, be it resolved:

(a) That a Capital Plan in which the cost of capital projects of the Board do not exceed the capital revenue available to the Board from all sources be approved;

(b) That the first priority to be met by this plan be the accommodation of students in schools in areas that are currently over-enrolled;

(c) That the Toronto Lands Corporation report to the Board annually to identify sites with the potential for severance and sale, sites with the potential for sale in their entirety, and to identify all other sources of revenue sufficient to meet the capital needs of the Board annually;

(d) That any further capital expenditure added by the Board to its Capital Plan have sufficient and existing capital provided from within the capital funds available to the Board;

(e) That capital be generated for this plan from the sale of whole properties and sale and severance of partial school properties ONLY IF sufficient funding from the provincial government or other sources does not exist and is not forthcoming;

(f) That no sale of whole or severed property proceed without a technical review of the feasibility of sale of the site or partial site, or without consultation with the local trustee and consultation with the local community, as required in Ministry of Education policies on area review or in Board policies regarding severance and sale;

(g) That, first and foremost, the Board’s capital plan meet the accommodation needs of students for health and safety issues and address urgent enrolment pressures and that any additional capital funds that are acquired be made available and apportioned as needed each capital year:

(h) to address the maintenance backlog;

(i) to reduce the number of portables used by schools;

(j) to fund the capital building needs of the Long-term Kindergarten to Grade 12 Program and Pupil Accommodation Strategy;

(k) to create a capital contingency fund for the Board;

(l) That an ad hoc committee of trustees and staff be appointed to develop a portable reduction strategy;
(m) That the Board’s core holding strategy, in which sites are identified based on planning enrolment projections and held to address future enrolment pressures of the Board, continue to be honoured, including;

(i) That properties identified as core holdings not be considered for sale as a whole;

(ii) That core holding properties be considered for severance only if they meet all other severance consideration and consultation criteria of the Board;

(iii) That the Board’s core holdings be reviewed against enrolment projections every five years and that sites be added or removed from the core holding list in line with the best and most current enrolment projections available at the time of review;

(n) That, in each case of property being considered for sale in whole or in part, staff report on the renewal benefits to the local school community where the sale is being made;

(o) That accommodation reviews of small schools, using the full consultative process specified by the Ministry of Education, be continued in order to best determine the most feasible way of addressing accommodation needs within the areas within which the schools are situated.
### Summary of Capital Program Forecast

As at 25 February 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Program</th>
<th>2011 - 2012</th>
<th>2012 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Capital Opening Balance - excluding future approvals</td>
<td>$(17,804,563)</td>
<td>$(7,020,554)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Debenture - Opening Balance</td>
<td>$(31,065,835)</td>
<td>$(29,414,530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(48,870,398)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(36,435,084)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2011 - 2012</th>
<th>2012 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Capital Program and Proceeds of Disposition</td>
<td>$(36,912,066)</td>
<td>$(26,841,321)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ARCs Launched in October 09</td>
<td>$(59,933,683)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Projects</td>
<td>$(326,334)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Capital Program</td>
<td>$(69,726,013)</td>
<td>$(135,036,401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K to 12 Strategy</td>
<td>$(10,670,257)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Costs (assumes Future Sales in interest revenue)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>370,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(177,568,354)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(161,506,886)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2011 - 2012</th>
<th>2012 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects funded by Ministry Grants</td>
<td>$87,344,486</td>
<td>$124,487,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties Approved for Sale by TLC &amp; Other</td>
<td>$101,007,876</td>
<td>$71,969,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Grant funding of Debenture Principal</td>
<td>$1,651,305</td>
<td>$1,736,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Approved and Funded</strong></td>
<td><strong>$190,003,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>$198,192,907</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Capital Balance prior to future approvals</td>
<td>$(7,020,554)</td>
<td>$27,929,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Debenture Closing Balance</td>
<td>$(29,414,530)</td>
<td>$(27,678,426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(36,435,084)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,937</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Property Proceeds and Grants - Not Approved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Capital Balance including Future Approvals</td>
<td>$(7,020,554)</td>
<td>$27,929,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Debenture Closing Balance</td>
<td>$(29,414,530)</td>
<td>$(27,678,426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(36,435,084)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,937</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Interest rates used as follows: 10-11 at 2.5%, 11-12 at 3.0%, thereafter 3.5%

NOTE: All totals represent project totals (i.e. life to date amounts). Therefore addition of columns may not always add up to total, as we hide previous years to make chart readable those prior costs may impact total project costs in some cases
## Appendix D: Existing Capital Projects

### Summary of Existing Capital Program Forecast

**As at 25 February 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance</td>
<td>(20,912,042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Toronto CI</td>
<td>$2,571,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRMP 2</td>
<td>$170,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRMP 3</td>
<td>$1,707,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Ketchum</td>
<td>$10,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR Nelson Mandela (Phase-1)</td>
<td>$13,536,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR Churchill PS</td>
<td>$2,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF Thorncliffe PS</td>
<td>$4,221,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficient Schools</td>
<td>$3,952,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pools Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$1,190,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Strategy Funding</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Le - Child Care</td>
<td>$224,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase VI Energy</td>
<td>$59,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela PS - City Child Care</td>
<td>$2,842,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorncliffe Park PS - City Child Care</td>
<td>$769,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill PS - City Child Care</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Compliance</td>
<td>$1,417,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainge Macphail PS Field Renovation</td>
<td>$270,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloorlea MS Upgrade - Joint Partnership</td>
<td>$1,268,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Moves &amp; Closures</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure Sale Severance Readiness Project Implementation</td>
<td>$427,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Construction Expenditure Cash Flow</strong></td>
<td>$36,912,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Grants: PTR Nelson Mandela PS</td>
<td>$12,949,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR Churchill PS</td>
<td>$2,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF Thorncliffe PS</td>
<td>$4,221,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Strategy Funding</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficient Schools</td>
<td>$3,912,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pools Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$1,216,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Nelson Mandela PS - Child Care</td>
<td>$2,842,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorncliffe Park PS - Child Care</td>
<td>$769,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill PS - Child Care</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Le JFS - Child Care</td>
<td>$224,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Ketchum Jr. &amp; Sr.</td>
<td>$878,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloorlea MS Upgrade - City of Toronto</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds of Disposition - Approved</td>
<td>$86,234,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Property Proceeds to be generated - Not Approved</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Disposition Revenue Cash Flow</strong></td>
<td>$116,789,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Balance - Surplus/(Interim Borrowing)</strong></td>
<td>$58,965,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Interest rates used as follows: 09-10 at 1.25% 10-11 at 2.5%, 11-12 at 3.0%, thereafter 3.5%
## Appendix E: Summary of PARC

### Summary of PARC Capital Program Forecast

**As at 25 February 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARC</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening Balance</strong></td>
<td>$8,759,000</td>
<td>$(24,981,840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 1</td>
<td>Fairbank MS</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Preparatory Jr PS - Facility Framework</td>
<td>1,788,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 2</td>
<td>Cedarbrook Jr PS</td>
<td>712,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knob Hill Jr PS</td>
<td>784,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Gordon Sr PS</td>
<td>119,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John McRae Sr PS Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John McRae Sr PS Phase 2</td>
<td>6,848,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 3</td>
<td>Joseph Brant (Major Project)</td>
<td>7,606,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastview Jr PS (Major Project)</td>
<td>3,146,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William G Miller (Major Project)</td>
<td>5,963,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 4</td>
<td>JR Wilcox CS - Phase 1</td>
<td>524,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cedarale CS</td>
<td>607,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rawlinson CS</td>
<td>640,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humewood CS</td>
<td>698,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR Wilcox CS - Phase 2</td>
<td>3,619,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cedarale CS - Phase 2</td>
<td>4,128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 5</td>
<td>Keelesdale Jr PS</td>
<td>88,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kane MS (Major Project)</td>
<td>1,627,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE Webster (Major Project)</td>
<td>4,339,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 6</td>
<td>Chief Dan George PS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Stirling PS (Major Project)</td>
<td>99,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highcastle PS (Major Project)</td>
<td>293,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 7</td>
<td>Timberbank Jr PS (FDK)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 8</td>
<td>Brock PS</td>
<td>1,787,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pauline PS</td>
<td>295,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dovercourt PS (Major Project)</td>
<td>2,020,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 9</td>
<td>Hodgson PS</td>
<td>1,200,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davisville PS (Major Project)</td>
<td>46,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maurice Cody PS (Major Project)</td>
<td>5,287,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eglinton PS (Major Project)</td>
<td>1,402,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC 10</td>
<td>Gosford PS</td>
<td>81,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driftwood PS (FDK)</td>
<td>88,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoreham PS</td>
<td>144,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacksmith PS (FDK)</td>
<td>1,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Projected Construction Expenditure Cash Flow</strong></td>
<td>$59,933,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interest Charges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$229,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC Disposition Revenue</td>
<td>$7,908,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry ARC Funding</td>
<td>4,976,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Ministry FDK Funding</strong></td>
<td>13,308,247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Projected Disposition Revenue Cash Flow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$26,192,844</td>
<td>$36,859,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Cash Flow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(24,981,840)</td>
<td>$11,648,504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix F: Summary of New Capital**

### Summary of New Capital Programs Forecast

#### As at 25 February 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ (153,650)</td>
<td>$ (24,509,631)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowvale-Sheppard Site (Major Project)</td>
<td>$ 1,101,267</td>
<td>$ 11,786,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence - Midland - Benchmark Costs</td>
<td>$ 97,052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Repairs and Water Quality</td>
<td>$ 1,962,662</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Capital Renewal</td>
<td>$ 21,900,000</td>
<td>$ 13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Funded Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Condition Improvement (SCI)</td>
<td>$ 17,264,916</td>
<td>$ 17,552,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Accommodation</td>
<td>$ 1,470,000</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela (Phase 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 9,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDK</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 76,747,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Construction Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$ 69,726,013</td>
<td>$ 135,036,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Charges</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,324,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Funding for Meadowvale-Sheppard Site</td>
<td>$ 705,000</td>
<td>$ 10,647,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Grant for SCI &amp; Temp. Accommodation</td>
<td>$ 18,734,916.0</td>
<td>$ 19,022,165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDK</td>
<td>$ 24,930,116</td>
<td>$ 77,707,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Funded Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$ 45,370,032</td>
<td>$ 108,377,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Balance - Surplus/(Interim Borrowing)</strong></td>
<td>$ (24,509,631)</td>
<td>$ (52,493,382)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Interest rates used as follows: 09-10 at 1.25% 10-11 at 2.5%, 11-12 at 3.0%, thereafter 3.5%
Appendix G: Chronology and Next Steps

Chronology:

20 June 2012: The Board considered a Capital Plan which met the requirement to eliminate the Board’s capital deficit by 31, August 2013 and outlined projects and their proposed funding sources.

The recommendation, as approved by Board was that the Capital Plan be approved as presented, subject to Ministry approval. The Ministry did not approve that plan as was indicated in their letter dated 3 October 2012.

3 October 2012: The Board received correspondence from the Ministry of Education. In that letter, the Ministry stated that:

“As you are aware, the TDSB has been required to provide quarterly updates to the plan since April 2011, when the original plan was approved. Based on the Ministry’s evaluation of the revenue and expenditure projections contained in this latest update, we believe that the board is at significant risk of not eliminating its capital deficit by 2012-2013 as required. This is of great concern to the Ministry with respect to the potential impact a capital deficit might have on the board’s overall financial operating position.”

21 November 2012: Staff presented a revised Capital Plan which met the Ministry’s requirement to eliminate the deficit by 31 August 2013 and identified new projects and proposed revenue streams. The plan reflected the additional expenditures to increase the budget for a Board and Ministry approved project which incurred additional costs.

This plan also included projects identified as priorities by the Board and which were part of the plan presented in June 2012. However the scope and timing of those projects had been amended based on discussion with Ministry staff.

The proposed revenue streams to support the new capital projects included proceeds of disposition from properties which required Board approval to sell. This report was not approved by the Board.

Next Steps:

April
- TLC will present potential sites for severance
- Staff will present review of all TLC properties
- Staff will recommend sale of non-core holding TLC sites

May
- Staff will present list of capital priorities to be submitted to the Ministry to request Capital Priority funding

June
- Staff will present the Five Year Capital Building Program to the Board for approval based on the capital parameters approved by the Board in December 2012
- Staff will obtain Ministry approval
Appendix IV
Reorganization of the TDSB Capital Planning, Design and Construction Services

REPORT RE: THE REORGANIZATION OF THE TDSB CAPITAL PLANNING, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

I have worked with Donna Quan and the TDSB staff on a number of components related to the reorganization of the TDSB capital planning, design and construction functions.

The first component related to the elimination of the shared dual reporting relationships between TDSB and the Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC) for capital planning, design and construction services.

The Special Assistance Team (SAT) concurred with the Summary of Findings of the PwC Report and supported the need to more closely integrate the planning, design and construction functions within the TDSB. The SAT also identified the need to integrate the financial services to support the capital program (Appendix A).

I have been working with Daryl Sage, Director, Strategy and Planning, and Angelos Bacopoulos, Chief Facilities Officer to help design their specific organizations to integrate the staff repatriated from the TLC.

I have also been working with Donna Quan to establish a new capital management process. In the current organization there are effectively “silos” for planning, facilities, which now includes both design and construction, and finance. Each of the three “silos” reports directly to the Director.

In the attached memo to Donna Quan (Appendix B), I presented a proposal to establish a committee to provide leadership in integrating the planning, design and construction functions. The committee would be chaired by the Director and also include the Chief Financial Officer and the Chief Academic Officer(s). An alternative would have been to recommend a Deputy
Director for Planning and Facilities; however, the committee structure allows the Director to play a more direct role in establishing the new capital policies, provides an accountable framework for both planning and facilities, and allows for the direct participation by both finance and academic staff.

The main responsibilities for the committee would be to provide leadership in integrating the planning, design and construction functions; developing the Board’s capital strategy; and serving as an accountability framework for planning and facilities.

I also provided the Director with a memorandum regarding the mandate, specific deliverables and membership for the new committee, referred to as the Capital Strategy Committee (Appendix C). The committee has been established and is currently working on the development of the Board’s capital strategy.

Most recently I have prepared a memorandum to Donna Quan addressing some of the accountability functions for the new Capital Strategy committee, including monitoring the implementation of the Board’s capital plan, overseeing the consultation processes for the sale of surplus school sites, monitoring the Board’s Redevelopment Projects (Avondale, Davisville, et al), and serving as an accountability vehicle to ensure all major construction projects, such as Meadowvale-Sheppard, Bendale, Keele and Swansea are proceeding on time and on budget (Appendix D).

Ralph Benson

Special Assistance Team
APPENDIX A

Special Assistance Team
Executive Offices
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8
Tele: (416) 397-3188
Fax: (416) 393-0889

15 March 2013

Donna Quan
Director of Education
Toronto District School Board
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8

Dear Donna Quan:

In the Summary of Findings of the PwC Report, “PwC notes the TDSB has lost operational control over key staff within the Capital Projects and Design Services functions to the TLC due to a dual reporting structure. These TDSB staff report jointly to the TLC’s Chief Architect as well as to TDSB department heads. This dual or joint reporting relationship is highly problematic as it hampers the TDSB’s ability to direct and control key functions responsible for capital project management and design.”

The SAT concurs with the Summary of Findings of the PwC Report. The SAT also believes there is a need to more closely integrate the planning, design and construction functions within TDSB. In addition there is a need to integrate the financial services to support the capital program.

The SAT, after further analysis and discussions with TDSB senior staff, will provide its advice on how best to integrate the capital planning, design and construction functions to meet the long term needs of the TDSB.

The SAT would be pleased to discuss these recommendations with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Ralph Benson
Special Assistance Team

Bill Hogarth
Special Assistance Team
APPENDIX B

Special Assistance Team
Executive Offices
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8
Tele: (416) 397-3188
Fax: (416) 393-0889

22 March 2013

Donna Quan
Director of Education
Toronto District School Board
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8

Dear Donna Quan:

The SAT totally supports the steps you have taken to eliminate the shared dual reporting relationship with the Toronto Lands Corporation, and the process you are undertaking to more closely integrate the Board’s capital planning, design and construction functions.

As per our discussion, one of the important next steps is to establish a committee, chaired by yourself, to provide leadership in integrating the planning, design and construction functions, and provide leadership in the development of the Board’s capital strategy. The committee can also serve as an accountability framework to help ensure the goals are met in a timely and effective manner.

By including academic leaders on this committee, it provides a program framework to assist planning and facilities staff, and helps ensure that the program needs of students are paramount in the planning, design and construction decisions.

This committee should function on a policy level and take the lead in establishing the Board’s long term capital strategy. Collectively, you have the capacity to understand and evaluate the competing capital needs for new schools and additions, facility renewal, portable reductions, program facilities, and redevelopment projects.

This committee should enhance your capacity to provide comprehensive advice to your trustees, and facilitate their decision making in establishing and funding the Board’s capital priorities.
On an operational level, this committee would complement the Central Accommodation Team which would continue with its role of strategic placement of academic programming and services to support students and system wide accommodation needs. There may of course have to be some minor adjustments in the role of the Central Accommodation Committee to reflect the new Capital Strategy Committee.

Attached is a draft of the mandate, for the proposed Capital Strategy Committee (title to be determined) along with the specific deliverables and the potential membership.

I would be pleased to work with you in implementing the new committee.

Sincerely,

Ralph Benson
Special Assistance Team

cc: Bill Hogarth
Special Assistance Team
APPENDIX C

20 March 2013

CAPITAL STRATEGY COMMITTEE

Mandate:

- To develop the Board’s five year capital strategy.
- To integrate the planning, design and construction functions of the board to ensure they meet the Board’s pupil accommodation requirements.

Specific deliverables to include:

1. Development of the Board’s five year capital strategy which will include:
   - Current and future school redevelopment projects.
   - New schools and additions to schools to reflect growth
   - Facility renewal to upgrade the Board’s aging school infrastructure
   - Expanding and upgrading classroom facilities to meet current and future program needs
   - School organization to reflect current and future program delivery
   - Portable reduction strategy

2. Development of a revenue generation plan to support the five year capital strategy.

3. Revision of the Board’s design guidelines and technical specifications for schools to ensure capital projects can be constructed within the ministry benchmarks for the cost of school facilities.
4. Reviewing and improving all elements of the Board’s construction processes including:
   - Architectural selection
   - Project management and timing
   - Change order management

5. Assisting with the reorganization of Facility Services to reflect its revised mandate.

6. Addressing specific accommodation issues that have major implications for the Board’s pupil accommodation strategy.

7. Establishing the policy framework for the Central Accommodation Team.

**Membership:**

Director of Education  
Chief Financial Officer  
Chief Facilities Officer  
Director, Strategy and Planning  
Chief Academic Officer(s)  
Senior facilities, planning, and academic staff
Dear Donna Quan:

I believe things are progressing as well as they can with respect to the development of a capital plan for June 2013. The June 2013 capital plan will be the first step in a much longer process related to the development and implementation of a longer term capital plan. Much work remains to be done with respect to the revenue generation options – severances, sale of surplus sites, and redevelopment revenue. Much work also needs to be done to identify the capital priorities of the Board, including those related to TDSB 2027. Once the development of the initial capital plan is completed, and hopefully approved by the Board in June, the implementation stage will have to be undertaken.

The Capital Strategy Committee, which I described in a previous memorandum (copy attached) which is the vehicle to develop the capital plan, should also oversee the implementation of the Board’s capital plan. During the development stage of the capital plan, the committee will have to meet on an as required basis (possibly weekly) to develop the various components of the capital plan – the TDSB 2027 Seminar for trustees being just one of the components. The macro strategy with the elements and timeframes hopefully will be finalized for discussion at the seminar on April 15th.
Once the capital plan has been developed and approved, and is in the process of being implemented, the Capital Strategy Committee could meet on a less frequent basis, say every two weeks, to address specific capital issues and monitor the implementation of the capital plan.

The monitoring of the implementation of the capital plan can start immediately with the approval and oversight of the consultation strategy regarding the sale of the six surplus sites already identified.

The Capital Strategy Committee can also be used to monitor the Redevelopment Projects – bi-weekly updates on Avondale, Davisville, et al would ensure the projects are proceeding as planned. All the major construction projects, such as Meadowvale-Sheppard, Bendale, Keele and Swansea, could be monitored by the Capital Strategy Committee. Bi-weekly or monthly updates could be provided to the committee to ensure the projects are proceeding on time and on budget. Such information could also be shared with the trustees on a regular basis. I will provide you with models that other boards use for this purpose.

The secretariat function for the Capital Strategy Committee should probably be in the office of the Director. As we discussed previously, the committee could be expanded to include the Senior Manager, Planning and the Senior Manager, Construction and Project Management. These two individuals are critical to the implementation of the Board’s capital plan, and would benefit as well with regard to their professional development.

Sincerely,

Ralph Benson
Special Assistance Team

cc: Bill Hogarth
   Special Assistance Team
Appendix V
Implementation of Full-Day Kindergarten Program

Special Assistance Team
Executive Offices
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8
Tele: (416) 397-3188
Fax: (416) 393-0889

6 March 2013

REPORT TO THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION RE: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS (INTERIM REPORT)

At the specific request of the Ministry I have been analyzing the “more expensive” year four full-day kindergarten programs in order to help the Board reduce expenditures for year four, and help the TDSB establish an approach for the implementation of the year five full-day kindergarten projects that will allow the TDSB to work within the overall ministry financial allocation for the full-day kindergarten program.

The attached memorandum from myself to Donna Quan, based on a preliminary analysis I undertook with the Board’s facility design and construction staff, and the Board’s planning staff, questions the need for all five of the year four full-day kindergarten projects. (Appendix A)

The Board’s analysis has not been completed, however, it appears that it will not be necessary to undertake the George Peck PS addition, and I will be participating in a review of the need for the General Crerer PS addition with planning and special education staff on March 8, 2013.

As a result of my intervention with the facility design and construction staff, the Board staff have undertaken a value engineering consultation with NRB and have reduced the cost of the year four full-day kindergarten as described on the attached table. (Appendix B)

My memorandum to Grant Osborn and Nancy Whynot provides some insight into the cost of the modular buildings being utilized by the TDSB. The modular buildings are not attached port-a-pacs. The modular buildings are not dissimilar to bricks and mortars with concrete floors, hot water hearing hooked up with school boiler, heat recovery, air handling systems et al.

(Appendix C)
Now that the cost of the modular buildings and the specifications are more clearly understood by the TDSB staff, they will take a serious look at the appropriateness of this type of construction for year five full-day kindergarten projects. If the Board uses this type of modular building for some of the five year full-day kindergarten projects, they will be able to reduce the costs of these modular buildings by changing the specifications as per the value engineering and reducing the architectural fees.

I will be working with Board staff in the next few weeks to establish a new process to plan, design and build the year five full-day kindergarten projects.

Ralph Benson

Special Assistance Team
APPENDIX A

22 February 2013

Donna Quan
Director of Education
Toronto District School Board
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8

Dear Donna Quan:

The Ministry of Education has withheld approval of five year four Full-Day Kindergarten (FDK) projects, and requested that I talk with the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) staff to determine the need for these five projects, and if the projected costs of these five projects could be reduced.

Angelos Bacopoulous’ staff is reviewing the costs of these projects to determine if there are opportunities to reduce the projected costs. Any savings that are made would be transferred to offset the projected costs for year five FDK programs.

The attached memo from Daryl Sage’s staff indicated there is a possibility to take a different direction with respect to both the George Peck PS addition and the General Crerar PS addition. The estimated cost of the one classroom addition at George Peck PS is $1.3 M, and the estimated cost of the three classroom addition at General Crerar PS is $2.4M. If the additions are cancelled, the savings would be offset by the architectural fees expended to-date and any renovations that would be required.

Based on the attached memo, I suggest the TDSB review the two projects identified above to determine if they should go forward as originally planned.

I will advise Ministry staff that the two projects are being reviewed by TDSB staff at my meeting with Grant Osborn on Monday, 25 February 2013.

Sincerely,

Ralph Benson
Special Assistance Team
Att.
Hi Ralph,

Please find the planning information you requested for the five ‘held’ Year 4 FDK projects.

**George Peck PS**

Pupil enrolment declined George Peck PS between the 2011/12 and 2012/13 school years. As a result, the school has re-organized to a point where three ‘specialty’ classrooms are operational; Core French, Instrumental Music and Drama/Dance. This information was not available to Planning at the time the FDK plan was developed. Staff recognize that every school should be entitled to one unloaded ‘specialty’ space, but the additional two at this school are eligible for conversion to accommodate FDK. As such we believe that there could be opportunities to accommodate FDK in an alternative manner to the current proposal.

An issue with George Peck PS is the size of the existing classrooms. The board aims to provide at least 800 square feet in each FDK classroom and according to a quick review, the available classrooms in this facility are less than 800 square feet. To achieve an appropriately sized FDK classroom the following scenarios could be examined by design staff;

- First, confirm via the Cad drawings that there are no available classrooms over 800 square feet;
- If not, expand the existing kindergarten classroom (approximately 1,400 square feet) and divide into two FDK rooms, or;
- Expand Classroom 9 into the adjacent staffroom to create an appropriately sized FDK classroom (could relocate staff room upstairs to another classroom and move a smaller class, like HSP, into the former staff room).

**Warden Avenue PS** A subsequent review of enrolment, facility usage, residential development and demographics suggests that the FDK classroom requirement at this school has not changed from the plan currently proposed. The school is efficiently organized.

**Danforth Gardens PS** A subsequent review of enrolment, facility usage, residential development and demographics suggests that the FDK classroom requirement at this school has not changed from the plan currently proposed. The school is efficiently organized.
**Rosethorn JS** A subsequent review of enrolment, facility usage, residential development and demographics suggests that the FDK classroom requirement at this school has not changed from the plan currently proposed. The school is efficiently organized.

**General Crerar PS** A subsequent review of enrolment, facility usage, residential development and demographics suggests that the FDK classroom requirement at this school has not changed from the plan currently proposed. However, Planning will engage in a conversation with Special Education staff to examine the potential of relocating the LD (Learning Disability) program from this site into an adjacent school. The LD program occupies 3 classrooms at General Crerar PS. If this program was relocated, the FDK program could be accommodated at the school through internal retrofits only. This will require further investigation and consultation.

Regards,

Dan
### APPENDIX B

#### FULL DAY KINDERGARTEN - YEAR 4
TDSB SUBMISSION vs TENDER RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Davforth Gardens PS</th>
<th>General Cretar PS</th>
<th>George Peck PS</th>
<th>Rosethorn PS</th>
<th>Warden Avenue PS</th>
<th>Total - 5 Schools</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Scope</td>
<td>4 Modular KG</td>
<td>3 Modular KG</td>
<td>1 Modular KG</td>
<td>2 Modular KG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addition &amp; Renov. 1 Room</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Addition &amp; Renov. 2 Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition Square Footage</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,990,687</td>
<td>$2,535,932</td>
<td>$1,156,446</td>
<td>$1,813,182</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,272,311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,462,5F</td>
<td>$4,087,5F</td>
<td>$4,677,5F</td>
<td>$5,044,5F</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,025,5F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSF Submission Amount</td>
<td>$4,060,400</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
<td>$568,400</td>
<td>$835,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,101,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Bid Price from Contractor</td>
<td>$4,446,300</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td>$517,800</td>
<td>$711,920</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,513,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBB Modular Supply Price</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,962,796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Soft Cost</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td>$981,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,926,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Project cost per Tender</td>
<td>$3,098,576</td>
<td>$2,528,180</td>
<td>$1,477,439</td>
<td>$1,979,316</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,996,316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$472,5F</td>
<td>$502,5F</td>
<td>$502,5F</td>
<td>$502,5F</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,502,5F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Saving thru Value Engineering</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>Alternate 2-ply modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Roof Design</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Alternate Cladding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Building Envelope</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>Alternate Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delux Canopy</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>Alternate tiles etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Cost Saving Items</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Project Cost per Tender</td>
<td>$2,898,576</td>
<td>$2,428,180</td>
<td>$1,427,439</td>
<td>$1,939,316</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,216,316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$540,5F</td>
<td>$502,5F</td>
<td>$502,5F</td>
<td>$502,5F</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,502,5F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under/Over Run</td>
<td>$143,123</td>
<td>$(98,389)</td>
<td>$(99,993)</td>
<td>$(103,218)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(290,520)</td>
<td>Further cost saving thru Value Engineering in progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28 February 2013

Grant Osborn
Nancy Whynot

I have analyzed the five year four full-day kindergarten programs as per your request.

The attached memorandum from Daniel Castaldo and my memorandum to Donna Quan address the need for the five projects.

It looks now that another solution can be found, and the George Peck addition can be obviated. The General Crerer project is somewhat more difficult, however the Board is trying to determine if it is possible to move the learning disabilities classes. If they can’t find a satisfactory location for the learning disabilities classes, then the General Crerer addition will be required.

From a cost perspective, the additions from NRB are expensive in that they are not traditional portables bolted together to form a pack.

The additions are effectively modular buildings not portables – not dissimilar to bricks and mortar. They have concrete floors not plywood floors, hot water heating hooked up with school boilers, heat recovery, high air quality et al. The fact they have washrooms requires the additions to be on half-foundations with crawl space for the access to service the additions.

I am getting a further analysis of costs and it appears that TDSB is paying more than necessary for architectural fees in that they started the additions as bricks and mortar and then switched to modular.
They will take a serious look at using a modular approach in year five and will be able to reduce expenditures somewhat by changing the specifications for year five and their approach to architectural fees. But in the end, modular will still be an expensive option, but could be less than traditional brick and mortars.

A more typical port-a-pack is an alternative that TDSB will have to look at for the year five projects.

Sincerely,

Ralph Benson
The PwC Report identified issues with respect to the current TDSB Capital Planning process and proposed the following actions:

- The school board should formally establish a new capital planning process that begins with identification of the student accommodation need and the infrastructure need, followed by the approval of planning and budget requirements.

- Specifically, detailed planning and budgeting should take place first, before setting any public expectations around design parameters.

- Subsequent community consultation activities should be conducted within the framework provided by the approved budget for each capital project.

I have been working with Donna Quan and her staff in order to help the Board establish a new capital planning process.

In my memorandum to Donna Quan, dated March 22, 2013, I provided the following advice:

“As per our discussion, one of the important next steps is to establish a committee, chaired by yourself, to provide leadership in integrating the planning, design and construction functions, and provide leadership in the development of the Board’s capital strategy. The committee can also serve
as an accountability framework to help ensure the goals are met in a timely and effective manner.

By including academic leaders on this committee, it provides a program framework to assist planning and facilities staff, and helps ensure that the program needs of students are paramount in the planning, design and construction decisions.

This committee should function on a policy level and take the lead in establishing the Board’s long term capital strategy. Collectively, you have the capacity to understand and evaluate the competing capital needs for new schools and additions, facility renewal, portable reductions, program facilities, and redevelopment projects.

This committee should enhance your capacity to provide comprehensive advice to your trustees, and facilitate their decision making in establishing and funding the Board’s capital priorities.

On an operational level, this committee would complement the Central Accommodation Team which would continue with its role of strategic placement of academic programming and services to support students and system wide accommodation needs. There may of course have to be some minor adjustments in the role of the Central Accommodation Committee to reflect the new Capital Strategy Committee.

I proposed that the TDSB should establish a Capital Strategy Committee with the following mandate, specific deliverables and membership:

**CAPITAL STRATEGY COMMITTEE**

**Mandate:**

- To develop the Board’s five year capital strategy.
- To integrate the planning, design and construction functions of the board to ensure they meet the Board’s pupil accommodation requirements.

**Specific deliverables to include:**
1. Development of the Board’s five year capital strategy which will include:
   - Current and future school redevelopment projects.
   - New schools and additions to schools to reflect growth
   - Facility renewal to upgrade the Board’s aging school infrastructure
   - Expanding and upgrading classroom facilities to meet current and future program needs
   - School organization to reflect current and future program delivery
   - Portable reduction strategy

2. Development of a revenue generation plan to support the five year capital strategy.

3. Revision of the Board’s design guidelines and technical specifications for schools to ensure capital projects can be constructed within the ministry benchmarks for the cost of school facilities.

4. Reviewing and improving all elements of the Board’s construction processes including:
   - Architectural selection
   - Project management and timing
   - Change order management

5. Assisting with the reorganization of Facility Services to reflect its revised mandate.

6. Addressing specific accommodation issues that have major implications for the Board’s pupil accommodation strategy.

7. Establishing the policy framework for the Central Accommodation Team.

**Membership:**

Director of Education  
Chief Financial Officer  
Chief Facilities Officer  
Director, Strategy and Planning  
Chief Academic Officer(s)  
Senior facilities, planning, and academic staff
I provided Donna Quan with further advice on planning in my letter of April 11, 2013:

“I believe things are progressing as well as they can with respect to the development of a capital plan for June 2013. The June 2013 capital plan will be the first step in a much longer process related to the development and implementation of a longer term capital plan. Much work remains to be done with respect to the revenue generation options – severances, sale of surplus sites, and redevelopment revenue. Much work also needs to be done to identify the capital priorities of the Board, including those related to TDSB 2027. Once the development of the initial capital plan is completed, and hopefully approved by the Board in June, the implementation stage will have to be undertaken.

The Capital Strategy Committee, which I described in a previous memorandum (copy attached) which is the vehicle to develop the capital plan, should also oversee the implementation of the Board’s capital plan. During the development stage of the capital plan, the committee will have to meet on an as required basis (possibly weekly) to develop the various components of the capital plan – the TDSB 2027 Seminar for trustees being just one of the components. The macro strategy with the elements and timeframes hopefully will be finalized for discussion at the seminar on April 15th.

Once the capital plan has been developed and approved, and is in the process of being implemented, the Capital Strategy Committee could meet on a less frequent basis, say every two weeks, to address specific capital issues and monitor the implementation of the capital plan.

The monitoring of the implementation of the capital plan can start immediately with the approval and oversight of the consultation strategy regarding the sale of the six surplus sites already identified.

The Capital Strategy Committee can also be used to monitor the Redevelopment Projects – bi-weekly updates on Avondale, Davisville, etc would ensure the projects are proceeding as planned. All the major construction projects, such as Meadowvale-Sheppard, Bendale, Keele and Swansea, could be monitored by the Capital Strategy Committee. Bi-weekly or monthly updates could be provided to the committee to ensure the projects are proceeding on time and on budget. Such information
could also be shared with the trustees on a regular basis. I will provide you with models that other boards use for this purpose.

The secretariat function for the Capital Strategy Committee should probably be in the office of the Director. As we discussed previously, the committee could be expanded to include the Senior Manager, Planning and the Senior Manager, Construction and Project Management. These two individuals are critical to the implementation of the Board’s capital plan, and would benefit as well with regard to their professional development.”

Donna Quan has established the TDSB Capital Strategy Committee as recommended and has held a series of Trustee Seminars on Program Planning and Capital Strategies to introduce trustees to the new capital planning processes (PowerPoint presentation attached as Appendix A).

**Trustee Seminar**

The title of the PowerPoint presentation is Program Planning and Capital Strategies, which reflects the position that the Board’s Capital Plan should be program driven. The Board has carried out a major consultation with respect to a K-12 program strategy, and wishes to implement some of the findings of the K-12 consultations in the Board’s Capital Plan.

The Capital Plan Building Blocks (p.10) include facility needs (growth), Accommodation Review Committee commitments, redevelopment projects, FDK, portable reductions, facility renewal and program elements – moving grade nine students into the high schools, and consolidating elementary and secondary schools. Each of the Capital Program Building Blocks requires the development of capital implementation strategies. The Capital Plan also identifies the major sources of capital revenue for the Board with the sale of sites and site severances being the major sources of revenue. Revenues will also be generated through redevelopment opportunities (p.27-28).

The critical path to approving the capital plan and the timelines for implementation of the individual capital strategies are included in the presentation (p.30-32).

Working with the Capital Strategy Committee, a more comprehensive critical path for Board approval of the Capital Plan has been developed (Capital Plan Report Timelines attached as Appendix B).
**Capital Plan Report Timelines**

The critical path includes the Board’s Deficit Recovery Plan, and a Report Re: Site Severances from the Toronto Lands Corporation which will go to the TDSB Planning and Priorities Committee on May 2\(^{nd}\) and the Board on May 8\(^{th}\).

The Toronto Lands Corporation is also preparing a report for approval of the Board regarding the sale of surplus sites – referred to as proceeds of disposition in Appendix B. This report is scheduled to go to the TDSB Planning and Priorities Committee on June 19\(^{th}\) and the Board on June 26\(^{th}\).

The Capital Plan, including all the projects to be undertaken by the Board and the sources of revenue re: site severances and sale of surplus sites is also scheduled to go to the TDSB Planning and Priorities Committee on June 19\(^{th}\) and the Board on June 26\(^{th}\).

**Summary**

I believe the information described above and included in the appendices, clearly demonstrates that the TDSB is developing and implementing new capital planning processes that meet the Ministry expectations for school boards in Ontario, and are consistent with the capital planning proposals outlined in the PwC Report.

Ralph Benson  
Special Assistance Team
Overview Statement

A number of TDSB major capital projects have exceeded their budget allocation and have not met their projected timing for opening.

The overall goals for TDSB are to design and build capital projects based on Ministry benchmarks, to the extent possible, and have the schools ready to be occupied based on their projected schedules.

The overlapping roles of the Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC) and the TDSB, and the lack of coordination during planning, design and construction services have been identified in the PwC Report as the root causes of the budget and timing issues.

The overlapping role of the TLC and the TDSB has been addressed. The lack of coordination among planning, design and construction services within the TDSB still needs to be addressed. There also needs to be greater coordination between design and construction services within the Facility Services department.

TDSB Capital Planning, Design and Construction Process

In addition to the lack of coordination among planning, design and construction services, there are several TDSB capital planning, design and construction processes that are impacting costs and timing. Following are a number of specific processes, procedures and policies that impact the cost and timing of capital projects along with a number of specific recommendations for the Board’s consideration.

The analysis and recommendations are based on the Report of the Expert Panel on Capital Standards – Building our Schools, Building our Future; discussions with TDSB Planning, Design and Construction staff; discussions with the architects designing the new Lawrence-Midland
Secondary School and the cost consultants from Altus providing the cost estimates for the Lawrence-Midland project; discussion with the chief estimator of Atlas Construction, the contractor for the Meadowvale-Sheppard project; and a review of numerous TDSB capital projects including Nelson Mandela, Thorncliffie Park, Meadowvale-Sheppard, Keele, Swansea, Lawrence-Midland, Avondale, Davisville, Brockton, Churchill and a number of the year four and year five full-day kindergarten projects.

Project Identification/Due Diligence

Planning, design and construction services should work together to a greater extent in identifying potential capital projects.

The Swansea Junior & Senior Public School addition is a current example. The Swansea addition was identified as a capital project to meet enrolment growth and the implementation of full-day kindergarten. The project was originally scheduled to be completed for September 2014.

The Swansea addition was approved by the Ministry with projected costs of approximately $6.5M. It now appears that as a result of soil conditions – contaminated soil and load bearing capacity, the Swansea addition will not be available before September 2016 and the cost will be substantially higher.

Planning and Facility Services could have worked together to a greater extent, and the soil issues could have been identified in making the decision with respect to the Swansea addition. It may be that the Swansea addition is the only viable solution to the enrolment pressures, however, the timing and costs would have been known. To the extent necessary, the TDSB should make a budget available to Planning and Facility Services to carry out the necessary due diligence before projects are submitted for approval by the Board.

The Keele Street Junior Public School addition, with the additional expenditures for a retaining wall and restoration of the bank, is another example of an expenditure that might have been identified earlier and possibly included in a request for additional funding approval. The additional cost of $1,582,352 that is in excess of the benchmark, is detailed in the Operations and Facilities Management Committee Report, May 29, 2013.

Recommendations

R1. A budget should be made available to Planning and Facility Services to carry out the necessary due diligence procedures prior to a capital project being submitted for approval by the Board.
R2. Planning and Facility Services should conduct the appropriate due diligence procedures prior to submitting a capital project for the approval of the Board.

Project Lead Time

Timing is critical to the cost of capital projects. Planning must give Facility Services the lead time to design and construct a capital project, and design must give construction the lead time to build a capital project.

If a project is tendered with a compressed time schedule, the bids the Board receives will reflect the additional costs that the contractor will face in meeting the compressed time schedule.

A compressed time schedule might also result in a need for the Board to expedite a project in the last few months of construction. This might result in the board authorizing the contractor to expend additional financial resources on the project.

A compressed time schedule also makes it difficult to address issues at the site plan application stage in a rational manner. Board staff may have to make unnecessary and expensive concessions to attain site plan approval if they do not have time to negotiate a more satisfactory outcome for the Board.

Meadowvale-Sheppard is an example of a project that is in jeopardy of being completed for occupancy in September 2013. Ideally, the project should be completed no later than the end of July 2013 to allow opportunity to prepare the school for the students in September.

Experience of a number of school boards, indicates that for a new elementary school, there should be a minimum of 27 months allowed for the design and construction of an elementary school, with at least 17 months being provided for construction. Approval in spring 2013, with a construction start date in early spring 2014 for a September 2015 opening would be appropriate.

For a new secondary school, there should be a minimum of 36 months allowed for the design and construction of a secondary school, with at least 24 months being provided for construction. Project approval in spring/summer 2013, with a construction start date in spring/summer 2014 for a September 2016 opening would be appropriate.

The timing described above is also important in avoiding the extra costs associated with commencing a project in the winter months.
Recommendations

R3. There should be adequate time provided for the design and construction of all capital projects, subject to the nature and scope of a project.

R4. Winter construction should be avoided to the extent possible, to help control the cost of capital projects.

Third Party Consultants

Consultants play a critical role in the effective implementation of a capital project. The TDSB uses both a cost consultant on major capital projects, and other third party consultants.

The cost consultant on the Lawrence-Midland project was appointed by the architect. It is considered to be a better business practice and a Ministry requirement for the owner to appoint the cost consultant rather than the architect. It is generally considered a good practice that the cost consultant conduct its cost estimate prior to the completion of schematic drawings and at 80% completion. The first cost consultant report on Lawrence-Midland is at schematic drawing stage.

Third party consultants, such as a commissioning agent, should also be appointed by the owner, rather than the architect. It would be advantageous if the commissioning agent was appointed by the Board early in the design and construction process – in the pre-design stage.

Many boards find it helpful to have the same commissioning agent act for the school board on multiple capital projects in order to establish a longer term working relationship that best meets the need of the board.

Recommendations

R5. Cost consultants should be appointed by the Board, rather than the architect, and should provide costs estimates prior to completion of schematic drawings and at 80% project completion.
R6. Commissioning agents should be appointed by the Board, rather than the architect, and should be appointed early in the design and construction process (pre-design stage).

Project Charter

The Board’s “Project Charter” is a positive undertaking. It defines the scope, objectives and overall approach for the work to be completed and provides additional accountability and control for all major capital projects undertaken by the Board. The practice of developing a Project Charter for all major capital projects should be continued and enhanced on a go forward basis. Earlier steps in the planning, design and construction process should also be incorporated in the Project Charter.

The Project Charter can play a major role for the board in addressing its overall project management process.

Recommendations

R7. The Board should enhance its Project Charter by including earlier steps in the planning, design and construction process.

R8. The Project Charter should serve as a major vehicle in the overall project management process.

Community Consultation

Community consultation is important in the development of all major capital projects. Input from students, teachers, principals, superintendents, trustees, municipal councilors, school councils and the broader community can enhance a capital project and expedite its approval through the site plan approval process.
Consultation processes however, must be designed so that they do not impede the development of a capital project, do not impose unnecessary expenditures on the Board, and allow the project to be completed within ministry benchmarks, to the extent possible.

The consultation process with respect to the Lawrence-Midland Secondary School project appears to have found the appropriate balance and is considered to be quite successful. The revised process being proposed for the Railway Lands Block 31 also appears to be appropriate in meeting community and Board needs.

Recommendation

R9. Community consultation which is critical to the development and approval of a capital project, should be designed to expedite project implementation and allow the Board to function within Ministry benchmarks, to the extent possible.

Architect Selection and Fees

The selection of the project architect is one of the most critical decision in determining the success of a project. The architect drives both the design of the capital project and the costs – ability to be built within Ministry benchmarks.

The TDSB has a reputation of historically engaging architects that are very talented in terms of creative design. Other school boards have sacrificed creative design to an extent, and focused to a greater extent on working within benchmarks. The challenge is to find the appropriate balance between creative design and costs, and build a quality school that meets the program needs of the students and reflects the realities of life cycle costing.

The TDSB should consider changing its practices with respect to the selection of architects. The appointment of professional staff such as architects does not have to follow more typical procurement guidelines.

The Board, for example, could prequalify a set of architects that have significant experience in designing quality elementary and secondary schools that have been built within Ministry benchmarks, and then have an RFP process involving those architects.

The Board could also be more aggressive in negotiating architect fees. For example, a saving of 1% on a $30M capital project is $300,000. The board always has to be concerned with the
relationship of the fees being paid and the services being provided. The experience of other school boards however is that architect fees can be reduced and the quality of service maintained.

Recommendations

R.10 The Board should change its practice with respect to architect selection and utilize experienced school architects that have demonstrated the capacity to build schools within Ministry benchmarks.

R11. The Board should be more aggressive in negotiating the fees it pays to its architects.

Ministry Benchmarks

Building new schools and additions within the Ministry benchmarks is critical for both obtaining Ministry approval to proceed with a capital project, and the ability to finance the capital project.

The majority of other school boards in Ontario, that have built the vast majority of the new schools in the Province, have demonstrated that it is possible to build quality schools within Ministry benchmarks.

The Ministry benchmarks for the TDSB have been adjusted upwards based on an analysis of relative costs of building schools throughout the Province by the Altus Group. The TDSB benchmarks have been adjusted upwards by 5% in the core area and 2% for the rest of the Board jurisdiction to reflect the higher costs of constructing schools in Toronto.

The benchmarks were not designed to include demolition and site servicing costs. For example, with the Lawrence-Midland project, the demolition of Bendale, extension of Brockley Drive and the additional Storm Water management would be in excess of benchmark costs. These costs are detailed in the Operations and Facilities Management Committee Report, May 19, 2013 and total approximately $4.4 million.

The Toronto By-Law requirements re Green Roof and Bird Friendly Guidelines detailed in the Operations and Facilities Management Report at $166,000 and $115,000 respectively, in my opinion, should be within benchmarks. All school boards in Ontario experience municipal site plan approval requirements. The requirements vary by municipality, with an acknowledgement of such requirements generally being incorporated within the benchmarks.
In order to build new schools and additions within Ministry benchmarks, in addition to considering the recommendations above, the TDSB should consider the following recommendations:

Recommendations

R12. Design schools that are functional in meeting student needs, with creative design being a secondary consideration.

R13. Design schools that are less expensive to build by having more compact designs, and avoiding elements such as curved walls that are more expensive to construct.

R14. Integrate the design and construction functions within Facility Services to a greater extent, to ensure that all the expertise with Facility Services is brought to bear at all stages of the design and construction processes.

R15. Adopt a more rigorous planning review process to help reduce the number of change orders being experienced by the Board.

R16. Based on the Altus Group analysis of the cost premium between TDSB technical specifications and those in the Report of the Expert Panel on Capital Standards, particularly those with respect to mechanical and electrical, review the technical specifications to identify potential savings.

R17. Give more respect and consideration to the Report from the Expert Panel on Capital Standards – Building our Schools, Building our Future. This report is based on the experience of school boards that have built the vast majority of new schools in Ontario in the last ten years, and is the underpinning of the Ministry capital approval process.
R18. Standardize school designs to the extent possible, in that unique designs result in higher tender prices in that the contractors have to include an amount in their bids for the greater risk they are undertaking.

Ralph Benson
Special Assistance Team