



Committee Minutes

Long Term Care Redevelopment Planning Task Force

March 3, 2022 – 1:00 PM

The Long-Term Care Redevelopment Planning Task Force met on the above date through electronic means with the following members in attendance:

Present: Chair Burley, Councillors O’Leary, Milne, Robinson, McQueen, Mackey, and Warden Hicks

Staff

Present: Kim Wingrove, Chief Administrative Officer; Randy Scherzer, Deputy CAO; Anne Marie Shaw, Director of Housing; Jennifer Cornell, Director of Long-Term Care; Heather Morrison, Clerk; Mary Lou Spicer, Director of Finance; Michael Letourneau, Director of Legal Services/County Solicitor; Karen Kraus, Executive Director-Rockwood Terrace; and Olivia Yale, Digital Communications Specialist

Guests: Andrew Rodriguez, Project Manager, Stephen Lidington, Managing Director, Linda Andal, Senior Manager and Surya Pulickal, Senior Manager, Colliers; Deborah Wadsworth Senior Project Architect, and Nancy Wilson Senior Project Manager, Kasian Architecture and Michelle Weideman, Architect, Ted Handy and Associates.

Call to Order

Chair Burley called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Reports

Rockwood Terrace Redevelopment Project Update

Mr. Rodriguez provided an overview of the presentations for today's meeting and introduced members of both the Colliers and Kasian teams. He provided a general update to the work completed to date noting the kick-off meeting with Kasian has occurred along with the initial planning phase. He also indicated that the project is currently in the design activities phase which includes program and master planning as well as the components related to the schematic design phase including net zero feasibility studies, updates to site plans, stormwater management plans, access and site servicing, public meeting, and pre-consultation meetings.

He provided some construction cost estimates based on classifications noting the cost estimate accuracy which is currently a Class D estimate based on the concept sketch design has an estimate accuracy of $\pm 20-30\%$.

Mr. Rodriguez outlined the key decisions required from the Task Force and County Council including direction on the preferred option relative to the campus of care model scope based on the master plan presentation, authorization to proceed with the selected option based on the capital costs estimates, and direction on the campus of care options analysis proposed for the next steps.

Mr. Rodriguez then introduced Deborah Wadsworth from Kasian Architecture. Ms. Wadsworth provided an overview of the Kasian team for the Task Force. She outlined some key information for the members related to site plan considerations including ensuring adequate separation between the long-term care facility and the quarry for noise and vibrations, optimizing views, ensuring secure and accessible gardens, and ensuring a low impact development.

Ms. Wadsworth then outlined some landscape priorities including edible and sensory gardens, native species, paths with benches and rest stops, and a plan for ecology education. She spoke about connecting the community to the development by ensuring informal pathways and sidewalks to neighbouring properties are included in the plan, indoor and outdoor spaces on the perimeter for community and resident use, and sheltered scooter parking.

Ms. Wadsworth then outlined the design options for the members and provided various configurations to the members. She also highlighted the evaluation criteria for consideration including access to significant green space, convenient and safe staff parking, no more than a two-storey building for long-term care and assisted living facilities, ensuring a variety of views for residents to enjoy, having a village square that is connected to the long-term care facility, animated green space, future flexibility for

operations, future expansion and flexibility for market housing, no vast parking areas and no more than three stories in total.

Ms. Wadsworth then outlined the preferred option for the campus of care model along with various aspects related to the preferred option. She noted that the village square was to be community centred with an outdoor area adjacent to it. She then spoke to the long-term care approach ensuring it follows Grey County's Colour-It Your Way approach, is research led, home-like, has adequate places for staff and has intergenerational connections. She spoke to a shift in culture for long-term care homes to more person-centred and outlined the proposed floor plans for consideration, focusing on infection control, acoustics, and privacy.

Ms. Wadsworth then spoke to the two-storey 40 unit assisted living facility that will include synergies with the long-term care home and have access to the village square. The independent living space was then reviewed as well as the landscape design features. She outlined the next steps associated with the design phase of the project including identifying problems and challenges, analysis of user program and care philosophy, concept and goal drivers, development of design solutions, continuous evaluation, and the ability to pivot as new research arises.

The following questions from Task Force members and responses were then raised:

- High resident acuity and use of amenities. It was noted that the design is based on Ministry guidelines with it being a lean program and footprint while still meeting the requirements. The focus is to add life to the years for residents.
- Semi-private (basic) and private rooms. The private rooms are not fully flushed out yet and this will be contained in the next phase of design as well as the assisted living and village square designs. Decisions related to room layout will be part of upcoming design discussions. There will be a split between basic and private rooms as required by the Ministry. It was noted that rooms are designed accordingly to Ministry guidelines which supports the comfort and dignity of the residents.
- Have provisions been made in the design for future expansion options? Ms. Wadsworth noted that yes there are various areas including the independent living space that have options for future expansion. Another option available is to add on another floor in the future. Provisions for future structural engineering may be an option for future building flexibility.
- Do the decisions made in one area impact any decisions made in other areas? It was noted that the decisions are independent relative to long-term care only or full campus of care but to look at the full campus of care model, some elements are interconnected.

Mr. Stephen Lidington introduced himself and provided some background on the methodology behind the option analysis and asked his team to provide introductions. Mr. Surya Pulickal and Ms. Linda Andal also introduced themselves to the members.

Mr. Surya Pulickal spoke to the options analysis for the Rockwood Terrace Campus of Care model. He provided an overview of the concept design including 128 long-term care beds, 40 assisted living beds, village square and a 60-unit independent living area. There are three development options related to the project and an overview of these was provided to the members for consideration:

- Option 1- building the long-term care building and horizontal infrastructure for long-term care only
- Option 2- building the long-term care, horizontal infrastructure, assisted living and village square components
- Option 3-full campus of care model (includes all of option 2 plus the 60 unit seniors apartment)

He then outlined the objectives of the development including care needs, housing needs, technical challenges, costs, and time. He spoke to a procurement option that takes market interest, cost, time and other risks, resource requirements, operational efficiency, and quality of the asset into account.

Mr. Pulickal then outlined the development options criteria relative to a qualitative analysis including resident experience and satisfaction, continuum of care and housing solutions, operational efficiency, cross subsidization, and improvements to the schedule, cost certainty with a view to diminish the risk of development and procurement. Further details on each component were then provided to the members. The evaluation approach for the development options and ranking framework relative to the qualitative analysis was then outlined for the three options with Option 3 achieving the highest score.

Mr. Pulickal provided information related to the quantitative analysis including the capital costs, operating revenue, operating expenses, for each option as well as a final conclusion for the three options. Three components related to capital costs were then outlined including hard costs (building construction, site works etc.), soft costs (consultant fees, municipal charges etc.) and furniture, fixtures, and equipment and then provided the total development costs for each option with Option 1 costing \$75,287,990, Option 2 costing \$108,498,050 and Option 3 costing \$139,532,550. He noted the per square foot costs of \$760/sq/ft for Option 1, \$740 sq/ft for Option 2 and \$610 sq/ft for Option 3. He then outlined operating revenue including residential rental income, commercial revenue, ministry funding, provincial supplements, construction funding subsidies along with other revenue sources.

He provided an overview of the total operating expenses associated with each option:

Option 1-(\$13,637,163) with a total annual deficit of (\$5,305,922)

Option 2-(\$14,601,473) with a total annual deficit of (\$5,932,770)

Option 3-(\$14,871,938) with a total annual deficit of (\$6,863,639)

Mr. Pulickal provided conclusions related to each option noting for total operating expenses, net operating income, capital expenditure reserve, cashflow before debt service and surplus/deficit that Option 3 net position has the lowest ratio of equity to cost of 28%.

Ms. Andal provided an overview of the qualitative and quantitative analysis for the two procurement options being a design bid build (DBB) plus separate operations and maintenance Contract (O&M) option or a public private partnership (P3)-Design Build Finance Operate Maintain (DBFOM) option.

The procurement option criteria were then reviewed including market interest/competition, encourages schedule and construction cost certainty, risk optimization, owner's resourcing, flexibility to accommodate change, and asset quality, including innovation, longevity, and efficiency considerations. She then provided further detail on each consideration as well as the evaluation approach.

Ms. Andal provided a comparative analysis of the procurement options noting that the DBFOM scored the highest on the qualitative analysis and was the preferred procurement option. She provided an overview of a current DBFOM project ongoing in Newfoundland and the savings being realized over the full project term. She then outlined the key advantages of moving ahead with a DBFOM procurement process including risk transfer, bundling, and expanded capital opportunities. She noted the opportunity to spread capital payments out over the period of time to allow for other capital project development.

The process related to the Market Sounding approach was then outlined noting that nine companies and organizations were invited to participate with eight interviews taking place between February 1-7, 2022. It was noted that the preferred development option from the interviewees is a full campus of care model with the preferred procurement option being the DBFOM. She also provided some key findings stemming from the market sounding process and the proposed project.

Mr. Pulickal then outlined financing source options for different components of the proposed campus of care project including municipal and provincial funding (Infrastructure Ontario), Housing Investment Corporation funding and National Housing Co-investment funding.

He also stated in conclusion that Option 3 offers the highest resident experience/satisfaction through its community setting and integrated care delivery approach. He noted a campus of care model offers residential/care solutions in one place for older adults and Option 3 is more financially sustainable in the long-term as positive cash flow from one component of the campus can cross subsidize the other entities when required.

CAO Wingrove spoke to the requirement of staff to review the bottom-line cost to the County of the debt associated with each of the options which is significantly more than what is currently being spent.

Ms. Andal provided some conclusions related to the procurement including the DBFOM as an integrated approach to designing, building, financing, and maintaining the project, along with time and budget certainty and the components contained within each.

Ms. Andal provided closing remarks and next steps including the project timeframes and associated tasks.

Questions from the members then followed including:

- Current costings involved in various components of the campus of care-. Staff noted that a number of areas need to still be reviewed and assumptions included. Staff spoke to options related to the term of debt repayment and potential for a longer repayment term to lower payments. It was noted that the County provides \$2.1 million in the 2022 budget for Rockwood Terrace operations as well as putting \$1.3 million in reserve for future debt repayment, therefore meeting the requirements of any option will have a significant financial impact to the County's finances.
- No development option scored full points for meeting the continuum of care relative to aging in place. Is something missing from the plan? Staff noted that there are no guarantees under the current system that would ensure someone in assisted living or seniors' accommodation would be assigned a bed in the Rockwood Terrace LTC home.
- Why is there little difference in residential rental income between Option 2 and Option 3? It was noted that a significant part of revenue comes from assisted living rather than independent living. The senior's apartments are intended to be a mix of affordable and market rate units.
- How does the County's debt servicing capacity compare to the conclusions of the analysis for the proposed project and the capital requirements and repayments going forward? Borrowing capacity must be maintained for future projects. Staff noted that the 2022 annual repayment limit figure has not been released yet but is expected shortly. The Debt Repayment Policy passed by County Council in 2020 recommended use of 10% of own source revenue for debt repayment and

spoke to rough calculations and the debt capacity limits. Staff noted the provincial limit of 25% for debt repayment.

- What is the impact on Grey County relative to the financial load, tax levy and savings related to choosing one option over another? Staff indicated that a further report will be completed that includes some of this analysis and brought back to the next meeting.
- Does the independent living building become a County-owned asset? Mr. Rodriguez noted that the full procurement option analysis will be sent shortly and that analysis relative to this item has not been completed to date. CAO Wingrove noted that is internal work which needs to be completed by County staff in order to pull together that information and outline the impact on the County. Mr. Rodriguez noted the risks associated with moving forward with only the long-term care component.
- The aging population in Grey County was noted and whether the full campus of care is the right investment at this time. It was noted that there is an increased demand for senior care facing Grey County and a need to look at the investment and economy of scale. Looking at the uniqueness of operating a full campus of care model for Grey County.
- Discussion on affordable housing opportunities took place noting that there is existing affordable housing property in Durham that could be redeveloped in the future if current residents were moved to the new location.
- Can the County look at Option 2 being the long-term care and assisted living components only and is there a place for the private sector to be engaged in the independent living component? This will be included in the staff report. Mr. Rodriguez did caution on carving up the project into components and the possible lower desired interest by partners.
- Is there an opportunity for the potential redevelopment and/or selling of a portion of those lands? Planning considerations will be included in the staff report.

Staff committed to continue working with the consultants and bring back a report to the Task Force that includes further analysis related to the questions outlined above.

Other Business

Councillor McQueen requested an update regarding the presentation by SHS Consulting in December on the Grey Gables Feasibility study and the inclusion of actual Grey County information rather than industry standard. Staff are looking at bringing back a report to the Task Force on this item in late Spring, 2022.

Questions around the timeline for the development were raised. Staff noted they are still waiting for the development agreement from the province. Discussions from a project

management perspective will continue relative to the long-term care portion in order to meet provincial timelines.

Next Meeting Dates

To be Determined

On motion by Councillors McQueen, and Mackey the meeting adjourned at 3:29 PM.

Dwight Burley, Chair