Appendix C - Completed Capital Projects over \$200,000 between November 2011 and March 2012

City of Greater Sudbury Completed Capital Projects over \$200,000 Completed between November 2011 and March 2012 Note - For all projects below any under (over) expenditure has been funded from other completed (underspent) projects or from contingencies. Only variances greater than \$50,000 have been explained below.

Division	Department	Project Description	Year Started	Total Original Budget	Final Cost	Variance	Notes
Community Development	Leisure	ISF Grace Hartman Amphitheatre 2010 Capital Budget ISF Funding - Provincial ISF Funding - Federal NOHFC Grant	2010	1,666,667 1,665,000 1,665,000 835,000			
		RINC James Jerome Sports Complex 2010 Capital Budget 2008 Capital Budget - Accessibility RINC Funding - Provincial RINC Funding - Federal NOHFC Grant	2010	5,831,667 1,000,000 80,000 990,000 990,000	6,178,713	(347,046) Note 1	Note 1
	Citizen Services	Archive Projects 2009 Capital Budget 2011 Capital Budget	2010	3,585,598 153,192 143,858	3,571,731	13,867	
	Senior Services	Pioneer Manor - Shipping & Receiving Council Report (April 14, 2010) - Municipal Infrastructure Investment Initiative - Reserve Fund 2011 Budget	2010 ative	297,050 500,000 150,000 340,000 990,000	305,890	(8,840)	

Appendix C - Completed Capital Projects over \$200,000 between November 2011 and March 2012

Division	Department	Project Description	Year Started	Total Original Budget	Final Cost	Variance	Notes
Community Development	Senior Services	Pioneer Manor - York Wing Interm Beds	2010	- Suager		741141166	
		Council Report (Sept 15, 2010)		888,000			
		LHIN Funding		70,000			
		C		958,000	894,258	63,742	Note 2
Emergency Services	EMS	Ambulance Type III	2011				
		2011 Capital Budget		426,240	394,633	31,607	
Infrastructure Services	Roads	Downing / Picard	2010				
		2010 Capital Budget		90,000			
		2011 Capital Budget		80,000			
				170,000	266,074	(96,074)	Note 3
		Radar Road	2011				
		2011 Capital Budget		1,500,000	2,316,549	(816,549)	Note 4
		Sellwood	2011				
		2011 Capital Budget		200,000	246,234	(46,234)	
		Regent St (Armstrong to Loach's Road)	2011				
		2011 Capital Budget	2011	1,650,000	1,996,108	(346,108)	Note 4
		2011 capital badget		1,030,000	1,330,100	(540,100)	11010 4
		MR 8	2011				
		2011 Capital Budget		2,900,000	1,715,009	1,184,991	Note 4
		Panache Lake Road	2010				
		2010 Capital Budget		1,000,000	992,135	7,865	
		Crack Sealing	2011				
		2011 Capital Budget		200,000	188,737	11,263	
		Tributary 8A Drain	2007				
		2006 Capital Budget		425,000			
		2007 Capital Budget		200,000			
		2008 Capital Budget		500,000			
		2009 Capital Budget		200,000			
		2010 Capital Budget		105,000			
				1,430,000	1,408,073	21,927	•

Appendix C - Completed Capital Projects over \$200,000 between November 2011 and March 2012

			Year	Total Original			
Division Infrastructure Services	Department	Project Description	Started	Budget	Final Cost	Variance	Notes
	Roads	Pilon Municipal Drain	2009				
		Council Report (July 27, 2009)		271,325	260,585	10,740	
	Water	Ramsey Lake Watermain Looping	2011				
		2009 Capital Budget		850,000			
		2011 Capital Budget		100,000			
				950,000	631,108	318,892	Note 5
		Maley Drive Watermain	2011				
		2011 Capital Budget		325,000	489,317	(164,317)	Note 6
		Picard / Downing Watermain	2011				
		2010 Capital Budget		145,000			
		2011 Capital Budget		155,000			
				300,000	243,846	56,154	Note 7
		Ash Street Water Tank Demolition	2011				
		2009 Capital Budget		250,000	208,082	41,918	
	Wastewater	Picard / Downing	2011				
		2010 Capital Budget		35,000			
		2011 Capital Budget		285,000			•
				320,000	124,130	195,870	Note 8
		Sudbury WWTP - Aeration Tank, Pumps					
		and Lift Station Upgrades	2010				
		2008 Capital Budget		1,045,782			
		2009 Capital Budget		750,000			
		2010 Capital Budget		2,000,000			
		Approval from August 11, 2010 Council Re	eport	2,499,302			
				6,295,084	6,336,520	(41,436)	
		Walden WWTP - Clarifier #1 Upgrades	2008				
		2007 Capital Budget		70,000			
		2011 Capital Budget		550,000			
				620,000	644,927	(24,927)	

			Year	Total Original								
Division	Department	Project Description	Started	Budget	Final Cost	Variance	Notes					
Notes:	For all projects a	All transfers have been completed in accordance with the Capital Policy. For all projects above any under (over) expenditure has been funded from other completed (underspent) projects or from contingencies. Only variances greater than \$50,000 have been explained below.										
1	Amphitheatre in system. These c expenditure was	e higher than budgeted due to the chal cluded: unforeseen geotechnical issue: hange orders resulted in additional cos funded from approved budgets for Bel well as a grant from Greater Sudbury Ut	s, infrastructure requir ts for design and consu II Park - Contract Costs	ements and the Iltation from the	cost for the perf architect. The	ormance over-						
2	Actual costs wer Capital Budget P	e lower than budgeted due to favourabolicy.	ole pricing. The surplus	of funds will be	used in accorda	nce with the						
3	anticipated durir	e higher than budgeted due to poor soing design. Additional cost was required ver-expenditure was funded from the su	I to over excavate poor	soils and replac	e with suitable g	granular						
4	favourable pricir asphalt and gran contract to spen under-expenditu	The tenders for these three contracts (Radar Road, Regent Street from Armstrong to Loach's Road, and MR 8) received favourable pricing due to the current economic climate regarding commodity pricing which resulted in lower prices for asphalt and granulars that were unexpected. As these roads had additional needs, staff extended the limits in each contract to spend within the total budget allocation for the three combined projects. These three capital projects had a net under-expenditure of approximately \$22,000 as of March 2012. The extension of the contract limits is in compliance with the Purchasing By-Law and the Capital Policy at that time.										
5	tender price to t what was anticip	awarded to the lowest tender at \$767, he original budget price was due to favorated during detailed design, so the maddance with the Capital Budget Policy.	ourable unit prices. Fi	eld conditions di	d not vary signfi	cantly from						
6	accurate estimat	Actual costs were higher than budgeted amount because the budgeted amount was based on a conceptual design and accurate estimates were not available at the time. Unexpected ground conditions also caused additional expense as an alternative had to be found. The over-expenditure was funded from 2011 Watermain Rehab account.										
7	detailed design e	The original capital budget of \$300,000 was based on a conceptual design whereas the tender price was comparable to the detailed design estimate. As field conditions did not vary significantly from what was anticipated during detailed design, some of the contingency was not utilized. The surplus will be used in accordance with the Capital Budget Policy.										
8	detailed design e	tal budget of \$285,000 was based on a estimate. As field conditions did not valingency allowance was not utilized. The	ry significantly from wl	nat was anticipat	ed during detail	ed design,						