

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

January 12, 2011

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, January 12, 2011, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Dr. Avrum Gotlieb (In the Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost, Academic Operations
Professor Philip H. Byer
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Mr. Shaun Datt
Mr. Ken Davy
Professor Meric S. Gertler
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Dr. Jim Yuan Lai
Professor Henry Mann
Ms Natalie Melton
Ms Carole Moore
Dr. Susan Rappolt
Ms Lynn Snowden
Mr. W. John Switzer

Non-voting Assessors:

Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
Ms Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate Officer

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary
Mr. Henry Mulhall
Ms Mae Yu-Tan

Regrets:

Professor Parth Markand Bhatt
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Professor Douglas McDougall
Ms Catherine J. Riggall

In Attendance:

Professor Franco Vaccarino, member Governing Council, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Ms Judith Wolfson, Vice-President, University Relations
Ms Gillian Morrison, Assistant Vice-President, Divisional Relations and Campaigns
Mr. Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Strategy Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. John Aruldason, President, Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU)
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Prof. Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic) University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)
Mr. Desmond Pouyat, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC)

ITEMS 4 AND 5 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Chair's Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting (November 10, 2010)

Report Number 139 (November 10, 2010) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak referred to the detailed presentation on pension plan matters that had been made at the Committee's meeting on November 10, 2010. The University faced a challenge to meet the substantial deficits in its defined-benefit pension plans. The severity of the deficits was affected by the state of the financial markets and interest rates. In the near term, the University was required to demonstrate to the provincial government that it had appropriate strategies in place to address the deficits in its pension plans. Most divisions had indicated in their respective budget meeting that they had begun to put in place plans for new contributions for special payments towards the pension plans. It was expected that special payments totaling \$30 million would be made in 2011-2012 to begin to address the deficit in the pension plans. The deans of the divisions had already been working on strategies of special pension payments.

In response to a question from a member, Ms Garner clarified that the special payment contributions of \$23 million represented approximately two to three per cent of the University's total operating budget. Professor Misak added that over the long-term, it was expected that the sustainability of the pension plans would depend on increased contributions from active members of the pension plans. A goal was to stabilize the University's pension plans in line with those of other institutions. The University was expected to present its strategies to address the pension-plan deficits in the following weeks.

3(a). Annual Report: Ontario Disability Act Accessibility Plan 2010-2011, University of Toronto

Professor Misak introduced Professor Hildyard, to present the [*Annual Report: Ontario Disability Act Accessibility Plan 2010-2011, University of Toronto*](#).

Professor Hildyard said that there had been a steady increase in the number of students, faculty and staff who had availed themselves of the excellent services offered by the Accessibility Services offices on all three campuses. As legislated by the provincial government in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA), the University had introduced the Customer Service Standard in 2010. The University had worked with the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) towards introducing the Information and Communication Standard, the Transportation Standard, and the Employment Standard in 2011. The Built Environment Standard was expected to be introduced in 2012. The Advisory Committee constituted for the implementation of the legislated standards had expressed its general satisfaction at the progress made on their implementation. Across the province, the University was seen as a leader in the implementation of the legislated standards. In closing, Professor Hildyard acknowledged the leadership and commitment shown by Ms Andrea Carter, Employment Equity AODA Officer, in the execution of the standards.

3(a). Annual Report: Ontario Disability Act Accessibility Plan 2010-2011, University of Toronto (cont'd)

In the discussion that followed, members remarked that the Health and Wellbeing Programs and Services had been an asset for faculty members. This was more so for young faculty members who in the past had been reluctant to avail themselves of such services. A member queried the reasons for an increase in the number of students who had sought assistance through Accessibility Services. Professor Hildyard replied that overall there was there an increased awareness of mental health issues. High school students had sought more assistance to succeed and this practice continued once they entered post-secondary institutions. As highlighted by the press, the area of mental health issues was a growing one. It affected members from a cross-section of the University's community including its staff, students and faculty. The issue was not unique to the University. The implementation of the standards outlined in the AODA, such as Information and Communication, could result in the reconfiguration of some of the University's programs to assist instructors and students. A member outlined the need to create awareness among the faculty in this regard. Another member asked about the consequences of the implementation of the standards legislated by the AODA on the competencies requirements for professional certification. The members stressed on the importance of identifying the needs of students who required accommodations to complete their programs, but were yet unable to meet the competency requirements for professional certification. Professor Hildyard agreed to provide the Committee with a follow-up report on this matter.

4. Infrastructure Project: Site Remediation for the North Campus at the University of Toronto at Scarborough

Ms Sisam said that the site remediation project for the north campus would allow UTSC to meet its enrolment objectives as outlined in the *Towards 2030* report. The site of the remediated land would be used for the UTSC Sport and Recreation Centre. The UTSC campus was spread over an area of 302 acres. The south campus had been built in the early 1960s for a small student population that had grown to over 9,600 full-time equivalents (FTE) in the ensuing period. The Instructional Centre on the periphery of the north campus was scheduled to open in March 2011. Even though the total area of the north campus comprised approximately 96 acres, there were limitations on its usage for development. The site had once been a quarry and had subsequently been a municipal landfill site. The last remaining segment of the campus consisted of 154 acres of valley land. The valley land segment was protected under the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and was restricted from further significant development.

The current use of the land on much of the north campus was limited to parking lots. Ms Sisam said that the 2000 UTSC Campus Master Plan had identified development sites that were necessary to meet the plan for enrolment growth. There were limitations on the areas identified on north campus because of the land that required remediation. The areas identified in the Master Plan were away from the landfill on soil that had been deemed undisturbed. Nevertheless, further studies had been deemed necessary prior to the commencement of construction of the Instructional Centre on this land.

UTSC had been involved in discussions to address its enrolment growth as identified in the *Towards 2030* report. The student population was expected to grow to about 12,100 FTE by 2030, and it was important for UTSC to determine where to place the facilities required to accommodate that student population. The completion of the Instructional Centre would provide UTSC with seventy one per cent of the space required to accommodate the students. If no further buildings were added to the UTSC campus, the space available would be at between fifty to sixty per cent of the required capacity. The remediation project would provide significant space for the required growth of the campus. The forthcoming UTSC Master Plan would provide further details on the growth of the campus. It would also present opportunities for partnerships with the private sector in the utilization of space.

4. Infrastructure Project: Site Remediation for the North Campus at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd)

Ms Sisam reiterated that the academic growth of the UTSC campus remained the primary motivator for the project. The proposed athletic centre would cover an area of approximately 23,000 net assignable square metres (nasm). The remediation project would result in clearing enough land to address UTSC's growth requirements. The project had been studied in detail by the University and the City. Consultants and environmental engineers had compiled data and the project and implementation was being reviewed by the Ministry of the Environment. A requisite number of public meetings had been held with the community and adjoining neighbourhoods to apprise them of the work that was planned.

The total area of the site was 18.5 acres, including the University's portion of eight acres. The funding brought to the remediation project would allow the University to leverage funding for the UTSC Sport and Recreation Centre.

Professor Misak added the University had been presented an opportunity to proceed with the goal of addressing the expected growth of the UTSC campus. The investment in the remediation of the north campus was critical to meet the needs of future students.

Ms Sisam said that the landfill extended beyond the boundary of the north campus of UTSC into City of Toronto owned land. The University and the City had conducted studies in the areas of the landfill. Boreholes and monitoring stations had been placed throughout the area and reports from the studies indicated that there was seepage of methane. The University was required to obtain zoning clearance for the Instructional Centre, even though the Instructional Centre was not directly on the site of the landfill. This was required because of speculation that there may have been some methane migration. In 2010, bore holes were dug in a grid pattern to determine the volume of waste that needed to be cleared. The cost of the remediation project would be determined by the amount of material that was dug up and transported to another landfill in the province. Consultants had provided estimates of the cubic yardage of waste that needed to be removed. The lowest level of the landfill was composed of sand and silt. The depth of the landfill varied up to eight metres. The top level of the landfill was made up of clean soil fill. In order to control costs, the clean soil would be reused once the landfill was cleared.

The following issues were discussed by the Committee:

Cost of the Project

A member informed the Committee that he had been involved with similar projects. In his experience, the final costs of a project of this nature often exceeded the estimated costs. The member asked:

- What were the contingency plans to deal with any the cost overruns?
- Where would the financial risk of any cost overrun fall?
- Did the cost sharing agreement of 2:1 include the liability for any cost overrun?

Ms Sisam responded that three engineering firms had worked with the City on the proposed remediation of the site. Through the process of boreholes and grids described, the nature of the landfill debris was determined. The estimated costs were based on the volume of municipal debris that would need to be removed. The University would continue its discussions with the City on the removal of the landfill, and the relocation of the debris to another landfill within the province.

4. Infrastructure Project: Site Remediation for the North Campus at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd)

The City, like the University, was averse to risk. Even though there were some contingency plans in place to allow for cost overruns in the project, the University continued to formalize the details with the City. A clearer scenario would emerge once the contractors were able to determine the total cost of the landfill removal. If it was determined that the cost of the University's share would significantly exceed amount as stated in the motion, the project would be brought back to governance under the guidelines stipulated in the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*.

Professor Misak added that the motion presented for the project had conditions built into it that addressed the procurement of the required approvals and funding for the project. If the newly-elected municipal council decided against contributing towards the project, the project would be cancelled.

Environment and Community

A member asked whether the City would be removing all the debris removed from the landfill site. Another member sought information on the maintenance and responsibility for the efficacy of the barrier wall. Members also asked what information on the scale of the work involved had been provided to the neighbourhoods in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Ms Sisam said that the project would be implemented by the City. The City would only remediate the identified site. The mound further to the northern edge of the campus would not be remediated, rather a barrier wall would be built to retain the remaining landfill outside of the site area on City land and, as such, the City would be required to conform to the guidelines outlined by the Ministry of the Environment. The effectiveness of the barrier wall would be monitored.

Ms Sisam added that two public meetings had been held to apprise residents of the surrounding neighbourhoods of the proposed projects. The meetings had been attended by residents of the surrounding communities and there had also been representation from the Ministry of Environment. At the meetings, the residents were provided with details of the project, identifying municipal landfill to be removed; the general volume of the debris being removed; and, the movement of the removal trucks. Residents had also been apprised of the University's plans through the information sessions regarding the UTSC Master Plan. There had been a deliberate process to engage the community. Flyers, with information had been distributed to each household surrounding the site inviting residents to the public meetings.

In conclusion, Ms Sisam said that it was anticipated that the work on the site would commence in April 2011 and be completed to allow for the start of the construction of the UTSC Sport and Recreation Centre. There were some contingency built in to allow for time over-runs.

Invited to comment, Professor Vaccarino said that the project had received enormous support from the community. In his view, the Sport and Recreation Centre, when completed, would be a point of pride and focus for the surrounding neighbourhoods. The UTSC campus had approximately seventy per cent of the space, as outlined by the COU, for its student population, which now exceeded 9,600. In the existing scenario, the quality of student experience was severely compromised. The remediation of the land on the north campus would allow UTSC to provide the study space and improve the quality of student experience.

4. Infrastructure Project: Site Remediation for the North Campus at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Subject to all required government approvals and subject to funding being in place prior to commencing the work:

- (a) THAT the recommendation identified in the “Report on Site Remediation for the North Campus of the University of Toronto at Scarborough”, dated January 6, 2011, a copy of which is attached as [Appendix “A”](#), be approved in principle.
- (b) THAT subject to all other approvals and funding being in place prior to commencing construction, the University of Toronto contribution for the remediation, having a total project cost of \$52 million (2010 dollars) comprise:
 - \$5 million from UTSC resources
 - \$5 million debt to be repaid by UTSC

5. Project Planning Report: University of Toronto at Scarborough Sport and Recreation Centre

Ms Sisam said that the UTSC Athletics and Recreation Centre facility had been built in 1963 to serve a student population of 4,000.

The current student population of UTSC was close to 9,600, and had outstripped the demand on the existing athletic facilities at that campus. In 2004, UTSC and the City of Toronto had begun discussions on the construction of joint facility that would serve as an athletics facility and a community centre. A planning committee had been struck to determine the space requirements and had resulted in the development of a space program to address the requirements of UTSC and those of the surrounding communities. From the UTSC’s perspective, the athletics facility would meet the needs of its growing student population. The neighbourhoods surrounding UTSC had been identified as areas of priority by the City; and the centre would provide much-needed community space. The announcement of the successful bid for the Pan Am Games 2015 had provided greater impetus to the concept of a joint athletics facility and community centre. For UTSC, the needs of its students remained paramount and these needs remained embedded in the proposed facility. The Scarborough Campus Students’ Union (SCSU) had held a referendum and there was substantial support in favour of a student levy to contribute towards the project. The UTSC students had recognized how their contributions towards the athletics facility could be used to leverage contributions from federal, provincial and municipal levels of government. A separate working group had been involved in the scheduling of the construction work of the facility, and the assignment of space within the facility to meet the needs of the students. The time and space requirements for intra-mural activities had been studied in detail by the group.

Ms Sisam said that the total area of the facility would be approximately 23,000 nasm, with a constructed area of approximately 37,000 gross square metres (gsm). When completed, the University’s portion of the annual operating budget of the facility was estimated to be approximately \$1.5 million. The facility would be located on the remediated lands identified on the north campus of UTSC, located within a ten-minute walk to the existing parking lots. Ms. Sisam highlighted the funding matrix as outlined in the project planning report.

5. Project Planning Report: University of Toronto at Scarborough Sport and Recreation Centre (cont'd)

In the discussion that followed, a member sought information on some aspects related to the project:

Transportation

What plans were in place to make the venue accessible to spectators to the Pan Am Games 2015? The member also noted that, in the long-term, some of the existing parking space would be utilized in the construction of the facility.

Professor Misak responded, the University was hopeful that the successful bid to host the Pan Am Games would tilt the decision towards an extension of the LRT line. Ms Sisam added that the location had been planned specifically to allow for the accommodation of the option of light rail transit. The University had worked with the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) and the City on this aspect of the plans. Parking space was a critical component of all academic expansion. The plans for the facility generated two parking spaces per hundred square metres of assignable space. These included the parking spaces on the site of the facility and acknowledging student use of the facility, the existing spaces on the UTSC campus.

Agreement with the City of Toronto

The member noted that the proposed facility would use large amounts of water and electricity, and, in the future, there would significant costs related to its operation. As this was a joint facility venture between the City and the University, was there a formal agreement in place with the City regarding the management of the facility and the cost related to its operations?

Ms McLean informed the Committee that a management board structure had been proposed, with representatives from the City, the University, and possibly the High Performance Sport body. The board would hire an administrative team to manage the facility. Members of the University community, including its students, faculty and staff would be represented on the board. Numerous management agreements remained to be signed with the City. There was considerable enthusiasm between the City officials and the University for the success of this project.

The member commented on the scale of proposed facility and the reaction of the surrounding neighbourhood on its completion. He thanked the students at UTSC for taking the initiative for the project.

The Chair invited Mr. Aruldason to address the Committee. Mr. Aruldason said that successful bid by the City to host the Pan American Games in 2015 had been well received by the UTSC student body. A large segment of UTSC students were also residents of that campus's surrounding neighbourhoods that would benefit from the proposed facility. The UTSC student body had extended its support to the project as a means of providing an everlasting legacy to that campus and its surrounding community. He thanked the University and other bodies for moving this project further towards its realization.

5. Project Planning Report: University of Toronto at Scarborough Sport and Recreation Centre (cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Subject to the availability of funding for the land remediation of the site,

- (a) THAT the Project Planning Report for the UTSC Sport and Recreation Centre, as accommodated in the Pan American Aquatics Centre, Field House and Canadian Sport Institute Ontario to be built at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, dated January 6, 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#), be approved in principle.
- (b) THAT the site northeast of the corner of Military Trail and Morningside Avenue be assigned to the Pan American Aquatics Centre, Field House and Canadian Sport Institute Ontario Project.
- (c) THAT the total project cost for the UTSC portion be \$37.51 Million (2008 dollars) out of a total project cost of \$170.5 Million (2008 dollars) for all parts of the project.
- (d) THAT the funding costs for the UTSC portion of \$37.51 Million (2008 dollars) comprise:
 - \$30 Million acquired through a student levy and,
 - \$7.51 Million from UTSC/U of T Central funds.

6. Capital Project: Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, and the Dunlap Institute for Astronomy – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

The Committee received for information the Membership and the Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committees for the Capital Project for the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, and the Dunlap Institute for Astronomy.

7. Capital Project: Front and Back St. George Campus – Project Planning Committee Terms of Reference

The Committee received for information the Membership and the Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committees for the Capital Project for the Front and Back St. George Campus.

8. Annual Report: Design Review Committee, 2009-2010

In a brief introduction to the Report, Ms Sisam said that the [Design Review Committee](#) (DRC) had met eight times over the 2009-2010 period to review seven projects.

Ms Sisam provided a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the following projects:

Mississauga Academy of Medicine: It was expected that the construction of the Academy would be completed by July 2011. The estimated cost of the project was approximately \$ 37 million. On completion, the Academy would be the first University medical training facility off the St. George campus in the Greater Toronto Area. UTM had partnered with municipalities in the Peel region to create the Academy. The project had been the recipient of a Canadian Architect award.

Pedestrian Strategy – Willcocks Street: This project was a joint venture with the City of Toronto. A goal of the project was to create more civic space free of vehicular traffic. The City had proposed that the University to close a section of Willcocks Street, between St. George Street and Huron Street, to vehicular traffic. The University had permission to close that section of Willcocks Street until September 2011. The City had provided funding for planters and barriers that were placed at either end of the closed section to prevent vehicular traffic. Sections of the pavement had been painted and artificial turf had been placed on the pavement. Umbrellas and street furniture had been provided by the City. The closure had been a success with an increase in the usage of the enclosed space on Willcocks Street for a host of activities. There was an interest to include the Sidney Smith Hall Plaza to the project.

A similar project had also been tried on Devonshire Place on the St. George campus but with limited success.

Joseph L. Rotman School of Management: It was expected that the expansion project of the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management would be completed by April 2012. The project was valued at \$91.8 million.

Munk School of Global Affairs: The project to refurbish the heritage building at 315 Bloor Street West for the Munk School of Global Affairs was valued at \$13.6 million. The refurbished building would be wheel-chair accessible. The project was expected to be completed by October 2011.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair thanked Ms Sisam. He asked her to convey to the members of the Design Review Committee the Planning and Budget Committee's gratitude for their work.

9. [Annual Report: Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Approvals](#) [\(a\) Annual Report on Approvals on Projects between \\$50,000 and \\$ 2 Million \(2009-2010\)](#)

Ms Sisam reported that in 2008-2009, the University had received one-time-only funding for projects under the government's Capital Renewal Program (CRP). There were fewer projects during 2009-2010 compared with number of projects completed during the previous period. The report for the period 2009-2010 had included some residual projects from 2008-2009. The University had used all of the funding provided by the government for a broad range of projects. In some instances the funding had also been used to service the debt undertaken for some eligible projects, including accessibility projects.

A part of the mandate of the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) was to ensure that construction and renewal projects were completed with minimal disruption to the University's activities.

10. Date of the Next Meeting – Wednesday, March 2, 2011

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, March 2, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

11. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 19, 2011