

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 61 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

May 24, 2000

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Wednesday, May 24, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)
Professor Ronald Venter (Vice-Chair)
Professor Adel S. Sedra,
Vice-President and Provost
Professor Michael Finlayson, Vice-
President, Administration and Human
Resources
Professor Derek McCammond,
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Carl Amrhein
Professor John Challis
Professor Raymond Cummins
Professor Ruth Gallop
Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Bruce Kidd
Professor Michael Marrus

Mr. Elan Ohayon
Professor Nancy Reid
Professor Fred Wilson
Ms Judith Wilson
Mr. Vilko Zbogar

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Heather Munroe-Blum,
Vice-President, Research and International
Relations

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard
Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

Mr. Brian Burchell
Mr. Arvin Hariri
Professor Susan Horton

Ms Jacqueline Orange
Professor Paul Perron
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones

In Attendance:

Mr. Robert Spencer, member, Governing Council
Mr. Brian Davis, member-elect, Governing Council
Dr. Mary Barrie, Director, School of Continuing Studies
Mr. Adam Bretholz, President, Students' Administrative Council
Ms Sheila Brown, Controller and Director of Financial Services
Professor John Browne, Director of Residence Development
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Dr. John G. Dimond, Co-ordinator of the Bloor/Devonshire Precinct Project
Ms Ericka Duffy, Equity Issues Commissioner, Students' Administrative Council
Mr. Martin England, Assistant Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Joan Foley, Acting Principal and Acting Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough

Ms Manon Le Paven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students

Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties

Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant-Vice-President, Operations and Services

Mr. John Rawle, Chief Financial Officer, School of Continuing Studies

Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION. ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 59 (March 7, 2000), was approved.

The Chair noted that Report Number 60 of the meeting of April 24 and May 9 had been placed on the table and would be dealt with at the next meeting.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**Item 4 Capital Project: Munk Centre for International Studies - Funding Allocation**

The Chair recalled that Professor Finlayson had undertaken to report on cost overruns in connection with this project. Professor Finlayson's report had been placed on the table. There were no questions.

Item 9 Other Business - Motion re Physical Accessibility

The Chair explained that at the previous meeting, a member had submitted a request signed by the required 10 percent of the members of the Committee that a motion appear on this agenda. He asked the member to speak briefly to his motion and put the motion before the Committee.

The member referred to the documentation he had submitted in support of his motion. He noted that the original motion had been changed slightly and two other motions, that had grown out of discussions in which he had participated since the last meeting, had been added. He suggested that the changes and the additional motions did not contravene the spirit of the motion he had placed on the agenda. He recalled that issues about accessibility and accessibility barriers had been discussed in the governance process in the past. He characterized the lack of accessibility as the sword of Damocles hanging over the University. He said that the University could not be a truly international class University without paying attention to this issue. He noted that the president of APUS was unable to enter the offices occupied by that organization and he invited members to walk around the University and see the problems. There were barriers in both old and new buildings. The Munk Centre contained elevators and was largely accessible but the washroom doors did not meet the specifications for accessibility. The member drew attention to two tables in his submission. The first showed a number of capital projects that had received funding in 1999-2000 as well as several allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund. This was the list of projects that had led the member to specify the amount given in his motion. The second table showed the total amount spent on deferred maintenance for several years and the amount in each year spent on accessibility. In 1998-99, \$7.7 million was spent on deferred maintenance of which \$400,000 was earmarked for disabled access. In 1999-2000, \$100,000 of \$14.1 million was

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)**Item 9 Other Business - Motion re Physical Accessibility** (cont'd)

spent on disabled access. Students supported accessible capital projects. He said that he had chosen the Capital Renewal Fund as the source because he knew it contained sufficient unallocated funding to cover the amount he had recommended be spent on accessibility. This expenditure, if approved, would leave \$1 million in the Fund. He urged members of the Committee to set an example in this area for the universities of Canada.

The Chair asked the member to move the motion as set out in his original request presented at the previous meeting and found on the last page of the Report of the meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT \$4,647,973 immediately be allocated from the Capital Renewal Fund to ensure accessibility to currently inaccessible University of Toronto facilities.

The Chair noted that he had granted permission for a number of speakers to address the Committee. Ms Ericka Duffy, the Equity Issues Commissioner at SAC, said she was currently a member of SACWAC (SAC's Wheelchair Accessibility Committee). She spoke to the first of the three motions presented in the member's submission. (Secretary's note: this motion was not before the Planning and Budget Committee.) That motion called for a committee to be struck to produce guidelines and a checklist to ensure the physical accessibility of all new construction and renovated facilities. She noted that such a structure already existed, the University of Toronto Design Standard Guidelines, and these guidelines were more stringent than the provincial government ones. She asked that an annual audit of campus accessibility be undertaken. This would make the University community aware of the many accessibility needs. With respect to the motion calling for an expenditure of funds to support accessibility, she recalled that since 1992 SAC had raised and spent \$3 million on accessibility initiatives. Undergraduates had shown their dedication toward accessibility and she acknowledged that the University had matched the students' funding. SACWAC was nearing the end of its mandate and was operating on endowed funds that provided \$30,000 to be spent annually on these projects. This was not enough to address accessibility concerns. If the Capital Renewal Fund was not the appropriate source of funding, she urged the administration to find the funding elsewhere. She asked that SACWAC and the Disability Co-ordinator be consulted. She reminded members that if they personally had no problems with accessibility, the issue could be forgotten or ignored.

Ms Le Paven, President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, thanked the member for bringing this matter to the attention of the Planning and Budget Committee. She suggested that it would save money to have accessibility issues addressed at the beginning stages of building design and construction rather than when the building was almost complete and changes were deemed to be necessary. With respect to renovations, it was also important to have someone knowledgeable about accessibility review the plans. Elevators were not useful if there were steps in front of them. Gravel and stones were attractive but not negotiable in a wheelchair. She urged members to look at facilities from the point of view of the disabled. She recalled how she had become disabled through an office accident that could happen easily to anyone. She wondered whether the office doors around campus could accommodate a member of the staff in a wheelchair. Accessibility ramps should not be built at the back of buildings, away from the main traffic areas. That became a safety issue. The disabled should be able to use the front doors.

Mr. Sousa, President of the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), expressed his pleasure at seeing this item on the agenda. The GSU supported the motion and supported accessibility

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)**Item 9 Other Business - Motion re Physical Accessibility** (cont'd)

initiatives beyond those financed by student levies. He expressed his willingness to work with the administration on this issue.

The Chair opened the floor for debate. A member agreed that physical accessibility was clearly an important issue but she wished to know the history and the background concerning accessibility projects. She wondered if this was the best way to proceed. The amount suggested for the initiatives appeared to be more symbolic than realistic in view of the work to be done.

Professor Sedra indicated that he was pleased to be able to respond to the member's questions. He welcomed the discussion and noted that he had recently met with the mover of the motion. He said that the SAC and APUS speakers had made some very good points; it made sense to have people concerned with the accommodation of those with disabilities participate at the design stage. In the construction of new buildings, the University should do all it could to make them accessible. With existing buildings, the University was trying over time to make them accessible, using opportunities presented during renovation projects. The SACWAC fund had been used advantageously. He indicated that he was in support of the general intent of the motion before the Committee but he could not support the arbitrary funding included in the motion. This was not the way capital projects were planned, and he urged the members to vote against the motion. He asked that Miss Oliver and Professor McCammond be asked to supplement his remarks.

Professor McCammond reported that since 1994: a total of about \$5 million had been spent on renovations to improve accessibility, \$2.2 million had been spent on accessibility projects using SACWAC funding, and a further \$2.7 million has been provided by the University in a matching fashion. In addition, each year the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate spent \$30,000 on smaller but equally important projects such as small ramps, curb cuts and door openers.

Miss Oliver indicated that the University's design standards included the requirement to conform to various industry and government guidelines for accessibility. Indeed, the University was considering instituting higher standards. In the past, the University had asked the convenor for disability services to meet with the project manager and architects and sign off on construction projects. This was a difficult task for an individual and the process had been changed to a checklist for the architects. She said she would consider Ms Le Paven's point about a post-construction audit and the possibility of a representative group of users checking the buildings. She said that she would be pleased to distribute copies of the checklist.

A member noted that Professor Sedra had indicated his support for the intent but not the allocation. The member hoped all members supported the intent. But without an infusion of funding, accessibility would not improve. Severe problems remained and waiting for funding to undertake renovations, including perhaps some funding to address accessibility issues, was not the best solution. The disabled were excluded from a number of the University's facilities. Action was needed now. The University was not doing enough for the existing members of the University community who were disabled. Perhaps there were concerns about the amount or the source of funding mentioned in the motion, but some funding should be earmarked for accessibility projects. He asked what the alternative was. Professor Sedra responded that the alternative was what the University had been doing in the past, as reported by Professor McCammond. Perhaps, however, accessibility concerns were not being addressed quickly enough.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)**Item 9 Other Business - Motion re Physical Accessibility** (cont'd)

Invited to comment, a member of Governing Council recalled that when he had served as a member of the Planning and Budget Committee, he too had tried to establish a fund for a specific purpose. He asked that Professor Sedra consider this discussion an expression of concern about accessibility issues. The administration should draft a long-range plan to make the University fully accessible. He was particularly pleased to note that the University was considering setting standards higher than those proposed by industry and government. The plan should be costed and a timeframe set, and the proposal should be brought back to this Committee as a part of the budget process. He encouraged the administration to take up the challenge presented by this issue and to capitalize on student interest and energy. He said that the amount chosen in the motion was too random and there was no plan of how to proceed. He hoped to see a proposal that would include a list of projects, a plan to undertake them, the total cost, and the amount to be spent each year to achieve the goal of a fully accessible University.

A member said that he had listened with interest to the comments by the student speakers, particularly about the placement of ramps. He noted that the documents submitted by the member in support of his motion were several years old and he asked what had been done to address accessibility concerns in the intervening time. He asked what was being done to address these problems on the other campuses. He also wished to know whether it was economically feasible to make all facilities accessible and what the total cost would be.

A member indicated that he supported the intent of the motion and was attracted by some of the ideas raised in the debate. He too favoured the drafting of a comprehensive plan. Perhaps it could be part of a review of disability services. He also noted that it was important to consider what the various priorities were for the University's limited resources. There was a huge deferred maintenance list. Seventy percent of the St. George campus buildings were 30 years old or older. The strategy of tackling the problem through a combination of renovation and new construction was a good one. He was reluctant to commit funds to accessibility projects without seeing an updated strategy.

A member suggested that the Committee could support the intention of the motion by voting for it. He did not agree that this was a bad way to plan. He suggested that the Committee and the Academic Board often agreed to proposals in an ad hoc way. In this case, the problem had been identified and a proposal to alleviate that problem, with an allocation, had been placed before the Committee. He urged members to vote for the motion.

The mover of the motion said that although accessibility issues did not directly affect members of this Committee, other members of the University community had a more immediate interest in the outcome of this discussion. He noted for example that the Nursing building was not accessible. He believed the motion was clear and the number was not meaningless. It represented more than an intent.

The vote on the motion was taken.
The motion was defeated.

A member asked if the Provost would undertake to develop a strategy to accelerate the financing of necessary upgrades to existing University facilities to achieve accessibility. Professor Sedra undertook to provide a report on this issue at a fall meeting of the Committee.

3. School of Continuing Studies: Report

With the consent of the Committee members, this item was considered before the senior assessor's report. Dr. Barrie said that it was a pleasure to be presenting a "good news" report to the Committee, as a follow-up to the report she made in December. She focused particularly on two graphs circulated to the members as part of their agenda package. The first graph showed the revenue for the School from 1990-91 to 2000-01. For the first half of the decade, the revenue for the School had remained around the \$6 million mark. Beginning in 1996, the annual revenue had started to climb, with a dip in 1999, and was projected to be \$9.7 million in the budget year 2001. The 1999 dip in revenue had been due to the drop in enrolment of the English-as-a-second-language (ESL) program caused by the problems in the Asian economies and the local Canadian economy. However, the School had rebounded in 2000 and achieved a 45 percent increase in revenue over the 1999 level.

The second graph represented the accumulated deficit from 1990-91 to 2000-01. At the beginning of the decade, the School had had an accumulated deficit of \$3.4 million. The deficit had been reduced to \$0.5 million in 1996. However, the trouble with the Asian markets had caused difficulties in reaching the projected revenue levels, and the deficit had grown to almost \$2 million in 1999. She was pleased to announce that the rebound of 2000 had resulted in the deficit's being reduced to \$1 million. For 2000-01, there was a projected 7 percent increase in revenue which would further reduce the accumulated deficit to an expected \$0.24 million.

A member was also pleased with the financial results. He noted the expected growth in the following year was 7 percent and asked whether it was the best that could be expected. What was the limiting factor to growth? Dr. Barrie responded that people in mid-life were the main market for continuing education courses and the demographics supported growth in this area. The second large group of registrants at the School consisted of those who wanted to update their career skills. She noted that, in a new departure, the School was launching day classes. She said that the limiting factor on growth was the environment - how to accommodate those who wished to take courses. Internet learning was also an area which the School would explore.

In response to a question about the School's rebound, Dr. Barrie explained that the demand for ESL courses had revived. The consumer market was strong and people were spending on discretionary items. There was a growing demand from the mid-life group which she referred to as "middllescence". Career development courses accounted for 64 percent of the enrolments while liberal arts courses accounted for the remainder. She noted that there was almost no competition from the other two Toronto universities in continuing education; their focus was on credit courses. The School attracted international students. Diversification was the best guard against fluctuations in the School's business cycle. The nature of the economy and the size of the population from which it drew its students were the best predictors of the School's financial performance.

Professor Sedra congratulated Dr. Barrie and her staff on this excellent report. He agreed that the School had little competition in the Toronto area. York University provided credit continuing education programs similar to those offered at Woodsworth. Ryerson offered 85 percent of its courses for credit. The School was unique. Diversification was the key - and not relying on a particular market for success. In bad times, the School scaled back its operations and decreased its expenditures.

In response to a question about the Oakville site, Dr. Barrie said that Oakville Public Library was the latest experimental site for offering courses. The School had taken advantage of a number of opportunities to partner with other institutions and offer courses in various locations such as the Science Centre and the Art Gallery of Ontario. With respect to

3. School of Continuing Studies: Report (cont'd)

the internet, Dr. Barrie noted that it had no territories or boundaries. The use of the internet has been much discussed; there was a considerable cost for infrastructure. Currently 4,000 students were served by distributed education, that is, the School went to the students or sent the material to them by video or telephone or on paper. The School had 50 years' experience in this area and had a strong administrative structure and understanding of distributed education. How to translate this experience to the internet was the question. Questions concerning how to control the growth or how fast to grow had also been raised. She did not want the School to become a "giant server."

A member said that the School had an important role to play in outreach to the community. He asked how the University ensured access to continuing education. Were there subsidies for those who could not afford the fees? Dr. Barrie indicated that the School was administered on a cost-recovery basis. The students who attend the courses were well educated and were keen to continue to learn. She also noted that they were relatively affluent and were willing to pay the fees.

4. Senior Assessor's Report

(a) University of Toronto at Scarborough - Responsibility Centre Management

Professor Sedra thanked Professor Foley for attending the meeting. He recalled that in 1996, the University had decided to experiment with a budget system, Responsibility Centre Management (RCM), which was adapted and instituted on an trial basis at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTS). The experiment had been operating for some time and the results could now be assessed. The results were mixed; some good initiatives were undertaken but there was a great deal of complexity arising from the protocol that was necessary in order to deal fairly with Scarborough under this new system. The joint judgement of the administration and UTS was that Scarborough return to the budget system used by the rest of the University. It was thought that the good initiatives could have been undertaken under that system. On the spectrum of highly centralized budget process at one end to the decentralized RCM system at the other, the University's budget process was in the middle and provided a great deal of flexibility. It was also a great deal less demanding to administer. He had visited the UTS campus and announced the plan to return to the former budget system; he believed the announcement had been very well received.

Professor Foley confirmed that the move back to the former budget system had been well received. There would be a great deal of work to be done in order to change the budget system. She noted that there had been some experiences with RCM that had certainly not been foreseen or intended.

A member expressed his interest in this matter. He noted that the protocol had been described as too cumbersome. Was it possible to change that? Would the change of budget process mean that the initiatives that arose out of RCM would not be implemented? Professor Sedra responded that the protocol had not been made deliberately cumbersome. He said that a recent paper from one of the universities in the California system confirmed the University's findings with respect to RCM. Referring back to the budget process continuum, he said that as UTS worked its way back to the present budget process, it would not be necessary to return to the same system that it had left. Professor Sedra explained that several very good things arose from RCM including UTS's greater interest in enrolment and recruitment. He hoped to be able to maintain that interest. He noted that an aspect of RCM has been folded into enrolment agreements with a number of faculties where their failure to meet the target enrolments in their agreements had consequences in terms of funding. The experiment with RCM had changed and improved the whole budget process.

4. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd)**(b) Canada Research Chairs Program**

Professor Sedra said that because of time constraints he would not give the planned presentation on the Chairs Program. A final version of a paper on the allocation of the chairs would be ready shortly and this would be mailed to the Committee. He would make a presentation at the June 7 meeting.

5. Bloor/Devonshire Precinct: Presentation

The Chair invited Dr. Dimond to give his presentation. Dr. Dimond noted that Professor John Browne and Professor Bruce Kidd were also in attendance and could add to the presentation or respond to questions.

Dr. Dimond showed members a model of the proposed development plans for the area now designated as the Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor precinct. He recalled the decision of the Governing Council one year previously not to pursue a large-scale commercial development project on this site but instead to pursue a different plan. The development to date had been guided by two sources: the athletic centre task force, which had specified various site requirements, and the residence expansion program, which called for a substantial increase in residence spaces on campus so that 25 percent of the University's full-time students could be housed on campus. The model represented a work in progress and a great deal of work remained before a formal report and recommendation could be made to the Governing Council.

Dr. Dimond then highlighted the proposed aspects of the development project.

(a) Athletics Facilities

- the athletic field would be maintained in its north-south orientation and would be equipped with an all-weather surface;
- an 8-lane track would border the athletic field;
- the 20,000 seats currently in the stadium would be torn down and replaced by 5,000 seats on the east side of the site. These would be partly cantilevered over the roof of the existing Varsity arena, thus providing space for a concourse that would house common facilities for users of the stadium and arena;
- substantial renovations, in line with recommendations of the athletic centre task force, would be made to Varsity Arena;
- a second hockey rink, turned in an east-west orientation, would be constructed immediately south of the existing arena. This would allow the University to decommission the existing open-air rink located on Robert Street. Dr. Dimond noted that this site was partially owned by Trinity College and, therefore, the cooperation of the College would be required for its development.

(b) Residences

- a capacity of 1660 residence spaces was projected for the precinct, which included not only the Varsity Stadium/Arena site, but also the lands on the west side of Devonshire Place north of the Trinity tennis courts and the south-east corner of Bloor Street and St. George;
- the majority of residences being contemplated were suite style (i.e. four bedrooms grouped into a single suite with a kitchen/living area and one or more bathrooms);
- about 380 of these residence spaces were earmarked for Woodsworth College, which had proposed the site at Bloor Street and St. George Street (Site 26) as the location for its new residence. Dr. Dimond anticipated that this might be the first site to be developed;

5. Bloor/Devonshire Precinct: Presentation (cont'd)

- a residence was contemplated for the west side of Devonshire Avenue (Site 12) which currently housed a parking lot and two day care facilities. The development of Site 12 would require that the University find alternative space for the facilities and would, therefore, take some time to develop;
- an area of new green space, comparable in size to the quadrangle within Massey College, would be created west of Devonshire between the above two new buildings;
- the field within the Varsity Stadium site would be moved south and east to create building sites along the perimeter of the site and would be slightly below grade;
- a 6-story building, with generous openings for views throughout the site, would border the perimeter to the south and west sides of the new stadium. At the north-west corner of the site there would be a 'point' tower of thirteen additional stories above the six stories that would house approximately 380 residence spaces, and at the north-east corner a similar tower would house approximately 320 residents;
- in addition, each tower would have approximately 15 two-bedroom apartments for housing new faculty;
- the two towers, including the building on which they would sit, would be 19 stories in height, 3 stories higher than the OISE/UT building on the north side of Bloor Street;
- a small building site on the south-west corner of the Varsity Stadium site would be able to accommodate 100 residence spaces. Running north from this building along the east side of Devonshire Place would be a narrow building with 100 additional spaces. This building would include, at grade, several views through to, and a means of easy access to, the playing field area;
- the final residence element under study was a 130-bed dormitory-style building on the south face of the proposed new second rink. Since this would be entirely on Trinity College property, it was being presented as an option for Trinity College to consider.

(c) Other Development Potential

- the administration was studying the possibility of an underground multiplex movie theatre to be located beneath the north end of the playing field. Such an initiative would be more likely if it could assist in financing the overall precinct development;
- at-grade spaces along the Bloor Street frontage of the precinct, as well as some second floor spaces, would house retail operations or student services. As each residence plan was developed, student service spaces would be contemplated;
- landscaping would be a significant component of the project, including a lot of attention to the various streetscapes and plans to reinvigorate Philosophers' Walk.

In conclusion, Dr. Dimond underscored that the project was in its preliminary stage and that he and his colleagues were continuing to get feedback from on- and off-campus groups. Discussions with the City's Planning Office, particularly concerning the development of the Bloor Street frontage between Avenue Road and St. George Street, were an integral step in the process. He anticipated that a more complete report would be available in the early fall.

A member noted that the plans called for the Robert Street rink to be replaced by an indoor rink at the south end of the proposed site. He said that the easy visibility and community feel of the old rink would be lost. Professor Kidd replied that the outdoor rink was neither efficient nor an effective use of funds. The City would continue to share in costs of operating the new rink. He also noted that the rink would be visible both from Devonshire Place and on the north-south line from Bloor Street. Dr. Dimond noted that this particular concern had not been raised at previous presentations. Others have seen the second rink as a positive component of the proposal.

5. Bloor/Devonshire Precinct: Presentation (cont'd)

A member said that the proposal was very exciting and he was pleased that the site was being used for housing instead of commercial activity. He referred to the proposed residence rooms on the east side of Devonshire Place which had been described as being off a single corridor and up several steps. These rooms, of course, would not be accessible to people with physical disabilities. Dr. Dimond stressed that this was a planning presentation and not the final design plan. He pointed to the other components of the proposal which were accessible. The member referred to the plans to finance the residences through student room rates. He asked whether any thought had been given to incorporating public housing which would make available more sources of funding.

A member said that the new residences could be seen as a contribution to solving the housing shortage in the City. Dr. Dimond explained that there was no existing government program to support the building of student housing. In the discussions with the City, the University was making the case that 1700 student residence places would be a significant contribution to the City's housing stock. Students housed on campus would not be occupying spaces elsewhere in the City. Professor Browne noted that research on this issue was underway. Professor McCammond indicated that the University has raised the issue of capital funding for residence construction with the Ministry, encouraging the government to make residences eligible SuperBuild Growth Fund projects. If the government supported increased numbers of student places in post-secondary institutions, it would need to provide funding for student housing. He recalled that in the past, the government had funded a bed subsidy program in which each university had been allocated a number of residence beds with the attached capital funding per bed.

In response to a question about parking, Dr. Dimond said that the best location for parking, should the University choose to have a parking facility as part of the project, would be under the playing field. There were no utilities under the field and it would be cheaper to build there than under a building.

A member asked about the possibility of a subway entrance as part of the project. Dr. Dimond responded that the matter had been raised, but it was a very expensive proposition to build a connection under Bloor Street and no one was willing to pay the cost.

A member noted the plan to house offices for student groups in some of the buildings; this would affect the amount of rental revenue that could be realized. Dr. Dimond said that the use of space by student groups was being considered by the Provost's Office. Woodsworth College might provide student activity space on its main floor. There would be opportunities for income from commercial sites along the Bloor Street frontage.

The Chair thanked Dr. Dimond for the excellent presentation.

6. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday June 7 at 5:00 p.m. There would be a summer meeting; the date was yet to be determined.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Secretary
May 31, 2000

Chair