



# University of Toronto

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PROVOST, SPACE AND FACILITIES PLANNING

---

## **FOR INFORMATION:**

TO: Planning and Budget Committee

SPONSOR: Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
CONTACT INFO: 416-978-5515; ron.venter@utoronto.ca

DATE: November 1, 2004 for November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

AGENDA ITEM: 10

## **ITEM IDENTIFICATION:**

Project Committee for the Varsity Stadium & Varsity Arena.

## **JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:**

Under the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, section 5.A, the membership and terms of reference of Project Committees shall be reported to the Planning and Budget Committee.

## **BACKGROUND:**

The University has anticipated development on the Varsity Site [ site # 21 in the Campus Master Plan] since 1985, when it first began to review development opportunities on the St. George Campus. Zoning approval was given by the City in 1997; including allowance for a significant commercial component that could be placed at the north end of the site along the Bloor Street frontage.

In 2000, the University considered and rejected a proposal that would have had the exclusive use the north end of the site for commercial purposes in a land lease arrangement. The remaining south end of the site was to be developed by the University to become a track and field facility.

Thereafter, in 2000, the University explored using the Varsity site for new residence facilities, [a University goal because of rapidly increasing enrolment] and new and revitalized athletic facilities. The Bloor Devonshire Planning Study was developed outlining an overall plan for this sector of the Campus including student residences, commercial space and athletic facilities to be built in two phases, including a 5000 seat stadium. The planning directives from the Bloor Devonshire Report informed the work of the Project Committee addressing the Report on the Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports 2001.

The plan was endorsed by community groups and the City was favourably disposed to changes in the University's Master Plan and zoning necessary for implementation, which was anticipated to begin in

spring 2002 in order that the residences would be ready for the fall of 2004. The full completion of the multi phased project [estimated to cost \$155 million] was anticipated to be by the summer or 2005.

Funding was to be assembled from a variety of sources, including amortization of the residences, private benefaction, naming opportunities, the University, the City of Toronto, and a student referendum for the athletic facilities. The student referendum was held in March 2002 and was defeated.

In 2003, the University explored an option for partnership in the development of the Varsity Centre with Maple Leaf Sports and Entertainment. The facilities program given to the architects was for a smaller, less ambitious facility. Nevertheless, the business plan was not viable and again the project was unable to proceed.

Early in 2004, a proposal was brought forward from discussions with the Toronto Argonauts, in collaboration with Soccer Canada, for a new \$80 million 25,000 seat stadium that would have an athletic and special event focus, could also accommodate soccer and house the University athletics program.

Provincial Government support [\$8 million] for this project was forthcoming because of the potential *to have a positive impact on Sport Tourism and Sport Event Hosting, giving Toronto and Ontario the opportunity to host international sport events* and was contingent upon the success of the Canadian Soccer Association bid to host the FIFA Men's U-20 Worlds Championships in 2007. The Federal Government also committed \$27 million in support of this initiative. The proposed facility was to be managed and operated by the Argonauts with the University paying annual rent from the operating budget of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. Debt costs were to be paid by the Argos from revenues of operation over a period of 35 years. The University was to retain ownership of land and buildings and approve naming, leases and advertising for the facility. Considerable planning studies were undertaken during May through to September, 2004 in a serious attempt to identify the precise requirements and an accurate cost of the construction of the facility (prior to securing the approval of Governing Council). As a result of the significant projected increases in the cost of this facility, the University administration, following careful consideration, chose to discontinue the project as developed with the Toronto Argonauts, Soccer Canada and supported by the Provincial & Federal Governments.

#### **Varsity Stadium & Arena.**

The space program identified in the Report on the Varsity Centre for Field and Ice Sports 2001 [December 2001] forms the base requirements for the University. The work of the current project planning committee will be to prepare a revised plan for the Varsity site to include the 8 lane, international standard track, the regulation football & soccer field, 5000 spectator seats, change-room and related facilities in support of the athletics program plus the renovation of the Arena. What is required is a master plan of these requirements with a clear understanding of the projected costs and whether the project can be completed as a single entity or preferably phased-in as funds become available. The utilization of the facilities should also be clarified and the extent to which outside activities accommodated should be clarified.

The Project Planning Committee will also identify all other secondary costs to ensure that the facilities will service both the arena and stadium development, including infrastructure. The Faculty of Physical Education and Health will be responsible for the portion of consulting fees associated with the planning study as it relates to the Arena. The results of the planning study must be available to be included in the master plan of the Varsity Centre Project Planning Report. The terms of reference that follow therefore include reference to the study for Varsity Arena.

The Faculty of Physical Education and Health has indicated that the renovations of Varsity Arena will be their major fundraising priority, upon completion of the stadium. Once funded and implemented, the project will complete the redevelopment of Varsity Centre.

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:**

Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, Director, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs  
Mr. Flemming Galberg, Director, Property Management, Design & Construction, Facilities & Services  
Mr. Willard L'Heureux, Co-chair, Project Blue  
Ms. Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Programs, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Ms. Michol Hoffman, Graduate Student  
Professor Gretchen Kerr, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Peter Lewis, Massey College  
Mr. Andy Macdonald, Manager, Arena/Stadium/Fields, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Christopher Allsop, Interim President, Students' Administrative Council 2001-2002 [previously Matt Lenner and Chris Ramsaroop represented SAC on this Committee]  
Darren Levstek, Co-Chair, Council on Athletics and Recreation, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, 2001-2002  
Professor Ann Zimmerman, Environmental Protection Advisory Committee  
Ms. Shirley Roll, (Secretary), Facilities Planner, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Ms. Mary Ann Pilskalnietis, Special Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health [joined the Committee in August, 2000; previously Paul Carson served as the Dean's Assistant on this Committee]

**REVISED COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR 2004:**

Professor Bruce Kidd, (Co-Chair), Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Ms. Elizabeth Sisam, (Co-Chair), Director, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Ms. Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs  
Ms. Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Programs, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. Andy Macdonald, Manager, Arena/Stadium/Fields, Faculty of Physical Education and Health  
Mr. John Fraser, Master, Massey College.  
Ms. Shirley Roll, (Secretary), Facilities Planner, Campus and Facilities Planning  
Mr. John Bisanti, Chief, Capital Projects  
Ms Sarah Lipton, Student Representative  
Ms Natalie Slomka, President of the PHE Undergraduate Association.  
Mr. Russell Fields, Student Representative  
Mr. Howard Tam, Vice-President, Student's Administrative Council  
Mr. Ron Swail, Acting Assistant Vice President, Facilities and Services  
Mr. George Phelps, Capital Projects.  
Mr. Julian Binks, Capital Projects

This membership of the Project Planning Committee was tabled for information at the September, 2004 meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee. This membership has not changed, however the Terms of Reference have been adjusted to reflect the new requirements for the site.

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE:**

*(The original terms of reference, presented to the Planning and Budget Committee of Governing Council in May 1998, and were revised in 2000 to align with the Bloor Devonshire Plan .The Following are the Terms of Reference revised once again to reflect the change in direction for a revised Varsity 2004 Plan.)*

1. Identify those elements of the 2001 space program and the functional layout for a new Varsity Stadium that will be used for University purposes.
2. Identify the space program and functional layout for a renovated Varsity Arena, accommodating all of the program elements identified in the 2001 space program. Clearly identify those elements that must be displaced as a result of the redevelopment plan for the stadium, including a provision for a new entrance at the south end of the Arena, due to the expansion of the Royal Conservatory of Music.
3. Ensure that the space program, layout and amenities are designed to achieve the goals of gender equity, and a welcoming, inclusive environment for athletics and recreation.
4. Ensure that the plan will allow ready access to the new Stadium and Arena from Bloor Street and access to both Stadium and Arena for persons with disabilities.
5. Identify the needs of other University users and members of the public, including those participating in programs conducted by the City of Toronto and the potential for the rental tenants.
6. Identify all equipment and furnishings required by the project.
7. Identify all resource implications for the **stadium**, including the capital cost, new equipment and furniture purchases, and the projected increase, if any, of the University's annual operating cost.
8. Identify all resource implications for the **arena**, including the capital cost, new equipment and furniture purchases, and the projected increase, if any, of the University's annual operating cost, and separately any work that is associated with the stadium renovation.
9. Identify a plan that can be implemented in phases, if required, and the costs associated with each phase. The phases refer to the stadium phase followed by the arena phase.
10. Determine a plan and its associated costs for staging to maintain programming during the transition to the new facilities.
11. Respond to the rich history of Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena, of events and architecture in the design of the new facilities.
12. Address campus wide planning directives as set out in the campus master plan, open space plan, urban design criteria, and site conditions that respond to the broader University community.
13. Prepare a site plan showing the extent of the new plan for the Arena in relation to Philosophers' Walk, Trinity College, RCM and the interface with Varsity Stadium and Arena.
14. Consult widely with the University community and members of the public.
15. Report by February, 2005.



# University of Toronto

OFFICE OF THE VICE- PROVOST, SPACE AND FACILITIES PLANNING

Appendix "E" to  
Report Number 136  
of the Academic  
Board (June 2, 2005)

TO: Planning and Budget Committee

SPONSOR: Ron Venter, Vice-Provost, Space and Facilities Planning  
CONTACT INFO: 416-978-5515; ron.venter@utoronto.ca

DATE: April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2005, for May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

AGENDA ITEM: 4

## ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health.

## JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

Under the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, the Planning & Budget Committee reviews Project Planning Reports prepared for a capital project and recommends to the Academic Board approval in principle of the project.

## PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

There have been no previous approvals of the current Project Planning Report for the Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health. A new Project Planning Committee was established in November, 2004. The Committee, with particularly strong and enthusiastic student representation, has diligently assembled a creative phased plan for Varsity Centre that addresses the needs of the students, the University community and the neighbouring community.

The proposed facility represents a major contribution in support of the Stepping-UP initiatives of the University of Toronto.

Following the precise identification of the phased-in plan, a series of informative town-hall meetings and smaller group meetings were held to solicit response and ideas from students, internal university neighbours, members of various Governing Council committees and the community. The Provost was directly involved in each of these meetings and was able to learn first-hand of the likes and dislikes of the attendees. It should suffice to indicate at this juncture that the feedback received from all who attended these information meetings was exceptionally positive; suggestions, as appropriate, have been incorporated into the report. A copy of a typical presentation is provided as an attachment to this memorandum.

## BACKGROUND:

The Varsity Stadium site has played an important role in the history of the University of Toronto and the city of Toronto for over a century. The revitalization of Varsity Stadium has been a goal of the

Faculty of Physical Education and Health for the past 40 years. The first Users Committee for *Varsity Centre* was struck in 1998 and since that time a variety of projects have been explored. These projects ranged from private partnerships to the extensive redevelopment of the Bloor-Devonshire sector. Most recently, a proposal discussed with the Toronto Argonauts, in collaboration with Soccer Canada, would have provided a 25,000 seat stadium. This facility would have had an athletics and special event focus, accommodating professional football and soccer in addition to the University athletics programme. These plans required the use of both Site 12 and Site 21 to accommodate the extensive facilities. The required space plan could not be accommodated on the site within the available budget envelope which led the administration, after careful consideration, to discontinue the project. The former Varsity Stadium was demolished in 2002. Since 2002 the existing grass field has continued to be used with temporary stands, change-rooms and storage facilities being erected as required.

**HIGHLIGHTS:**

Varsity Centre 2005 will be implemented solely by the University of Toronto and will provide facilities to serve the University and its immediate community. The philosophy of Varsity Centre is that of a *physical activity for all* facility. The new stadium will contain an artificial surface and both a regulation size football and soccer field. There will be a *competitive plus training* level running track, and seating for 5,000 people. A high tech air supported structure over the playing field will significantly extend the use of the field throughout the winter months. The Varsity Centre will provide indoor training facilities and athletic support space. The Centre will also provide non-athletic student space in the form of a café/student meeting space and a child minding/babysitting space. Renovating and expanding the existing Varsity Arena is also a part of the new Varsity Centre 2005. Extensive community consultation has shown strong community support for this facility.

The Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health is to be built in four phases over a number of years and as funding for each subsequent phase is secured. The project can be built as-of-right, that is, without requiring additional zoning approvals from the City (the height of the bubble in Phase 2 being the only possible exception).

**Project Phases**

- Phase 1:       A       Master Design
- B       5,000 seats, public washrooms, change rooms, media gondola, entrances
- C.     Field, track, lights, scoreboard, fencing, landscaping
- D       Foundations and services as required below the field track for the bubble

- Phase 2:       A       Bubble installation
- B       Off-site track and field throwing events

*Prior to the commencement of Phases 3 & 4 it will be necessary to address the Electrical Infrastructure expansion on the NE Campus to provided the required power needs for the new Athletics Facility and the Arena Renovation.*

- Phase 3:               New Athletics Facilities (3792 nasm)

- Phase 4:               Arena Renovation

**Project Schedule**

The following schedule outlines the best case scenario with respect to project completion dates, but will require that all funds for Phases 2, 3 & 4 are secured for in advance of the formal project approval.

May 2005	Planning & Budget Committee Approval; start of approvals
June 2005	Approval by Governing Council
June 2005	Appointment of Consultants; start of Phase 1A
April 2006	Commencement of Phases 1B, 1C and 1D
<b>Fall 2006</b>	<b>Completion of Phase 1; Phases 2A and 2B, provided funds are in place</b>
April 2007	Commencement of Phases 3 & 4, provided all funds are in place
Fall 2008	Completion of Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health

To maintain the proposed schedule, showing completion of Phase 1 by the fall of 2006, the consultants must be appointed by the end of June 2005, coinciding with Governing Council approval of the Project Planning Report. Working within established policy guidelines the architect selection process must begin immediately following the approval by the Planning and Budget Committee. A Request for Proposals [RFP] will be posted immediately with the short-listing of firms anticipated within two weeks following the posting.

Under the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, the Project Planning Committee will continue through the implementation phase. The Working Executive of the Project Implementation Committee will comprise the lead User(s), a Planner and Implementer all of whom have been closely associated with the project planning and definition since its inception; this membership is:

- User:** Bruce Kidd/ Liz Hoffman
- Planner:** Elizabeth Sisam/ Shirley Roll
- Implementer:** Julian Binks

This Working Executive will be expanded to include a Project Manager to be appointed by the Chief Capital Projects Officer. Furthermore, given the importance of this project to the student body, it is also recommended that two students, representing all students, be invited to participate on the Executive Committee. The students on the Project Planning Committee have recommended that these representatives be the co-chairs of the Council of Athletics and Recreation, both of whom are students elected by the student body.

Student representatives will also be invited to serve on the Architects Selection Committee.

#### **FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS:**

All projects that are advanced for consideration by the Planning & Budget Committee are evaluated against a stringent set of academic criteria. These criteria are detailed in the Capital Plan tabled at the Planning & Budget Committee, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2004<sup>1</sup>. The Stepping-UP initiative targets the need to improve the student experience for all students on campus. The Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health will serve as an exciting new node of activity on the campus in support of physical fitness and health. It has the enthusiastic support of all student groups on campus who have also actively contributed as members of the Project Planning Committee in the development of the proposed

---

<sup>1</sup> The nine criteria by which all capital projects are assessed are:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Mission Objectives of the University, | 2. Policy Objectives & Legislative Requirements, |
| 3. Provincial Space Standards,           | 4. Strengthening Scholarship,                    |
| 5. Providing Academic Leadership,        | 6. Student Experience,                           |
| 7. Economic Consistency,                 | 8. Resources,                                    |
| 9. Deferred Maintenance.                 |  |

phased-in facility. The cost of the project will be supported entirely by the University with additional support being provided by the Faculty of Physical Education and Health.

It is to be noted that the University made the firm commitment to contribute the sum of \$14,000,000 to advance the immediate development of the first phase of the project. A further clarification, again to accelerate the development of the project, identified that no student levy would be required to complete Phase 1 of the project. This university contribution will provide the new-found momentum for the initial phase and serve to generate support and interest from friends of the University to support the subsequent phases and bring the entire project to a successful conclusion.

**Borrowing capacity for the Capital Plan:** The maximum borrowing capacity available to the University, as outlined in the Capital Plan presented to Planning & Budget on December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2004] was approximately \$112 million<sup>2</sup>. At present the borrowing capacity as of March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2005 has been reduced to \$89 million.

The Varsity Centre is identified in the Capital Plan with a projected borrowing contribution of \$14 million which will be increased to \$16,386,100, the revised full cost of Phase 1 of the project. All additional phases, i.e. Phases 2, 3 and 4 will require full funding to be in place prior to the approval of each phase. Of this required total cost, \$14 million will be available from the operating budget of the University of Toronto. The balance of \$2,368,100 will be provided through a short term mortgage to be paid from the operating budget of the facility.

**Operating Costs:**

The annual operating costs of the facility, Phase 1, are estimated at \$1,400,000. These costs will be carried from revenues resulting from the operating budget of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health and rental of the facilities.

**Financial Analysis & Risk:**

A detailed assessment and risk analysis of the project has been completed by Financial Services with particular focus on the \$2,386,000 to be provided from the operating budget of the new facility.

As a result of the commitment to carry the \$14 million mortgage by the University of Toronto operating budget, the risk in Phase 1 is limited to construction cost overruns. If the Phase 1 project costs increased by 10% the financing costs are estimated to increase by \$800,000 (based on a 6% interest rate). This would require that the short term loan, in the amount of \$2,368,000, to be carried by the operating budget of the new facility be increased from 5 years to 12 years.

In addition, the fallback position for the repayment of the \$2,386,000, in the event that revenues do not materialize as planned or construction costs increase, is from trust funds<sup>3</sup> held by the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. It is important that the planned flows to this trust fund be maintained and not be used for any other purposes until this project has been completed.

Given the details provided, and assuming that the flows to and the availability of the trust funds are maintained, Financial Services is of the view that the Varsity Phase 1 project is considered to be a low risk venture.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Capital Plan data is based on all capital project approvals up to, but not including the Business Board approvals on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

<sup>3</sup> Current balance in this trust fund identified specifically for Arena/Stadium Renovations is \$500,000. There is an annual allocation in the amount of \$875,000 to this trust account which would increase the available balance up to \$2,250,000 in 2006-07.



## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended to the Academic Board:

1. THAT the planned four phases Varsity Centre space and facilities program located on site 21 be approved in principle;
2. THAT the planned first phase of this multi-phased project for Varsity Centre be approved to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities at a total project cost of \$16,386,000 from the following sources:
  - (i) Contribution in the amount of \$14,000,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty-five years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto, and
  - (ii) Contribution in the amount of \$2,386,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over five years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the new facility.
3. THAT all subsequent phases, consistent with established policy, will require formal approval by Governing Council and will require that the Project Planning Reports for each phase be reviewed by either the Planning and Budget Committee or the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate.

**7. University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM): Departmental Restructuring and Name Changes (cont'd)**

Professor Tavakoli-Targhi explained to members that this restructuring brought together resources and offered education for twenty-first century Canada. Courses on religion were being expanded to include courses on Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and other world religions. Professor Goel observed that this restructuring reflected what was envisioned in the three-campus structure. Each campus would develop unique courses suitable to its academic plan and student body.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the program in religion be moved from the Department of Anthropology and Religion to become part of the Department of History and Classics.

THAT resulting from the above change, the name of the *Department of Anthropology and Religion* be changed to the *Department of Anthropology*, effective January 1, 2005, and

THAT the name of the *Department of History and Classics* be changed to the *Department of Historical Studies*, effective January 1, 2005.

**8. Capital Project: OISE/UT – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Committee received for information the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee to address the deficiencies and functionality of facilities at 252 Bloor Street West for the Ontario Institute for Studies of Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT).

A member asked if faculty members were included on the Project Planning Committee. Dean Gaskell replied that there were two faculty members of the Committee – Professor Glen Jones, Co-Chair, and Professor Janet Astington.

**9. Capital Project: University of Toronto Art Centre – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Committee received for information the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee for the University of Toronto Art Centre.

A member asked whether direction would be given to the Committee with respect to item number 8 in the Terms of Reference: the identification of all proposed sources of funding. Professor Goel replied that the Art Centre would be responsible for the full funding of the project and for the operating costs through advancement.

**10. Capital Project: Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

The Committee received for information the terms of reference and the membership of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Stadium and Varsity Arena.

A member asked how the student members of the Committee had been selected. Professor Venter replied that three students were from the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, and the fourth student member was a Vice-President of the Students' Administrative Council (SAC). The member noted that a group of students was meeting with Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students, to discuss increased student involvement on Committees.

A member requested that savings and opportunity costs be provided in the identification of resource implications.

**11. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough - Electrical & Mechanical Upgrades Phase 3: Cooling Towers – Project Planning Committee, Terms of Reference and Membership**

Professor Venter explained that the recent construction of five new buildings at UTSC had resulted in the need for infrastructure improvements. A number of projects had been approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD), since the cost of each project had been less than \$ 2 million. However, as the price of the cooling towers would exceed \$2 million, the total scope of the project was being laid out at this time. As a first step, the Planning and Budget Committee was receiving for information the Terms of Reference and Membership of the Project Planning Committee.

**12. Date of the Next Meeting**

Members were reminded that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, December 7, 2004 beginning at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

**13. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

November 30, 2004

#### **4. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report**

The Chair welcomed students and staff from the Faculty of Physical Education and Health who were present for consideration of this item. He explained that the Agenda Planning Group had agreed that it would be useful for members to receive information of funding for capital projects, before considering the Project Planning Reports that were on the agenda for the meeting.

The Chair invited Ms Sheila Brown, Chief Financial Officer, to make a brief presentation.

##### **Presentation on Use of Operating Funds for Capital Projects**

Ms Brown explained that the presentation was intended to answer two questions:

- What proportion of the Capital Plan was operating funds?
- What operating funds had been spent on capital infrastructure as a percentage of operating fund revenue and how did this compare to other Ontario universities?

The cost of capital projects at April 30, 2005 totalled \$898.4 million. Of that amount, \$527.6 million, or 59%, was funded by borrowing from the following sources:

- \$251.3 million: Ancillaries
- \$109.9 million: University Infrastructure Investment Fund (UIIF)
- \$ 54.8 million: Divisional funding (dedicated by division to project)
- \$ 49.9 million: Enrolment Growth Fund (EGF)
- \$ 38.7 million: Funding Gap – no funding source identified
- \$ 23.0 million: Student levies

Of those sources, the UIIF and EGF were operating funds, and were designated for specific purposes. Divisional funding would also likely be sourced from operating funds.

The remaining \$370.8 million, or 41%, was funded from the following sources of revenue:

- \$153.3 million: Government funding including Access to Opportunities (ATOP) and SuperBuild
- \$ 97.1 million: Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)/Ontario Innovation Trust (OIT)
- \$ 64.0 million: Donations
- \$ 23.7 million: Operating - funds from divisions
- \$ 14.0 million: UIIF allocations, some dating back several years
- \$ 11.2 million: Interest
- \$ 3.2 million: Ancillaries
- \$ 2.8 million: Student levies
- \$ 1.5 million: School of Continuing Studies

The majority of funding for capital projects was required to be spent on specific projects.

A member asked how much of the amount borrowed was external debt. Ms Brown replied that the University's approved borrowing strategy allowed external borrowing of up to 40% of net assets, smoothed over 5 years. That sum was currently set at \$585 million, of which \$565 million was specifically approved for borrowing. That sum included borrowing for capital projects and for other purposes.

**4. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

Ms Brown explained that it was difficult to determine how the amount spent on capital infrastructure as a percentage of operating fund revenue by the University of Toronto compared with other universities, as there was not a lot of comparable data. The closest approximation was determined by examining the actual expenditures by other universities on acquisition costs; land improvements and site preparation including landscaping, sewers and roads; building construction costs, fees and planning costs relative to the direct expenses as well as any costs such as utilities incurred during the period of construction. Ms Brown presented data for the percent of revenues spent on building, land and site services for the years ended April 30, 2003 and April 30, 2004 for Ontario universities with revenues greater than \$100 million. She noted that only a very small amount of operating funds were going into capital projects.

**Review of Capital Projects**

Professor Venter reviewed the information he had placed on the table concerning the status of capital projects.

<b>Gold Projects</b>	<b>Claret Projects</b>	<b>Blue Projects</b>	<b>AFD Projects</b>
<i>Approved by Governance with committed funding</i>	<i>Short term capital plan – November 8, 2004 to December 31, 2010; projects may receive a share of the limited borrowing available</i>	<i>Long-term capital plan; Require full external financing to proceed.</i>	<i>Under \$2 million</i>
<i>Approved November 2004 – April 2005</i>	<i>Funding allocations suggested in May 2005 update:</i>	<i>Recent approvals in principle to allow fundraising efforts to begin:</i>	<i>June 2005 approval:</i>
155 College Street Centre for Biological Timing and Cognition (CBTC) Department of Mathematics Phase 1 UTSC Food Services UTSC Cooling Towers	UTM Resident 8 adjustment - \$0.5 mil Medical Arts Building - \$6.0 mil Relocation of Dept. of Anthropology to Hughes Building - \$6.0 mil Upgrades to OISE/UT, 252 Bloor West - \$6.0 mil Ramsay Wright Building - \$3.0 mil St. George Infrastructure - \$16.0 mil UTSC and UTM Infrastructure - \$6.0 mil Bridge Financing for Pharmacy - \$10.0 mil	<i>April 2005:</i> Relocation of Faculty of Law	Humanities Centre in Medical Arts Building Lash Miller/McClennan Courtyard
<i>Proposed for Approval May-June 2005</i>		<i>June 2005:</i> Relocation of University Art Centre	
<b>Total Cost of all Gold Projects: \$898 million</b> <i>Funds in Hand: \$370 mil</i> <i>Borrowing: \$528 mil</i>	<b><i>Borrowing available for Claret Projects:</i></b> <i>\$89 million</i> UTSC Science \$20 mil Varsity \$14 mil Multi-faith \$3 mil		

#### 4. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)

##### Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health

Professor Venter reminded members that the membership and terms of reference for the Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health had been approved in November 2004. The phased project plan that was being presented for approval addressed the needs of students, the University community, and the neighbouring community. The proposed facility also represented a major contribution in support of the *Stepping UP* initiatives of the University.

The new facility would contain an artificial surface, a regulation size football and soccer field, a competitive plus training level running track and seating for 5,000. A high tech air-supported structure (bubble) over the playing field would significantly extend the use of the field throughout the winter months. The proposed facility would also provide indoor training facilities, athletic support space, café/student meeting space and child-minding/babysitting space. The facility would be completely accessible.

The Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health would be built in four phases over a number of years and as funding for each subsequent phase was secured. The project would not require additional zoning approvals from the city, with the possible exception of the height of the bubble in phase 2. The four phases were:

- Phase 1:
- A Master Design
  - B 5,000 seats, public washrooms, change rooms, media gondola, entrances
  - C Field, track, lights, scoreboard, fencing, landscaping
  - D Foundations and services as required below the field track for the bubble.
- Phase 2:
- A Bubble installation
  - B Off-site track and field throwing events
- Phase 3:<sup>1</sup> New athletics facilities (3792 nasm)
- Phase 4: Varsity Arena renovation

Professor Venter explained that the first phase would provide visibility for the project. No external funding was required for the first phase.

Professor Goel thanked Professor Venter for the work involved in bringing forward the project report.

A member asked how the seating capacity of 5,000 had been determined. Professor Venter replied that studies conducted by the University had indicated that 5,000 seats would be the appropriate number for University athletic events. It would also be possible to bring in additional seats for an event.

A member expressed her appreciation for the respect given to students during the development of the project planning report. She noted that some wording had been

---

<sup>1</sup> Before starting Phases 3 and 4, it will be necessary to address the electrical infrastructure expansion on the Northeast campus to provide the required power needs for the new athletics facility and the arena renovation.

#### 4. **Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

dropped from page 6 of the Project Planning Report. Professor Venter agreed to re-insert the wording that had been inadvertently omitted from the Project Planning Report.<sup>2</sup>

A member asked whether student levies would be required in subsequent phases. Professor Venter replied that the current focus was on Phase 1. It was possible that Phase 2 would be funded by external sources. All options remained open for funding for phases 2, 3 and 4.

The member noted that the Master of Massey College had been on extended leave during the development of the Project Planning Report. Professor Venter explained that Professor Fraser had been present at the Committee's early meetings, and that the Committee had kept Massey College informed of its work.

On motion duly moved and seconded

#### YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the planned four phases Varsity Centre space and facilities program located on site 21, as described in the Project Planning Report which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle;
2. THAT the planned first phase of this multi-phased project for Varsity Centre be approved to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities at a total project cost of \$16,386,000 from the following sources:
  - (i) Contribution in the amount of \$14,000,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto, and
  - (ii) Contribution in the amount of \$2,386,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over five years to be repaid from the operating budget of the new facility.
3. THAT all subsequent phases, consistent with established policy, will require formal approval by Governing Council and will require that the Project Planning Reports for each phase be reviewed by either the Planning and Budget Committee or the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate.

#### 5. **Capital Project: Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice - Project Planning Report**

The Chair welcomed Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs, to the meeting for this item.

Professor Venter recalled that, in 2002, the Koffler Institute for Pharmacy Management had been identified as the preferred location for the Multi-faith Centre. Locating the Multi-faith Centre on the two upper floors of the Koffler Institute would require the relocation of the Faculty of Pharmacy to the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building upon its

---

<sup>2</sup> Secretary's Note: The final sentence in Section 8 Resources on page 6 of the Project Planning Report was revised to read: *There will be no student capital levy for Phase 1 and only a modest increase in student operating is proposed (under \$10 per term, to begin in 2008-09).*

**11. Statement of Commitment to Retired Faculty Members and Librarians (cont'd)**

A member asked how soon the Senior Scholar Centres would be established. Professor Goel replied that a Project Planning Committee for the Senior Scholar Centre on the St. George campus would be established in the fall of 2005. Allocation of resources to the Centres would be made within the overall planning framework of the University.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Statement of Commitment to Retired Faculty Members and Librarians, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved by Governing Council, effective immediately.

**12. Academic Initiatives Fund: Allocations for 2005-06**

Professor Gottlieb explained that the second call for Submissions to the Academic Initiatives Fund had resulted in thirty-seven proposals from fourteen University divisions totaling \$8.9 million of base funding and \$60 million of OTO support. The allocation decisions had been based on advice from a committee that had included representatives from Principals and Deans and the Provost's office. No questions had been raised by members of the Planning and Budget Committee.

A member commented on the importance of the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT), on page 3 of Appendix 2, for the creation of a Centre for Aboriginal Initiatives and the creation of two faculty positions in the area of Social Justice and Aboriginal Communities and Aboriginal Healing. She encouraged a University-wide effort to appoint aboriginal faculty members and to acknowledge and respect the knowledge and culture of aboriginal communities.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED

THAT the Second Round of Academic Initiative Funds be allocated as per the table (Appendices 2 and 3) attached to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated May 2 for May 10, 2005, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D".

**13. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report**

Professor Gottlieb informed members that, before considering this project planning report, the Planning and Budget Committee had been given a brief presentation by the Chief Financial Officer on the Use of Operating Funds for Capital Projects.

Professor Venter had then reviewed the status of the University's capital projects before summarizing the key components of the proposed Varsity Centre project. A member of the Committee had noted that the wording concerning the amount of increase in student fees had not been included in the Project Planning Report. The wording was re-inserted on page 6 of the Project Planning Report.



**13. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

A member had asked how the seating capacity of 5,000 had been determined. Professor Venter had replied that studies conducted by the University had indicated that 5,000 seats would be the appropriate number for University athletic events

A member spoke in opposition to the proposal. In her opinion, the proposed project did not include the alternative vision that had been articulated by some student representatives and which had included family housing, a community food kitchen, drop-in daycare, and student activity space. The member also observed that there was no commitment that Phases 2, 3 and/or 4 would not be subject to a student levy.

A member asked if Phase 3 would include a wellness centre that provided support for mental health, in addition to athletic facilities. In her view, such a centre would serve the community well. Dean Kidd replied that there was a deep commitment to the provision of services in support of both physical and mental health in the proposed centre, including research and counseling programming.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED**

1. THAT the planned four phases Varsity Centre space and facilities program located on site 21, documentation for which is attached hereto as Appendix "E", be approved in principle;
2. THAT the planned first phase of this multi-phased project for Varsity Centre be approved to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities at a total project cost of \$16,386,000 from the following sources:
  - (i) Contribution in the amount of \$14,000,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto, and
  - (ii) Contribution in the amount of \$2,386,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over five years to be repaid from the operating budget of the new facility.
3. THAT all subsequent phases, consistent with established policy, will require formal approval by Governing Council and will require that the Project Planning Reports for each phase be reviewed by either the Planning and Budget Committee or the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate.

**14. Capital Project: Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice - Project Planning Report**

Professor Gotlieb explained that the Multi-faith Centre was intended to provide the facilities and related services needed to support the religious and spiritual practices represented within the University community. Professor Venter had informed members of the Planning and Budget Committee that the Koffler family supported the location of the Multi-faith Centre in the Koffler Institute building.

## REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005

### 5. Capital Projects

#### (a) **Multifaith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice: Project Planning Report** (cont'd.)

gratitude for the active participation of numerous groups at the University. Because of the need to relocate the current occupants of the Koffler Institute of Pharmacy Management to the new Leslie Dan Pharmacy Building, Professor Venter noted, the Multifaith Centre would be ready for use in September 2006. The Koffler family had approved of the building's uses and the renovated building would continue to bear the Koffler name.

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE (PROSPECTIVE)  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

THAT the Project Planning Report for the Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice be approved in principle, to be located on the second and third floors of the existing Koffler Institute for Pharmacy Management at 569 Spadina Avenue including the renovation of 615 net assignable square metres of planned program space.

#### (b) **Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health: Project Planning Report**

The Chair welcomed several guests to the meeting room: Mr. Paul Carson, Executive Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, Mr. Russell Field, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation, member of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre, Ms Liz Hoffman, Assistant Dean, Co-Curricular Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, Ms Karen Lewis, past-member of the Governing Council, Assistant Dean, Administrative Services and Equity, Ms Sarah Lipton, Co-Chair, Council of Athletics and Recreation, member of the Project Planning Committee for the Varsity Centre, and Mr. Terry Rubenstein, Director of Financial Services and Information Technology, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

The Chair stated that no project in his memory had consumed more discussion time and planning expense, or had been as controversial both within the University or the neighboring community. Indeed, there were those who had argued that there was too much discussion, and that time and money had been wasted. In the Chair's opinion, however, at the end of the day, because of our participatory, democratic system of governance, this project had addressed the very best needs of the University with approval and respect from our neighbors.

Professor Venter provided a detailed presentation on the proposed Varsity development. The Project Planning Committee had been meeting since November, 2004, with broad representation from numerous groups including the Council on Athletics and Recreation (CAR), the Physical and Health Education Undergraduate Association (PHEUA), as well as the Students' Administrative Council (SAC), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS). It had consulted extensively both internally and externally to the University.

The project was designed to address first and foremost the needs of the University community, to enhance learning beyond the classroom, and to enhance the academic programs, both in teaching and research, of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health. The facility would provide athletic space for numerous sports and teams, and would help meet a huge demand for recreational space on campus. Over

**REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005****5. Capital Projects****(b) Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health: Project Planning Report  
(cont'd.)**

300 teams were on waiting lists to use space, and, because of both the artificial playing surface and the year-round use of the field, would allow much of the demand for athletic space to be met. In fact, the total hourly usage of the facility would rise from approximately 2,200 hours per year to approximately 9,500 hours per year, while maintenance time would fall from 49% of the available time to 6%. Elements of previous proposals that had been rejected included additional development of the Bloor Street frontage, parking facilities, residences, or a second ice surface.

Professor Venter noted that the proposal had four phases, the first of which would entail the completion of an all-weather track surrounding a field that would have the capability of having a temporary dome placed above it during the winter months. In addition, a 5,000 seat stadium would be placed on the eastern edge of the site, with change facilities and washrooms located in a building underneath the bleachers. Future phases contemplated the construction of a four-storey U-shaped building (of almost 4000 net assignable square metres (nasm)) at the southern end of the site that would expand the athletic facilities further and provide additional space for student and academic activity. The planning process would allow for an immediate start on phase one of the proposed development. Phase one would enable the construction of the 8-lane track, the field, the supports for the dome, and fencing, landscaping, and lighting. Phase 2 development would be the installation of the dome. Phase 3 would entail the construction of the U-shaped building, and Phase 4 would address much-needed renovations to the Varsity arena.

Completion of phase 1, if approved, would occur in Fall, 2006, and, depending on funding, future phases would follow in 2007 and beyond. Professor Venter expressed gratitude for the support of Professor Vivek Goel, Professor Bruce Kidd, and the many students who had served on the project planning committee and supported its work.

Professor Kidd declared his strong support and enthusiasm for the project, which would be a significant enhancement to physical activity. He complimented the project planning committee for the intelligent design proposed on the historic site, avoiding overcrowding or convoluted plans. The project would provide better space for the community and restore the site's and the University's reputation. He noted his pride that the proposal represented the best solution to the needs facing the University, and he was delighted that the project was proceeding in tandem with the Multifaith Centre, which was another important element in the ongoing enhancement of the student experience.

A member noted the strong student representation on the project planning committee, and asked if the representation would continue on the implementation committee. Professor Venter responded in the affirmative, noting that APUS, SAC and GSU felt that representation from CAR would serve the University community best in this instance. This assertion was confirmed by another (student) member of the Board. The member then asked what impact the Varsity Centre would have on costs to students. Professor Kidd noted that, once the project was in full operation with the projected increased use, including administrative and programming staff, the additional cost would approximate \$10 per full-time student.

A member noted that many students were reluctant to pay any levy to support the Varsity Centre. Another student asked if parking were a concern, but was assured that it was not. Another member noted his strong satisfaction with the status of the proposal, noting that it combined both openness and achievability.

**REPORT NUMBER 129 OF THE UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS BOARD – May 31, 2005**

**5. Capital Projects**

**(b) Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health: Project Planning Report  
(cont'd.)**

On the recommendation of the Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students,

**YOUR BOARD CONCURRED WITH THE (PROSPECTIVE)  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD**

Subject to the understanding that the campus life implications of subsequent phases of the project will be reviewed by the University Affairs Board,

- (i) THAT the planned four phases Varsity Centre space and facilities program located on site 21 be approved in principle; and
- (ii) THAT the planned first phase of this multi-phased project for Varsity Centre be approved to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities.

Members applauded.

**(c) Lash Miller / McLennan Courtyard: Project Planning Report**

Professor Venter informed the Board that the Academic Board would consider (at its June 2, 2005 meeting) a proposal to construct new green space at the Lash Miller / McLennan courtyard. He noted with satisfaction that the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Departments of Chemistry and Physics, as well as the Students' Administrative Council Wheelchair Accessibility fund (SACWAC) and the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate had combined to fund the project. He noted his hope that the proposal would enhance student life on campus.

**(d) Report on Barrier-Free Access**

The Chair informed the Board that the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) had a Standing Committee on Barrier-Free Accessibility, and that the administration had undertaken to make an annual accountability report on the progress of physical accessibility measures to the Planning and Budget Committee; the report was also provided for information to the University Affairs Board.

Professor Venter provided a thorough summary of the report, emphasizing the wide range of efforts undertaken to enhance physical accessibility to the University and its facilities.

A member asked what links existed between the Ontarians with Disabilities Act (ODA) implementation committee and the Committee on Barrier-Free Accessibility. Professor Venter responded that, in addition to having several common members, the ODA committee provided useful insight on policy and structure. Ms. Addario added that the ODA subcommittee on barrier-free access was in regular communication with the AFD committee.

**6. Recognized Campus Groups: Report #2**

Professor Farrar presented the above-noted report. There was no discussion.

**REPORT NUMBER 142 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – June 23, 2005****9. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health**

The Chair thanked Professor Venter for his very helpful, detailed briefing on this project in the half hour preceding this meeting.

Mr. Bisanti observed that the project now before the Board differed significantly from previous proposals for Varsity Stadium in its scope, size, scale and complexity. That said, it would still be a complex task to design the proposed facility within the constraints of the site. The University had arranged numerous town-hall meetings to discuss plans for the project, both for members of the University and for the broader community. The proposal enjoyed wide support from the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, the City and the surrounding community, which had been a vocal opponent of previous plans to rebuild the stadium. There had been extensive student involvement in the planning process. The proposal was within the current limits of the City plan for the University precinct; there would be no need to apply for a zoning variance. The project had been reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board and had been recommended to the Governing Council for approval.

Mr. Bisanti said that it was proposed to build the project in four phases strictly because of funding constraints. The first phase, to cost about \$16.4-million, would include preparation of the master design for the entire project; a 5,000-seat structure for spectators, including public washrooms, change rooms, a media gondola and entrances; a playing field with a top-quality artificial surface; a running track meeting international standards; floodlights; a scoreboard; fencing and landscaping; and foundations and services as required below the field to support a bubble that would cover the field during the winter months. The completion of later phases would depend on the availability of funding. They would include: phase 2 – installation of the bubble and off-site facilities for track and field throwing events; phase 3 – a new “U” shaped building wrapped around the southern end of the stadium to accommodate additional athletics facilities; and phase 4 – the Varsity arena renovation and upgrade. To accommodate the urgent needs of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health and the co-curricular athletics programs, it was proposed to proceed on an urgent basis with the completion of phase 1.

Invited to speak, Professor Kidd said that the proposal was a very exciting one that would be of great benefit to physical activities of all kinds. There was currently a long waiting list of individuals who wished to participate. The University’s building this facility on its own, and not with an external partner, would mean that the University would be able to address its own needs most satisfactorily and to meet pent-up demand on the part of students and others. The proposal was a feasible one. While there had been criticism in a recent number of the student newspaper, the *Varsity*, that the project would not match the quality of the neighbouring new facilities – the Royal Ontario Museum and the Royal Conservatory of Music – construction of a more elaborate facility would be much more expensive and well beyond the University’s means. The proposed facility would contribute enormously to the Faculty’s curricular and co-curricular programs, and Professor Kidd hoped that the excellent plan for phase 1 could be in place for September 2006.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

**REPORT NUMBER 142 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – June 23, 2005****9. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health (Cont'd)**

**(a) Alternative arrangements for the stadium and site.** A member observed that, in contrast to other proposals for redevelopment of the site, this proposal was for a facility with limited seating to be used solely for athletics purposes. Did that imply that there were no other possibilities for potential development of the site? Professor Goel replied that the administration had concluded that there were no presently practical possibilities for the joint development of the site. Previous proposals had included efforts to combine the stadium facility with a commercial development, with the development of four student residences, or with a facility that would also be used for professional football and soccer. All of those efforts had foundered because they sought to force too much onto the limited site. While the University had made its best efforts to bring the previous co-development proposals to fruition, it had become clear that doing so would have meant the sacrifice of too much, including a field and a track meeting international standards, necessary to meet the needs of the University's students. The current facility was not a mere rebuilding of the previous one. In this proposal, there would be spectator stands on only one side of the field, leaving enough room for the construction of the phase-3 building that would provide the additional athletic building at the south end of the stadium to accommodate other, critically needed athletic facilities.

**(b) Community use of the facility.** In response to a question, Professor Goel said that highest priority would be given to University of Toronto use of the facility, but the University also sought to be a good neighbour, welcoming (for example) community memberships in the athletic centre and secondary-school tournaments and other activities. Dean Kidd anticipated that secondary-school use for championship games and other major events would be frequent. The facility might also be used for professional-development courses by teachers and for occasional events by the high-performance athletic leagues, especially when the Rogers Centre was too large and too expensive.

**(c) Possibility of support from benefactors.** In response to a question, Professor Goel said that some external funding would be available from facility rentals. In addition, the University would seek donations over time. The challenge was that many supporters were concerned that the University had not made progress in replacing the old Varsity Stadium. It was anticipated that once visible progress on the site was made, opportunities for support would increase. The University therefore proposed to proceed at once, financing the cost of phase 1 from internal sources. It would then seek other sources to support the remaining phases of the project.

**(d) Aesthetic factors.** A member was concerned that the proposed development would be aesthetically unattractive. He thought that the two current athletic buildings were very unattractive, and he was concerned that the new facility would be even more so. While he recognized that raising funds for the project would be difficult, he urged that every effort be made to raise ample funds to allow for a pleasing design. He also urged that the architects selected for the project be ones with a proven record of building reasonably attractive buildings on a low budget. He was concerned that the bubble planned for phase 2 would be particularly unattractive.

**REPORT NUMBER 142 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – June 23, 2005****9. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health (Cont'd)**

Professor Goel replied that Phase 1 of the project included funds for architects to develop a master design for the entire project. The architects would be instructed that it would be very important that the development fit with others on Bloor Street: the Royal Ontario Museum, the Royal Conservatory of Music and the University development on site 12 across Devonshire Place from the Stadium. The Design would be reviewed by the University's Design Review Committee, and it would include landscaping to improve the aesthetic appeal of Devonshire Place. The University would of course do its very best to raise funds for the phases 2 – 4 of the project. Every effort would be made to ensure that the new facility was both aesthetically attractive and environmentally friendly. Professor Goel stressed that the new project would replace something that was currently not attractive. The bubble was a very important feature to extend the time that the facility would be available to students, especially as a proportion of the September – May period when most students were on campus. That higher level of use was one of the factors making the entire project worthy of completion. Every effort would be made to improve the aesthetics of the bubble. The member thanked Professor Goel but expressed his doubt that a favourable outcome would be possible without considerable success in fundraising.

**(e) Cost and quality of the facility.** In response to questions, Professor Venter said that all phases of the project were expected to cost between \$55-million and \$60-million, including the renovation of the arena. In addition, there would be need for infrastructure improvements, to be executed upon completion of phase 2 of the Varsity project, to serve all buildings in that part of the campus. The member noted that the cost of the project that had been approved one year ago, for a much more sophisticated 25,000 seat stadium to be completed in co-operation with the Toronto Argonaut football team, had been \$120-million. Professor Goel and Professor Venter replied that the \$120-million cost had been only an estimate, and that project had not included many of the facilities that formed a part of the current proposal, including the "U" shaped athletic building at the south end of the stadium. Moreover, the new project would include features of very high quality, including the artificial surface of the playing field.

**(f) Possibility of government assistance.** In response to a question, Professor Venter said that the government funding that had been offered for the 25,000 seat facility would not be available for the smaller stadium. The Government assistance had intended to provide a stadium for a particular purpose – the forthcoming world, under-twenty soccer tournament.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Business Affairs,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

Subject to Governing Council approval of the proposed project,

**THAT** the Vice President, Business Affairs be authorized to execute the planned first phase of the Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health

**REPORT NUMBER 142 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – June 23, 2005****9. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health (Cont'd)**

project to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities at a total project cost of \$16,386,000 from the following sources:

- (i) \$14,000,000 financing (an internal mortgage), amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto, and
- (ii) \$2,386,000 financing (an internal mortgage), to be amortized over five years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the new facility.

A member commended the close cooperation between the Vice-President and Provost and the Dean of Physical Education and Health in their work on this project.

**10. University of Toronto at Scarborough Science Building: Appropriation for Design and Site Preparation**

Mr. Bisanti said that this very important project was currently the highest priority project at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and one of the highest priority projects in the University. In the light of the absence of funding available for the full project, it was proposed to proceed in phases. Phase I would contain 55,000 gross square feet and would cost an estimated \$31.5-million. The somewhat higher than average cost per gross square foot was a manifestation of certain problems of the site. Of the \$31.5-million, \$20-million would be financed, with repayment of the borrowing by the operating budget of the University of Toronto at Scarborough. There would be several sources for the remaining \$11.5-million. Mr. Bisanti was requesting approval at this time to spend \$3-million for design and site-preparation work. The source of funding for the initial \$3-million would be a one-time-only fund in the 2004-05 operating budget for academic projects that were severely restricted by shortcomings in infrastructure and deferred maintenance. The remainder of the \$11.5-million would be covered by \$4.5-million from UTSC's carry-forward of unspent appropriations and an additional \$4-million that the University would seek from external sources. Those sources might include the Government of Ontario and the Canada Foundation for Innovation. In addition, the University could, if necessary, consider cost deferral by shelling in the fourth floor of the project or delaying dealing with certain secondary effects. The University would assess the availability of funding before proceeding with construction in April 2006. If necessary at that time, the University could consider up to \$4-million of short-term borrowing. With the design of the project underway, efforts to find benefactors for the project would also be facilitated. Mr. Bisanti was requesting approval for the \$3-million for design fees at this time because the project was on a very tight time schedule, with the need to relocate a temporary structure as soon as possible, to break ground on the project in April of 2006 and to have the project available for January 2008 to provide laboratory and office accommodation for the new science faculty members needed to teach the greatly expanded enrolment at UTSC.



**11. Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF): Allocations for 2005-06 (cont'd)**

commented that her notice of motion concerning the hiring of aboriginal faculty had not been placed on the agenda of the June meeting of the Academic Board, and that she had been ruled out of order when she had attempted to discuss the matter.

A member commented on the growth and development of aboriginal studies at the University that had taken place over the past years. He noted in particular the growth in the work and reputation of First Nations House.

A member expressed his support of the funding of global health initiatives, and expressed his belief that it was likely that additional funding would be generated as a result of the AIF funding.

A member asked whether the funding for the Faculty of Music to enhance the music student experience would extend the length of music lessons as the students had requested. The member also asked whether there was a monitoring mechanism in place to ensure that the funds were spent in accordance with the AIF proposal. Professor Goel replied that the AIF allocation would result in increased access to music lessons for all students. He also explained that academic divisions would be required to submit an annual report on the progress of meeting the benchmarks from AIF proposals.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

THAT the Second Round of Academic Initiative Funds be allocated as per the table (Appendices 2 and 3) attached to the Memorandum from the Vice-President and Provost dated May 2 for May 10, 2005, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 136 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

**12. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report**

Professor Corman commented that there had been little discussion about the Varsity Centre project at the Board, and that the Board had recommended approval of the project. One member had spoken against it, alleging that the project did not reflect the alternative vision that had been articulated by some student representatives, and which had included family housing and a community food kitchen. Another member had been assured that programming at the Centre would support both physical and mental health.

Dr. Bennett reported that the University Affairs Board concurred with the recommendation of the Academic Board. The University Affairs Board had received a substantial presentation on this project and had supported it strongly. The student members of the Board had pointed to this project as an example of the good work done by Project Planning Committees that had good student representation. In this case, three of the recognized campus-wide student groups – the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) – had agreed that the best student representation would be provided by those who would be most involved in the use of the facility – the representatives from the Council on Athletics and Recreation (CAR).

Dr. Bennett added that no project in his memory has consumed more discussion time, planning expense, or had been as controversial both within the University and in the neighboring community. Indeed, there were those who would argue that there had been too much discussion and that time and money had been wasted. The fact was, however,

**12. Capital Project: Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health - Project Planning Report (cont'd)**

that, at the end of the day, because of the University's participatory, democratic system of governance, this project addressed the very best needs of the University with approval and respect from its neighbors.

Ms Orange commented that the Business Board had also considered the Varsity project, and had given approval for the execution of the first phase, subject to Governing Council approval. The Board had been satisfied that there was no opportunity to pursue any mixed use of the site to generate revenue, as there was not enough space for both the University's programs and other uses. The Board had also been assured that every effort would be made to plan and landscape the site to produce an aesthetically satisfying facility. The Provost had cited the work that had been done on St. George Street as a model.

A member repeated her view that there was a need for facilities such as club space, family housing, and a community kitchen to be included in this project. She commented that there was no guarantee that there would not be a student levy for subsequent phases of the project.

A member stated that the proposed Varsity Centre project would be good for the University. He appreciated the discussions that had been held as part of the project planning process. He acknowledged that there were a number of needs in the community which should be addressed.

A member expressed his appreciation for the unwavering commitment of Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, to students and to others who would benefit from the facilities of the Varsity Centre project. Another member congratulated the Dean, and commented that the current project was doable, unlike previous proposals.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the planned four phases Varsity Centre space and facilities program located on site 21 be approved in principle;
2. THAT the planned first phase of this multi-phased project for Varsity Centre be approved to allow for completion of the track and field plus the immediate support facilities at a total project cost of \$16,386,000 from the following sources:
  - (i) Contribution in the amount of \$14,000,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto, and
  - (ii) Contribution in the amount of \$2,386,000 to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over five years to be repaid from the operating budget of the new facility.
3. THAT all subsequent phases, consistent with established policy, will require formal approval by Governing Council and will require that the Project Planning Reports for each phase be reviewed by either the Planning and Budget Committee or the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate.

**13. Capital Project: Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice - Project Planning Report**

Professor Corman reported that members of the Board had been informed that the Multi-faith Centre was intended to provide the facilities and related services needed to support the religious and spiritual practices represented within the University community, and that the Koffler family supported the location of the Multi-faith Centre in the Koffler Institute building.

Dr. Bennett commented that the University Affairs Board had reviewed the project and strongly supported it. Ms Orange added that the Business Board had also reviewed this project and had authorized its execution, subject to Governing Council approval.

A member spoke in support of the proposal and thanked the Provost for his support. Another member referred to the memorandum from the University of Toronto Secular Alliance that had been distributed to members of the Governing Council, and encouraged the administration to work with members of the group on space for non-faith groups. Professor Goel reminded the member that a Task Force was currently reviewing the needs for student activity space.

A member expressed his appreciation for the work done on this project by Ms Susan Addario, Director of Student Affairs, and Mr. Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs. Professor Goel also acknowledged the contributions that Ms Addario and Mr. Delaney had made to the planning of the Varsity Centre project.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was RESOLVED

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Multi-faith Centre for Study and Spiritual Practice, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 136 of the Academic Board as Appendix "F", be approved in principle. The Centre is to be located on the second and third floors of the existing Koffler Institute for Pharmacy Management at 569 Spadina Avenue and includes the renovation of 615 net assignable square metres of planned program space.
2. THAT the space program to accommodate expanded training facilities in support of the Administrative and Management Systems [AMS] and the Human Resources [HR] activities that is to be relocated to the ground floor at 256 McCaul Street be approved in principle;
3. THAT the funding for the project be approved at an estimated total project cost of \$3,389,400. The full cost of this project, in the amount of \$3,389,400, to be acquired from a mortgage, amortized over twenty-five years, to be repaid from the operating budget of the University of Toronto.

**14. Capital Project: Lash Miller / McLennan Courtyard - Project Planning Report**

Professor Corman commented that a member of the Academic Board had asked for clarification of why this project had received approval from the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate (AFD) when the anticipated cost had been more than \$2 million. The Provost had replied that the project could have been divided into two components of less than \$2 million, but, instead, the entire project was being presented to governance for approval.



Office of the Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

**TO:** Planning and Budget Committee

**SPONSOR:** Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President Campus and Facilities Planning

**CONTACT INFORMATION:** 416-978-5515; [avp.space@utoronto.ca](mailto:avp.space@utoronto.ca)

**DATE:** May 10, 2007 for May 22, 2007

**AGENDA ITEM:** 6

**ITEM IDENTIFICATION:**

Interim Project Planning Report for Varsity Centre 2007

**JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:**

Under the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, the Planning & Budget Committee reviews Project Planning Reports prepared for a capital project and recommends to the Academic Board approval in principle of the project.

**BACKGROUND:**

In June, 2005, the Governing Council approved a project planning report that recommended an implementation plan for a multi-phased approach for the Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health. The total cost of the project (all phases) was estimated to be \$56 million (subject to escalation) and was to be implemented in four phases.

The first phase, the track and field, received full approval for construction. The second phase, construction of the bubble (subsequently called the 'Dome'), was approved through the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate under the Capital Project Policy as it was estimated to cost less than \$2 million. Development of the master plan for the site was also funded as part of the first phase. The consultants confirmed the overall plan and requirements for the site.

Most of Phase 1, including the installation of the Dome, was completed by January, 2007. FIFA, the world soccer association, gave its highest certification to the field, and the thousands of students who played all manner of sports and games on it under the dome during the winter term gave the new facility their enthusiastic endorsement as well. The final two layers of the track, the installation of the scoreboard, and the remaining details of construction and landscaping will be completed this spring, making the new stadium fully operational by June, 2007.

Governance approvals in June, 2005, determined that the subsequent phases would require updated planning reports and funding plans for each.

Throughout its history, physical and health education and athletics at the University of Toronto have been driven by a spirit of excellence, including the encouragement of the highest levels of athletic performance, a commitment to the academic mission, and student involvement in governance and research. The goal has always been to create a facility, programmes and services which are welcoming, inclusive, celebratory of the University's past and present, and one which will serve the needs of future generations of users.

The new Varsity Centre when complete will enable the University to realize these goals. It is intended that 75% of the usage will be for U of T students, for activities ranging from academic courses and research to Varsity and intramural sports, while 25% of the time available will be used for community activities. In this latter category, the focus will be upon the development of high performance athletics, with outstanding coaching, scientific research, sports medicine and facilities enabling athletes to reach the highest levels of excellence.

### **HIGHLIGHTS:**

The Interim Report of the Project Planning Committee outlines the details of the remaining components of this project:

- . the Varsity entrance building
- . the Centre for High Performance Sport
- . the renovation of Varsity Arena

This Report addresses the site conditions, the funding issues, the current demands for physical activity and recreation facilities on this campus, and the goals and aspirations of the widely representative membership of the Project Committee.

Each of the remaining components can be constructed independently when funding becomes available. It is expected that operating costs of the new facilities will be funded by a combination of student fees and rental revenue of the facilities. The criteria for selection of capital projects are consistent with those stated in the 2005 project planning report.

The 2005 Plan for Varsity Centre located the new athletic facilities (initially to be called the Wellness Building) along the southern end of Varsity Stadium. The limitations of the difficult site resulted in an excessively high unit construction cost.

In early 2006 the possibility of including basketball and volleyball facilities was discussed. Ideally, such facilities would need to be located near to the New Athletic Facilities and the Stadium and Arena. About the same time, the Faculty of Law determined that their own plans for expanded facilities would be best located at 78 and 84 Queen's Park Crescent, thus releasing Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, making it available for other development. This location, directly across the street, is ideally suited for such a facility.

As a result, the Plan for the Varsity Centre has evolved into four complementary components totaling approximately 7750 net assignable square metres:

- Varsity Stadium, being completed by June, 2007
- The Centre for High Performance Sport, to be built on Site 12.

- The Varsity entrance building, to be built on Site 21, located in the south west corner of Varsity Stadium, a pedestrian/user point of entry to Varsity Stadium, the Dome and the Arena
- Arena Renovations

### **South Entrance Building**

A new configuration for the south end is planned. The Varsity entrance building will be the entry and control point to Varsity Stadium, Varsity Arena, and the Dome. It will serve as the base for operations of these facilities and provide change rooms for Varsity teams using the Stadium. It will be the entrance to the complex focused south to the University Community. It will also provide an entrance for users and spectators using Philosopher's Walk from the south laneway. With funding in place, the Interim Report recommends the construction of this component and the beacon and box office (see below) on Bloor Street to fully complete the track, field and stadium components of Varsity Centre.

### **Box Office and Beacon**

A combined box office and beacon is planned for the stadium entrance on Bloor Street. The Beacon will be constructed above the box office and adjacent to the new wall of the Royal Conservatory of Music, located at the east end of the site, adjacent to the forecourt entry. It will mark the public entry point and make the new facility visible from the north.

### **Centre for High Performance Sport**

The Centre for High Performance Sport is planned for the south end of Site 12, directly north of the Trinity College tennis courts.

The focal point of the Centre will be the 2,000-seat world class combined basketball and volleyball facility on the main floor. There will be two courts: a practice court and a feature court built to International Basketball (FIBA) and Volleyball (FIVB) standards.

The Centre's basement will house the support facilities for the courts, including the volleyball and basketball change rooms, visiting teams' change rooms, change rooms for officials, coaches' offices and public washrooms. These will be multi-use change rooms, to be used on an as needed basis by other Varsity, intramural and community teams using the Centre and Varsity Stadium.

The upper floors will accommodate the Strength and Conditioning Centre, the Exercise Studio, the sport science and sports medicine facilities, along with appropriate offices and meeting rooms.

The new Strength and Conditioning Centre has been expanded from 800 nasms in the 2005 Report to 1,100 nasms recognizing demonstrated student demand for these facilities. Its design and presentation will be similar to the new Strength and Conditioning Centre at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. This space has proven to be welcoming and integrative space for all people. Participants will have access to training opportunities to enhance the necessary fitness components of cardio, strength, endurance, flexibility and body composition, to build an optimal lifestyle which promotes learning beyond the classroom experience and to build a

foundation for health and fitness for the future. It will also have a dedicated heavy lifting facility for Varsity and high performance athletes.

Also included will be a new sport science assessment, teaching and research facility. The Mission of the Faculty of Physical and Health Education is “To develop, advance and disseminate knowledge about physical activity, health, and their interactions through education, research, leadership, and the provision of opportunity.” The proposed sport science research facility will assist in fulfilling this mission through research that enhances both sport performance and advances the health of athletes. It will be unique in Canada in addressing the balance between excellence and health for athletes.

Researchers will work closely with the physicians and therapists in the Faculty’s David L. MacIntosh Sports Medicine Clinic, also planned to be located in this facility, to support the health of sport participants.

Education of graduate students and the sport community outreach will be an important function of the sport science research facility. Training of future sport scientists and Knowledge Translation to the sport community will ensure that the research informs and is informed by ‘best practice’ today and into the future.

### **Arena Renovation**

Built five years before Maple Leaf Gardens, Varsity Arena is rich in history, the site of major sporting, political and cultural events for more than 80 years. Beginning with the new entrances and the mezzanine the building will be decorated in a manner which celebrates this history.

The objectives underlying the planned renovations are threefold, and consistent with those articulated in the 2005 project planning report:

- To integrate the arena into its new environment, including Varsity Stadium and the newly expanded Royal Conservatory of Music, which has eliminated Varsity Arena’s front entrance
- To modernize Varsity Arena from a technical and functional perspective, and
- To celebrate Varsity Arena’s historical past.

### **Campus Planning**

The detailed development of the master plan for Varsity Centre during the implementation of Phases 1 and 2 demonstrated limitations of construction of the entire program on Site 21. With the release of Site 12 on the west side of Devonshire Place, and with the new increased space program to include the Field House, the opportunity to expand athletic facilities to the south portion of Site 12 makes good planning sense.

Because this is an assignment of part of Site 12, implementation must be flexible to allow for full development of the site. Plans should also permit construction of each component of Varsity Centre when funds become available.

It is anticipated that a second building, possibly the Student Commons (for which an Interim Project Planning Report is being forwarded for consideration) will be

constructed north of the Centre abutting the south side of the Admissions Building. The Centre and adjoining facilities can share entrances, circulation and common space. In the event that the Student Commons does not proceed, other compatible activities, such as additional classrooms serving the north campus, or a student service node could be located on this site providing the complementary functions.

Students at the University are concerned with the University of Toronto's energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. They have taken great interest in this project and have developed a list of green building strategies that they would like to see explored in the design of these facilities and approach the design exercise considering LEED accreditation. The capital cost estimate has made provision for this standard of design.

The Centre for High Performance Sport will be student-centred, educational in focus and inclusive in design. It will provide for equity, diversity, community outreach and a sense of welcome in its spaces, services and programmes. Barrier-free accessibility for all persons must be integrated throughout the design.

Varsity Centre 2007 outlined in the Interim Planning Report comprises the following components:

- Arena Renovation
- Beacon Entry and Box Office at Bloor Street
- Centre for High Performance Sport (a portion of Site 12)
- Varsity Entrance Building (south end of Site 21)

The current proposal for the Varsity entrance building, the Centre for High Performance Sport and the renovation of Varsity Arena should have little, if any, impact on Trinity College or Massey College. The easement agreement with Trinity College over the right-of-way on the lane south of Site 21 currently allows for service access to Varsity Arena. Permission for pedestrian access for participants and spectators has been included in the easement agreement.

### **Secondary Effects**

Fifty-two parking spaces will be eliminated on Site 12 and must be absorbed into the University's parking inventory to maintain the by-law requirements for the St. George Campus.

One of the two offices of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) is temporarily located in 100 Devonshire Place at the south end of Site 12. As part of the on-going commitment to provide suitable space to APUS, the organization will need to be relocated, at least on a temporary basis, in order for development on the site to take place. Future space allocations to APUS will be dependent upon the development of other capital projects (e.g., the proposed Student Commons) and the administration's continuing discussions with the organization with respect to their space needs.



## Capital Cost Estimate

The capital cost is based on the data sheets provided for the facilities included in the remaining components are approximately 7750 nasm in total. When all taxes, contingencies, fees, equipment, financing and miscellaneous costs are included the total project cost of the remaining components is expected to be approximately \$69.8 million, premised on a tender date of October 2008. The details of the estimate are shown in Appendix A. Escalation on this estimate will be 7% per annum to date of tender

Separated into individual components, the capital costs are estimated to be as follows:

Arena renovation	\$ 7.1 million
Beacon and Box Office	\$ 0.5 million
Centre for High Performance Sport	\$52.7 million
Varsity entrance building	\$ 9.5 million
Total	\$69.8 million

## Operating Costs

The annual operating costs of the Centre for High Performance Sport facility are currently estimated at \$2.8 million. 75% of this amount will come from student fees, on the assumption that students will have access to the facilities 75% of the time. Separate operating costs will be determined for the Varsity entrance building. The remainder of the revenues will be generated through rentals, sponsorships and special events. There is no expected change to the operating costs of Varsity Arena after renovations.

## Capital

All components of Varsity Centre 2007 described in the project planning report will be funded by private benefaction, government grants and other outside sources.

## Schedule

This interim report is being brought forward for approval in principle of the space program that has been determined and to assign the south portion of Site 12 (100 Devonshire Place) to the Centre for High Performance.

Recognizing that Site 12 is one of the few remaining large development areas on campus, the Faculty of Physical Education and Health has been asked to complete necessary fundraising and obtain agreement on the operating plan by December 31, 2007, for the components comprising the Centre for High Performance Sport.

Construction will occur when funds are raised. It should be noted that each component can be implemented in any order once funding is available

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Planning and Budget Committee recommend to the Academic Board:

1. THAT the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on Site 21, 299 Bloor Street West, and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, as contained within the Interim Project Planning Report, be approved in principle,
2. THAT the south end of Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, be assigned to Varsity 2007 until December 31, 2007 at which time the financial viability of the project can be assessed.
3. THAT the components of the project for Varsity Centre, approximately 7753 net assignable square metres be approved in principle at a total project cost of approximately \$69.8 million (premised on a tender date of October 2008) to be funded by fundraising initiatives.
4. THAT the first components of Varsity 2007, the South entrance building, and the Beacon and Box Office be approved in principle to proceed to construct approximately 600 net assignable square metres as detailed in the Interim Project Planning Report and having a total project cost of approximately \$10 million on Site 21 as funding for these components is obtained from donations. No financing is required.

## 6. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007

The Chair welcomed student members of the Varsity Centre Project Planning Committee who were present.

### Presentation

Professor Goel presented the Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007. The highlights of Professor Goel's presentation included the following:

#### (i) Background

The Varsity Centre addressed key *Stepping Up* priorities, including enhancing the student experience. In June, 2005, the Governing Council had approved a project planning report that had recommended an implementation plan for a multi-phased approach for the Varsity Centre for Physical Activity and Health. The four phases had included the track and field; the construction of the bubble; the location of the new athletic facilities along the southern end of Varsity Stadium; and the Varsity Arena renovation. Most of phases one and two, including the installation of the bubble, had been completed by January, 2007. The 5,000-seat stadium had been finished, and the Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), the world soccer association, had given its highest certification to the field. It was expected that the track would be laid within the next week, and certification by the International Athletics Federation was anticipated.

#### (ii) Student Use

Professor Goel stated that it was intended that 75% of the usage of the new Varsity Centre would be for University of Toronto students, while 25% of the time available would be used for community activities. Of the student use, two-thirds of the time would be available for recreational and intramural athletics, and one-third would be used for intercollegiate varsity athletics.

It had been found that since the opening of the dome, the greatest proportion of hours had been for intramural use. Students had expressed their appreciation of the new facilities and enjoyed the variety of activities available even during the winter season.

#### (iii) Investment to Date

Professor Goel explained that the University had invested \$21.7 million for the construction of the field, stadium and concourse. The Varsity Campaign Advisory Board had raised \$1.1 million for the cost of the dome, and had also obtained a \$1.7 million donation from the Davenport Family Foundation to fund the track.

#### (iv) Varsity Arena Renovations

Professor Goel advised members that, because each of the remaining components could be constructed independently when funding became available, the order of construction was flexible. One component would involve the modernization of Varsity Arena, an eighty-year old historic building. The planned renovations would:

- integrate the arena into its new environment, including Varsity Stadium and the newly expanded Royal Conservatory of Music, which had eliminated the Varsity Arena's front entrance;
- modernize Varsity Arena from a technical and functional perspective, and
- celebrate Varsity Arena's historical past.

#### (v) South Entrance Building

The 2005 plan for Varsity had included a building along the southern end of the stadium. A new configuration was now being proposed. The Varsity entrance building would be the entry and control point to Varsity Stadium, Varsity Arena, and the Dome. It would provide change rooms

**6. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)****(v) South Entrance Building (cont'd)**

for Varsity teams and offices for coaching staff using the Stadium. It would also provide an entrance for users and spectators using the Philosopher's Walk from the south laneway.

**(vi) Box Office and Beacon**

A combined box office and beacon was planned for the stadium entrance at the north end on Bloor Street. The Beacon would be constructed above the box office, making the new facility visible from the north and would mark the public entry point into the University community.

**(vii) Centre for High Performance Sport**

The Centre for High Performance Sport was planned for the south end of Site 12, directly north of the Trinity College tennis courts on Devonshire Road. The Centre would include a 2,000-seat basketball and volleyball facility, two courts with retractable seats, a sport medicine clinic, a sport science assessment, teaching and research facility, a strength and conditioning centre, change rooms, and coaches' offices. It was proposed that the north end of site 12 could be used for the development of the Student Commons, allowing shared common elements between the two projects, such as food services.

**(viii) Capital Cost Estimate and Funding Sources**

The projected capital costs were estimated to be:

Arena Renovation:	\$ 7.1 million
Beacon and Box Office	\$ 0.5 million
Centre for High Performance Sport	\$52.7 million
Varsity Centre Entrance Building	\$ 9.5 million
 Total	 \$69.8 million

It was proposed that all components of Varsity Centre 2007 be funded by private benefaction, government grants and other outside sources. Construction would occur when funds were raised, and each component would be implemented once funding was available. It was expected that the operating costs of the Varsity Arena would remain unchanged after renovation and would be met in the existing budget. The annual operating costs of the new facility were estimated at \$2.8 million. It would be important to identify an appropriate level of support from students in order to provide for student access to the facilities. The remainder of the revenues would be generated through rentals, special events and other income.

**(ix) Schedule**

Professor Goel summarized the recommendations, emphasizing that the current project planning report with respect to the Centre for High Performance Sport and the Arena renovation was an interim one. A number of issues would need to be resolved prior to the submission of the final report, particularly sources of funding for the capital and operating costs. As well, secondary issues for site 12 and issues related to components of the David L. MacIntosh Sport Medicine Clinic and proposed research labs would also need to be addressed. In order to ensure that those issues be addressed in a timely manner, a limited time period until December 31, 2007 had been proposed for the assignment of the south end of site 12 to the Varsity Centre. The proposed project was a very important one for the University, however, if all issues were not resolved by the end of the year, then other options for use of the site might be considered. It was planned to proceed immediately with the Beacon and Box Office and the Varsity Centre Entrance Building.

**6. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)****Non-Member's Address to the Committee**

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Stephanie Tan, a University College graduand and member of the Intramural Sports Council, addressed the Committee. She stated that the intramural program at the University was very successful, with thousands of students participating in a range of sports each year. However, due to lack of facilities, there were lengthy league waitlists of students eager to play the more popular sports. With the completion of the Varsity Dome, waitlists for indoor soccer had been significantly reduced. Ms Tan attested to the many benefits of student participation in intramural sports and to the disappointment experienced by students on waitlists caused by limited availability of facilities. In her view, waitlists for intramural basketball and volleyball would be greatly reduced with the creation of the new facility. Ms Tan endorsed the proposed Varsity Centre, stating that it would have a positive impact on the student experience.

**Discussion**

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following:

**(a) Student Usage**

A member asked whether University of Toronto students participating in intramural sports would have priority in use of the Varsity Centre over external user groups. Professor Goel confirmed that they would, and as previously indicated, proportional use for students and community activities would be possible. However, such usage was contingent on available funds to pay for the cost of student use. If sufficient funding was not obtained, other options would need to be explored, such as internal user fees or increased usage by external groups.

**(b) Regional Sports Centres**

A member commented that the proposed Centre for High Performance Sport presented a wonderful opportunity for sports development not only for the University, but also for the Province of Ontario, which lacked such a facility.

Professor Kidd agreed with the member, elaborating that sport centres in Quebec and western Canada had been created in preparation for major international games. As such, international sports bodies had been able to determine where those centres would be located in Canada. Ontario had been unsuccessful in its bid for major games over the past two decades and thus had no new sports facility. While there was a virtual centre that Ontario athletes could access for assistance and information, there was no actual facility where they could undergo comprehensive assessment, sports medicine treatment, training, etc. Many athletes from Ontario had to train in other parts of Canada or elsewhere. Professor Kidd stated that organizations such as the Canadian Olympic Committee strongly supported the proposal for a Centre for High Performance Sport in Ontario and the time had come to develop such a centre in this province. A member voiced the opinion that with the strong support of the Governing Council, it was very possible that the Centre could be realized.

**(c) Interim Assignment of Site 12**

In response to a question, Professor Goel indicated that the University was optimistic that the Varsity Centre project was feasible, and that commitments for financial support would be obtained by the planned deadline of December 31, 2007. The Varsity Campaign Advisory Board had been working for many months to establish support for the project, so it should be possible to determine fairly quickly whether or not the required level of external support could be feasibly obtained.

**6. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on Site 21, 299 Bloor Street West, and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, as contained within the Interim Project Planning Report, a copy of which is attached hereto Appendix “B”, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the south end of Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, be assigned to Varsity 2007 until December 31, 2007 at which time the financial viability of the project can be assessed.
3. THAT the components of the project for Varsity Centre, approximately 7753 net assignable square metres be approved in principle at a total project cost of approximately \$69.8 million (premised on a tender date of October 2008) to be funded by fundraising initiatives.
4. THAT the first components of Varsity 2007, the South Entrance Building, and the Beacon and Box Office be approved in principle to proceed to construct approximately 600 net assignable square metres as detailed in the Interim Project Planning Report and having a total project cost of approximately \$10 million on Site 21 as funding for these components is obtained from donations. No financing is required.

**7. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Student Commons**

Ms Sisam informed members that in September 2005 the Committee to Review Student Activity Space had recommended the development of a new large node of student activity space. There had been requests and discussions from students for increased student activity space for decades. Even though much work had gone into the development of the current proposed space program, further discussion would be required to determine elements of the Student Commons for the final report.

Ms Sisam stated that the Project Planning Committee had considered several development sites on campus as possible locations for the Student Commons facility. Ultimately, site 12 had been proposed for the facility, as it was available for immediate construction, it had few secondary effects<sup>4</sup>, it was easily accessible by public transit, and it was in close proximity to the new Varsity Centre facilities.

Noting that the Project Planning Committee had toured the new Student Campus Centre at Ryerson University, Ms Sisam said that the Ryerson staff had recommended that the model for governance be determined prior to proceeding with the Student Commons. They had cautioned that operational issues might not be easily resolved once the facility was opened, so a predetermined agreement on a plan for management and operation was crucial. The Project Planning Committee had followed their advice and had included identification of governance as one of the recommendations in the Interim Report.

---

<sup>4</sup> Several parking spaces would need to be relocated elsewhere on campus.

## **7. Capital Project: Project Planning Report - Relocation of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services (cont'd)**

A member of the Board noted that employees of the Departments of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services would be sharing the elevators and stairs with those using the examination facilities, and asked whether this would cause any problems. Ms Sisam replied that the flow of movement within the building had been examined in light of building code requirements, and no problems were anticipated.

On motion duly moved and seconded

### **YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the third floor of 255/257 McCaul Street be assigned to the Capital Projects Department and to portions of the Facilities & Services Department.
2. THAT the renovation of the third floor of 255/257 McCaul Street, 2200 gross square metres, and an archive storage room on the first floor, 167 gross square meters, with a total project cost of \$6.0 million, as described in the Project Planning Report which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved and funded through borrowing.

## **8. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007**

The Chair observed that this Interim Project Planning Report had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on May 22, 2007. The interim Project Planning Report would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25, 2007, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Mr. Chen informed members of the Board that Professor Goel had provided members of the Planning and Budget Committee with a detailed briefing on the highlights of the Interim Project Planning Report - Varsity Centre 2007. The Provost had emphasized that this was an interim project planning report; a number of issues, including sources of funding, secondary effects of the project, and support from the operating budget, would have to be resolved before the final project planning report was submitted to governance.

Professor Goel had explained that the components of Varsity 2007 that were being recommended for approval in principle for construction at this time were the Beacon, Box Office and South entrance building. All other components were being recommended for approval in principle, subject to additional work being done to explore appropriate funding and secondary effects of the project.

Mr. Chen summarized the points that had been raised by members of P&B during the thorough discussion by the Committee.

- A member had asked whether University of Toronto students participating in intramural sports would have priority over external groups in the use of the Varsity Centre.
- Professor Goel had confirmed that priority for the use of Varsity Centre facilities would be given to intramural sports. However, such usage would be contingent upon the availability of funds to pay for the cost of student use. If funding was insufficient, other options might be explored.
- A member had commented that the proposed Centre for High Performance Sport presented a wonderful opportunity for sports development not only for the University, but also for the Province of Ontario, which lacked such a facility.

## 8. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)

- In response to a question, Professor Goel had indicated that the Varsity Campaign Advisory Board had been working for many months to establish support for the project. The University was optimistic that the Varsity Centre project was feasible, and that commitments for financial support would be obtained by the proposed deadline of December 31, 2007.

### Addresses by Non-Members to the Board

The Chair advised members of the Board that two speaking requests had been received from recognized Campus Groups prior to the meeting: the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS). In keeping with the practice of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees<sup>1</sup>, the requests had been granted, and the speakers would be given three minutes to address the Board.

The Chair thanked the GSU for providing a written communication to the Board, and reminded members that the GSU letter had been distributed on June 1, and copies had been available at the door.

The Chair noted that the *Procedures for Non-Members to Address Governing Council, its Boards and Committees* provided some discretion to the Chair in granting speaking requests for items on the agenda of a meeting. Requests were granted after the Chair had taken into account the relevance of the intervention to the agenda item, whether the members already possessed the information being offered, the length of the agenda, the number of speaking requests received and the maintenance of good relations with recognized campus groups representing students, faculty and staff. It was the Chair's view that the membership of the Academic Board provided a wide range of perspectives to matters before the Board, and that deliberations of the Board were not necessarily enhanced by interventions from a number of speakers.

The Chair invited Mr. Mulongo to address the Board. Mr. Mulongo noted that the Varsity Centre was a priority for the University, and that the GSU supported intermural and intercollegiate athletics at the University. The GSU was concerned, however, with the proposal to approve in principle the interim project planning report when funding for the project was uncertain. It was the view of the GSU that the proposal should be tabled until next year when the funding for the capital project was more certain. Mr. Mulongo re-iterated the opposition of the GSU to student levies or fee increases for capital projects.

The Chair invited Ms Molnar to address the Board. Ms Molnar stated that the Centre for High Performance Sport was not a priority for members of APUS, 70% of whom were women, and many of whom were working as well as studying. APUS objected to the assignment of a portion of Site 12 to the Centre for High Performance Sport. APUS had recently been given temporary office space in the former Margaret Fletcher Daycare facility that was located on Site 12, after having been relocated from the Woodsworth College Residence in 2006. She repeated the opposition of APUS to student levies.

The Chair thanked the speakers for their comments.

### Discussion

Professor Goel again emphasized that the Board was being asked to approve in principle the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on site 21 at 299 Bloor Street West, and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place. The south end of Site 12 was being assigned to the Varsity 2007 project until December 31, 2007, at which time the financial viability of the project would be assessed. Approval was also being sought for the construction of the South Entrance Building, Beacon and Box Office at a total project cost of approximately \$10 million, with the funding obtained from donations. Professor Goel reminded members of the Board that it had recently become the practice to submit interim project planning reports to

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/tgc/2.03.10.pdf>  
39392



## **8. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)**

### **Discussion (cont'd)**

governance for approval in principle where there were significant issues warranting discussion and to provide assurance to potential benefactors of the commitment of the University to the project.

A member of the Board commented that the name 'Centre for High Performance Sport' might be causing some confusion as it suggested a facility intended for elite athletes. Professor Kidd replied that the name reflected the University's pursuit of excellence, and noted the number of Centres of Excellence affiliated with the University. The Centre for High Performance Sport would be available to all students of the University, and would accommodate academic and research activities of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health.

Professor Kidd noted that Governing Council policy required that operating costs of extra-curricular activities be covered by students. External groups who used the facilities would be charged appropriate fees. Capital costs for the project would be funded by donors and friends of the Faculty.

A member of the Board described his area of research in physical activity, and explained that the phrase 'High Performance Sport' had a broad definition within the discipline.

On motion duly moved and seconded

### **YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on Site 21, 299 Bloor Street West, and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, as contained within the Interim Project Planning Report, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the south end of Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, be assigned to Varsity 2007 until December 31, 2007 at which time the financial viability of the project can be assessed.
3. THAT the components of the project for Varsity Centre, approximately 7753 net assignable square metres be approved in principle at a total project cost of approximately \$69.8 million (premised on a tender date of October 2008) to be funded by fundraising initiatives.
4. THAT the first components of Varsity 2007, the South Entrance Building, and the Beacon and Box Office be approved in principle to proceed to construct approximately 600 net assignable square metres as detailed in the Interim Project Planning Report and having a total project cost of approximately \$10 million on Site 21 as funding for these components is obtained from donations. No financing is required.

## **9. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Student Commons**

The Chair observed that this Interim Project Planning Report had been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) on May 22, 2007. The interim Project Planning Report would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25, 2007, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Mr. Chen informed members of the Board that members of the Planning and Budget Committee had been reminded that, in September 2005, the Committee to Review Student Activity Space had recommended the development of a new large node of student activity space. After consideration of several development sites on campus, the Project Planning Committee had proposed site 12 for the Student Commons facility.

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – June 21, 2007****12. Capital Project: Relocation of the Capital Projects and Facilities and Services Departments (Cont'd)**

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Business Affairs,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

Subject to Governing Council approval of the project,

- (i) THAT the Vice-President, Business Affairs be authorized to execute the relocation of the Capital Projects and Facilities and Services Departments to the fourth floor and first floor storage area at 255/257 McCaul Street at a total project cost not to exceed \$6.0-million, with sources of funding as follows:

Borrowing	\$6,000,000
-----------	-------------

- (ii) THAT the Vice President, Business Affairs be authorized to arrange such interim and long-term borrowing as required either from internal or external sources.

**13. Capital Project: Varsity Centre, 2007**

The Chair noted that the Interim Project Planning Report for the Varsity Centre, 2007 would be considered for approval by the Governing Council on June 25. She invited the Vice-President and Provost to make a brief presentation to provide context for the Board's consideration of the recommendation to approve execution of the proposed project.

Professor Goel reported that the Interim Project Planning Report for Varsity Centre, 2007 had been endorsed by the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board, and it would be before the Governing Council at its meeting of June 25. The 2005 plan had envisioned work in a number of phases. The first of them was a track and field with 5,000 spectator seats and the second involved the construction of an air-supported bubble or dome to enable the use of the Centre in the winter months. All of the work in the original two phases had been completed, with the track having just been put into place. The facility was looking very good, and it would be the site of an important track meet in three weeks' time. The third phase of the original plan was construction of a "U" shaped building to the south of the site to accommodate a 3,700 net assignable square metre athletic facility. The final phase was the renovation of Varsity Arena. As planning work proceeded, a number of difficulties had become apparent including, for example, certain needs for electrical service. It would be difficult to accommodate all of the facilities required in the "U" shaped building at the south end of the site, requiring that a part of that building overhang the track. The cost of the facility on the constricted site would have been very high. The result would have constrained the program opportunities. It had therefore been concluded that it would be highly inefficient to proceed as originally planned. At the same time, the Faculty of Law had determined that it would prefer to seek to develop its facilities on its

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – June 21, 2007****13. Capital Project: Varsity Centre, 2007 (Cont'd)**

current site on Queen's Park Crescent, making available the site on Devonshire Place, immediately to the west of the Varsity Centre. In addition, the University was considering the need for a Student Commons, and it had found that it would be possible to accommodate both the new athletic facility and the proposed Student Commons on the Devonshire Place site. Indeed, it would be possible to achieve efficiencies by placing the athletic facility and the Student Commons on this site, where they could share such services as an entry, child-care facilities and food services. The administration was therefore recommending that the site be assigned to the Student Commons and the new athletic facility, to be called the Centre for High Performance Sport. The new Centre would include a 2,000-seat facility for basketball and volleyball; a sport medicine clinic; a sport science assessment, teaching and research facility; a strength and conditioning centre and exercise studio; multi-use change rooms; and coaches' offices.

Professor Goel described the remaining elements planned for the new Varsity Centre project. (They were no longer being described as phases; rather they would be constructed in the order that funding for them became available.) Varsity Arena would be renovated to bring the 80-year-old building up to current standards. The renovation would include enhanced dressing rooms that would (unlike the current facilities) be large enough to serve participants' needs. An entrance building to the south end of the Centre would control entry to the facility off Devonshire Place. It would also control access to the dome and to the Arena – a new access point made necessary by the addition to the Royal Conservatory of Music to the north of the Arena. The entrance building would include team rooms for football and other sports, depending on which was in season. The northeast corner of the Centre would be marked by a facility currently described as a beacon (consideration was being given to various possible new names), marking an entry to the Centre from Bloor Street. The facility would include a box office. It would be designed to fit architecturally with the new Michael Lee-Chin Crystal of the Royal Ontario Museum and the new Royal Conservatory of Music facility, and it would mark the transition to the campus along Bloor Street West. In addition, the University would complete additional work to improve Philosopher's Walk.

Professor Goel said that the operating costs for the proposed new Entrance Building and Beacon were already in the operating budget for the original Varsity Centre plan. The capital cost of the Entrance Building would be met by donations, and Professor Goel had been advised that the University would soon be in a position to announce a benefaction for this purpose. Ms Riggall noted that the construction of the Beacon project had been approved by the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate from funds provided by donations.

Professor Goel said that the total cost of the remaining components of the Varsity Centre 2007 project was approximately \$70-million. The remaining components would proceed as funding became available. There would be no further borrowing for the Centre. Further consideration of the proposal for the Centre for High-Performance Sport would involve two issues: what to include in the Centre and how to pay for its capital and operating costs. It was anticipated that all of the capital costs would be met by donations or external funds. A plan for the operating costs would have to be developed prior to the final report's coming forward.

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE BUSINESS BOARD – June 21, 2007**

**13. Capital Project: Varsity Centre, 2007 (Cont'd)**

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Business Affairs,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

Subject to Governing Council approval of the project,

THAT the Vice-President, Business Affairs be authorized to execute the Varsity Entrance Building at a total project cost not to exceed \$ 9.5 million dollars, as funding is obtained from donations.

**14. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Haultain Building – Hydrogen Laboratory**

Mr. Zouravlioff reported that the proposal to renovate the Hydrogen Laboratory in the Haultain Building had been approved in principle under administrative authority as a project costing under \$2-million. However, the construction market, particularly for highly specialized projects, had heated up considerably, and the tenders for the project had come in above that amount. The needs of researchers were such that the Department did not wish to scale back the project, and it had the funding in hand to pay the additional cost. Therefore, the proposal was maintained according to the original plan and the approval of the Business Board was now being requested.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President, Business Affairs,

**YOUR BOARD APPROVED**

THAT the Vice-President, Business Affairs be authorized to execute the renovation of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Haultain Building Hydrogen Lab third floor at a total project cost not to exceed \$ 2.193 million dollars, with funding provided by the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

**15. Other Reports for Information**

The Board received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 84 of the Audit Committee (May 28, 2007)
- (b) Risk Management and Insurance: Annual Report, 2007
- (c) Borrowing: Status Report to May 31, 2007

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(b) Capital Project: Project Planning Report - Relocation of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services**

Professor Marrus reported that the proposed move of the Departments of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services had been considered at a meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee on May 22, 2007, and by the Academic Board on June 4, 2007. The proposed relocation would make space available at 215 Huron Street for the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics. The capital project, which had a total project cost of \$6 million to be funded through borrowing, would be implemented concurrently with renovations for the Examination Centre. The only question raised at the Board had concerned the combined traffic of employees in the two relocated departments and those using the examination centre, and whether this would cause any congestion problems, especially in the use of the elevators. The Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning had assured the Board that the project plans conformed to building code requirements and that no problems were anticipated.

Invited to comment, Ms Orange stated that the Business Board had also considered the project and had approved its execution, subject to approval by the Governing Council. The Board had been assured that the reduced space for the two departments in the new facility would be sufficient to accommodate current and future staff needs, given the shared service facilities and the open-space design. The Board had also been assured that the construction cost and the total project cost were within an appropriate range.

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

1. THAT the third floor of 255/257 McCaul Street be assigned to the Capital Projects Department and to portions of the Facilities & Services Department.
2. THAT the renovation of the third floor of 255/257 McCaul Street, 2200 gross square metres, and an archive storage room on the first floor, 167 gross square meters, with a Total Project Cost of \$6.0 million be approved and funded through borrowing.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 151 of the Academic Board as Appendix "C".

**(c) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report - Varsity Centre 2007**

Professor Marrus reported that the Interim Project Planning Report for the Varsity Centre 2007 had also been considered by the Planning and Budget Committee on May 22<sup>nd</sup> and by the Academic Board on June 4<sup>th</sup>. He explained that approval in principle was being sought to facilitate planning and to provide assurance to potential benefactors of the commitment of the University to the project. Approval was needed for the renovation of Varsity Arena on site 21 at 299 Bloor Street West, and for the planning and construction of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place. Approval was also being sought for the construction of the South Entrance Building, Beacon, and Box Office at a total project cost of approximately \$10 million, with the funding obtained from donations. The south end of Site 12 was being assigned to the Varsity 2007 project until December 31, 2007, at which time the financial viability of the project would be assessed.

Professor Marrus noted that a number of issues, including sources of funding, secondary effects of the project, and support from the operating budget, would need to be resolved prior to the

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(c) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report - Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)**

submission to governance of the final project planning report. Speakers from the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) and Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) had addressed the Board, and had indicated their opposition to student levies for capital projects. A member of the Board had observed that the name 'Centre for High Performance Sport' could imply that the Centre would only be available to elite athletes. Professor Bruce Kidd, the Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, had replied that the name of the Centre reflected the pursuit of excellence by the University in all fields of endeavour. Referring to Professor Kidd's recent article in *The Bulletin*<sup>1</sup>, Professor Marrus echoed the Dean's view that it was appropriate for the University to seek excellence in athletics. Professor Marrus added that the proposal for the Varsity Centre project had received overwhelming support from the Board.

Ms Orange informed members that Professor Goel had provided the Business Board with a full briefing on the Varsity Centre project. Subject to Council's approval of the interim project planning report, the Board had approved execution of the Entrance Building at a cost of \$9.5-million, with funding from donations.

**Non-Members' Addresses to the Council**

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Joeita Gupta of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) addressed the Council. Ms Gupta outlined APUS' objections to the Centre for High Performance Sport, stating that, in their view, the project was not inclusive of part-time students on the St. George campus. APUS believed that a number of part-time students had responsibilities that would prevent them from making use of the Centre. The assignment of site 12 to the Varsity Centre and the Student Commons would result in a further, unwelcome relocation of the APUS office from its temporary space in the Margaret Fletcher Building. Ms Gupta expressed the opposition of APUS to student levies and to students paying for bricks and mortar, and she sought assurance from governors of their commitment to the experience of part-time students.

Ms Masha Sidorova, Co-chair of the Council of Athletics and Recreation, also addressed the Council. She stated that in her role as an elected student leader, she had had an opportunity to speak with numerous students; it was clear there was strong support within the student body for the Varsity Centre. Ms Sidorova remarked on the necessity for student space on campus that would cater to the needs of all University of Toronto students. The Centre for High Performance Sport located on site 12 would provide research facilities, student space, and an opportunity for students to participate in athletics both as users and as spectators. Ms Sidorova commented on the benefits of the Varsity Dome since its recent opening – reduced waiting lists, longer, more flexible hours of operation, and a new offering of athletic programs for students. Stressing the importance of hearing all voices on the issue, she expressed the belief that it was possible to reach a compromise with student groups on campus so that the Varsity Centre project would be realized.

**Discussion**

Members spoke in support of both the Varsity Centre and the Student Commons proposals, stating that there was a great need for the proposed student activity spaces. Numerous students would be able to use the Centre for High Performance Sport, participating in intramural sports.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.news.utoronto.ca/bulletin/PDF\\_issues/06-12-07.pdf](http://www.news.utoronto.ca/bulletin/PDF_issues/06-12-07.pdf)

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(c) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report - Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)**

As well, child minding services would facilitate use of the Centre by students with parental responsibilities. Other benefits included the accessibility of site 12, twenty-four hour use of areas of the Student Commons, proximity to the subway lines and public transportation, and the provision of additional study space on campus.

A member thanked Ms Joeita Gupta for having spoken so eloquently on behalf of APUS. He clarified that students were not being asked to pay for “bricks and mortar”, as she had suggested, but rather to contribute to 75% of the operating costs, corresponding to student use of the facilities. The University would obtain funding for the capital costs of the Varsity Centre project through fundraising initiatives.

Three members noted that discussions on the student spaces had been ongoing for quite some time, and that it was important for APUS to participate in such discussions. APUS had been invited to have representation on the Student Commons Project Planning Committee, but had chosen not to participate actively. A member suggested it might be helpful for APUS and others who had expressed opposition to the Varsity Centre to consider a compromise for the sake of their fellow students, as many would benefit from the Centre for High Performance Sport. It was possible for APUS to make contributions and advocate on behalf of part-time students, even if their office were situated in a location other than the Margaret Fletcher Building.

A member noted that the University administration had collaborated effectively with the SAC (UTSU) on the plans to build the Varsity Centre and Student Commons on site 12. A member also thanked the University and President Naylor for acknowledging the needs of its students and working to make improvements for them.

A member asked whether APUS would be guaranteed a space in the Student Commons. Professor Goel replied that, as stated in the interim project planning report, the administration would work with APUS to identify an alternate office site. He noted that, prior to the move, it had been made clear to APUS that site 12 was a development site. Although they had been offered other locations for their office, they had chosen to move to site 12 temporarily. In response to a question of whether APUS would be provided with an alternate space during construction, Professor Goel explained that such secondary effects of the project, including the relocation of occupants, would be addressed before a final report was submitted to the Governing Council.

**5. Items for Governing Council Approval (cont'd)****(c) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report - Varsity Centre 2007 (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded

It was Resolved

1. THAT the planning and construction of the Varsity Entrance Building and the renovations to Varsity Arena, on Site 21, 299 Bloor Street West, and of the Centre for High Performance Sport on Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, as contained within the Interim Project Planning Report, be approved in principle.
2. THAT the south end of Site 12, 100 Devonshire Place, be assigned to Varsity 2007 until December 31, 2007 at which time the financial viability of the project can be assessed.
3. THAT the components of the project for Varsity Centre, approximately 7753 net assignable square metres be approved in principle at a total project cost of approximately \$69.8 million (premised on a tender date of October 2008) to be funded by fundraising initiatives.
4. THAT the first components of Varsity 2007, the South Entrance Building, and the Beacon and Box Office be approved in principle to proceed to construct approximately 600 net assignable square metres as detailed in the Interim Project Planning Report and having a total project cost of approximately \$10 million on Site 21 as funding for these components is obtained from donations. No financing is required.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 151 of the Academic Board as Appendix "D".

**(d) Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report - Student Commons**

Professor Marrus reported that a portion of site 12 at 100 Devonshire Place was being proposed for a Student Commons facility, with activities co-located with the Varsity Centre for High Performance Sport. It was expected that students would contribute to the costs of the Student Commons in the form of a levy, and student leaders would hold a referendum in the Fall 2007. The University would contribute fifty cents against each dollar raised through the levy for the capital costs of the project, consistent with contributions to student centres on the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) campuses. At the Board meeting, a speaker from APUS had indicated the Association's displeasure at the impact the assignment of Site 12 for the Student Commons and Varsity Centre would have on the APUS Office at the former Margaret Fletcher Day Care located on Site 12. Explanations of the issues, similar to those just given to the Governing Council, had been provided. The only question raised at the Board had been whether there was a maximum height for the structures being planned for the site. Ms Sisam had replied that 7.5 stories was the maximum height allowed under current zoning regulations. The Academic Board had supported the motion and had recommended it to the Governing Council for approval.

At the invitation of the Chair, Ms Andréa Armbrorst, President of SAC (UTSU) addressed the Council. She noted that Mr. Michel Hay, Vice-President, University Affairs, of SAC (UTSU), and Mr. Rick Telfer, General Manager of SAC (UTSU), were in attendance to demonstrate their commitment to the Student Commons project. Ms Armbrorst spoke in support of the project,