



**FOR ENDORSEMENT &  
FORWARDING**

**PUBLIC**

**CLOSED SESSION**

**TO:** Executive Committee

**SPONSOR:** Prof. Scott Mabury, Vice-President, University Operations  
**CONTACT INFORMATION:** [scott.mabury@utoronto.ca](mailto:scott.mabury@utoronto.ca)  
l.charpentier@utoronto.ca

**PRESENTER:** Ellen Hodnett, Chair of the Academic Board  
**CONTACT INFO:** 416-946-8676, ellen.hodnett@utoronto.ca

**DATE:** September 3, 2013 for October 23, 2013

**AGENDA ITEM:** 3d)

**ITEM IDENTIFICATION:**

Revisions to the University of Toronto *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*

**JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:**

The Executive Committee is responsible for the preparation of the agenda for meetings of the Governing Council (Section 5.1, Executive Committee Terms of Reference).

**GOVERNANCE PATH:**

1. UTM Campus Affairs Committee [for information] (September 9, 2013)
2. Planning & Budget Committee [for recommendation] (September 16, 2013)
3. UTSS Campus Affairs Committee [for information] (September 17, 2013)
4. Business Board [for recommendation] (September 23, 2013)
5. UTM Campus Council [for information] (September 30, 2013)
6. UTSC Campus Council [for information] (October 1, 2013)
7. Academic Board [for recommendation] (October 3, 2013)
- 8. Executive Committee [for endorsement and forwarding] (October 23, 2013)**
9. Governing Council [for approval] (October 30, 2013)

## **PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:**

In May 2012, the Governing Council approved revisions to *the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* arising from recommendations of the Task Force on Governance (2010). The revisions involved: streamlining consideration of capital planning and capital projects; increasing minimum thresholds for consideration by various bodies; the separation of policy and procedure; and strengthening the coordination and integration of project review between and among central and divisional offices. There were also minor revisions to remove references to committees and university departments that no longer existed.

In June 2012, the Governing Council approved a new governance structure for the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC). As of July 1, 2013, a UTM Campus Council and a UTSC Campus Council has replaced the UTM (Erindale) College Council and the UTSC Council.

## **HIGHLIGHTS**

With the establishment of the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and their standing committees, a revision to the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* is required to reflect provisions in the terms of reference for the respective Campus Affairs Committees and the Campus Councils regarding consideration of capital projects. Specifically, for capital projects with a project budget over \$3 million and up to \$10 million (Approval Level 2), projects at UTM and UTSC will be considered by the respective Campus Affairs Committee rather than by the Planning and Budget Committee. Following detailed scrutiny by the respective Campus Affairs Committees and the Campus Councils, the projects will proceed to the Academic Board for its recommendation. Such projects will continue to be placed on the Board's consent agenda and be confirmed by the Executive Committee of the Governing Council.

Projects requiring Approval Level 3 would follow the same path as Approval Level 2 and then proceed to Governing Council as required. Note, that these changes do not affect the steps required for the approval of projects at the St. George campus which will continue to be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee before proceeding to the Academic Board for its recommendation. Note, too, no changes are proposed for capital projects with a project budget with a value less than \$3 million (Approval Level 1). The administration, through the Capital Project and Space Allocation Committee (CaPS) and an Executive Committee will continue to have oversight of **all** project proposals with a projected total project cost greater than \$100,000. A minor revision has been made to the *Policy* to allow for minor expenses incurred by the administration while considering the feasibility of a capital project, prior to its review through CaPS and its Executive Committee.

Some text in the *Policy* text has been rearranged to highlight that if a project will require financing as part of the funding, the project proposal must be considered by the Business Board.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Be it Resolved

THAT the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

THAT the proposed revised *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* be approved, to be effective October 31, 2013.

~~May 9, 2012~~ October 31, 2013

# **POLICY ON CAPITAL PLANNING & CAPITAL PROJECTS**

# **POLICY ON CAPITAL PLANNING AND CAPITAL PROJECTS**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1. GENERAL PLANNING MATTERS**

- A. MASTER PLANS.**
- B. CAPITAL PRIORITIES**
- C. INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL PLANS**

### **2. PLANNING PRINCIPLES**

### **3. OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS**

- A. PLANNING**
- B. APPROVALS**
- C. IMPLEMENTATION**
- D. COMPLETION**

## **WEB LINKS:**

- **CAMPUS PLANNING PRINCIPLES**  
<http://www.updc.utoronto.ca/re.htm>
- **CAMPUS MASTER PLANS**  
<http://www.updc.utoronto.ca/re.htm>
- **DESIGN STANDARDS**  
<http://www.fs.utoronto.ca/aboutus/design.htm>
- **TYPICAL PROJECT PLANNING REPORT OUTLINE**  
<http://www.updc.utoronto.ca/re.htm>
- **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
<http://www.updc.utoronto.ca/re.htm>
- **CAPITAL PROJECTS AND SPACE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
<http://www.updc.utoronto.ca/re.htm>

# POLICY ON CAPITAL PLANNING AND CAPITAL PROJECTS

## INTRODUCTION

The continuing development of a modern university campus is no easy challenge. For the University of Toronto, which possesses an extraordinary variety of architectural styles, this challenge is amplified and requires careful attention.

Given the interest of prospective faculty, students and staff in working, studying, and dreaming in an inspiring and creative physical environment, the University's commitment to inspirational design must be consistent with (and indeed, a core component of) its highest academic aspirations. It is essential that the University of Toronto, as Canada's leading research intensive university, and as an institution firmly determined to stand among the top publicly supported research intensive universities in the world, integrates this commitment to excellence into each and every dimension of planning and design related activities. The standards for design excellence should be no less exacting than those that are set in the academic sphere. Campus design has a profound impact on the character and quality of human interactions within the university community.

For the St. George Campus of the University of Toronto the challenge is to integrate new structures with the existing structures to achieve coherent design with intelligent green landscaping, to be cognizant of the cultural landscape that exists and to ensure that new landmark buildings incorporate quality designs, energy savings and sustainability features, and materials that systematically will serve to strengthen and enrich the campus, located in the heart of Canada's largest city.

The challenges and opportunities for the University of Toronto Mississauga and Scarborough campuses are distinct from those on the St. George campus. Both are located in park like settings with large conservation areas surrounding the core academic spaces. Their neighbourhoods are fast encroaching, but still held at arm's length from the core of the campus by virtue of the protected green space. Environments consistent with the highest academic aspirations, unique in character and reflective of the surrounding areas must be created.

The University's development of its physical assets should be guided by a best practices approach to physical planning, design and construction. Accordingly, this *Policy* enunciates the norms for carrying out such an approach, specifies the framework within which individual projects can evolve, and establishes the approval and reporting requirements.

This *Policy* replaces the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* approved by the Governing Council in June 2001 and subsequently revised on June 25, 2012.

## **1. GENERAL PLANNING MATTERS**

General authority for capital planning and construction is delegated to the President, who in turn delegates it to the appropriate senior officers of the University.

The planning approach begins with the development of comprehensive Master Plans for each campus followed by the systemic establishment of Capital Priorities with specific Capital Projects that can be adequately supported by the appropriate Infrastructure Renewal Plans.

### **A. CAMPUS MASTER PLANS**

The Governing Council shall adopt, from time to time, [Campus Master Plans](#) for the University's St. George, Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, as well as for other University-owned properties as required. Master Plans provide a careful evaluation and review of each campus as a whole. Such Plans address the type and quality of the public space on each campus and identify potential uses and parameters for future development following the stated Planning Principles and in support of the University's academic objectives. Master Plans should normally be reviewed every ten years. (~~weblink~~)

### **B. CAPITAL PRIORITIES**

The Administration will maintain a list of Capital Priorities. These Capital Priorities, which are the outcome of the University's academic planning processes, set out the major Capital Projects to which the University has assigned priority for a specified period of time. Such priorities are normally adopted for multi-year periods and are updated, as required, to reflect progress made and new or altered priorities. Capital Priorities include all capital projects (above a specified cost), for all campuses, which are expected to be in planning and or implementation stage during the defined planning period.

### **C. INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL**

The Administration shall establish within the annual budget framework, an allocation for infrastructure renewal and maintenance and deferred maintenance for each campus. Such work will be managed to maximize the effective expenditure of the available funding, leveraging other capital projects where possible. Much of the renewal and maintenance work is non-discretionary and is required to comply with legislation or regulations or to ensure safety of building occupants. Governance approvals are normally not required for individual projects, beyond the approval of the annual funding amount.

In addition to these more routine projects for maintenance and infrastructure upgrading, which are integral to Infrastructure Renewal, individual infrastructure projects above \$3 million dollars will require approval through the capital project approval process described in Section 3B below. The preparation of the capital approval request for such infrastructure projects will be the responsibility of the designated Facilities and Services Group on each campus and will be in a format established by the administration from time to time.

## **2. PLANNING PRINCIPLES**

Campus Master Plans and Capital Project Plans should be developed and implemented in the context of principles that express the University's commitment to the orderly and responsible development and use of its assets. Such principles extend to the development of individual projects that are integral to the academic mission of the University, and which should provide examples of high quality design that incorporate the appropriate functionality and environmental responsibility.

Furthermore, individual projects should be satisfactorily integrated into the comprehensive Campus Master Plans of the University. The [Planning Principles](#), which are established from time to time by the Administration, constitute the enduring interests of the University and are to be taken into account in all detailed planning.

### **3. OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS**

#### **A. PROJECT PLANNING**

- **PROJECT COMMITTEE.** A Project Committee shall be formed at the outset of project planning and will include representatives of the project's users, the staff responsible for campus and facilities planning, the staff responsible for project execution and the staff responsible for building operations. The project committee will continue to exist until the completion of a project.
- The membership of the Project Committee will be assembled by the Vice-President and Provost (or designate) with input from the Dean(s), Principal(s) of the relevant academic divisions and or sectors for whom the project is undertaken. All Project Committees will include faculty, staff and student representation and may include the Dean/Principal or designate.
- The Vice-President and Provost (or designate) will designate a representative from each of these constituencies to serve on a working project executive committee (PEC).
- The Vice-President and Provost (or designate) will appoint the Chair of the Project Committee from among the members of the project executive committee.
- A detailed Project Planning Report or equivalent capital request (see below) is required for all projects where the budget is anticipated to be greater than \$3 million.
- An abridged Project Planning Report, addressing appropriate issues, will be required for projects where the budget is anticipated to be \$3 million or less and where the services of an architect will be required.
- **PROJECT PLANNING REPORTS** (~~weblink~~), are prepared for all individual Capital Projects for which Project Committees are established.
- The [Project Planning Report](#) typically will specify all desired functional requirements and/or special facilities consistent with the academic priorities and requirements and will address:
  - the program to be accommodated in the space;
  - the project's conformity with the University's overall physical planning principles;
  - reference to the quality standards anticipated for the particular project;
  - the special needs of the Project, e.g. exceptionally durable materials, architecturally significant exterior components, unique landscaping elements, etc. which should be identified for costing purposes.



- The Project Planning Report must include:
  - provisional estimates of the cost of the project (the project budget),
  - cost escalation,
  - the potential sources of funding,
  - the details of a projected cash flow analysis with respect to both revenues and expenditures,
  - the operating costs and sources of revenue to cover the operating costs, and
  - other key elements of the project including site and space.

## B. PROJECT APPROVALS

The administration will establish a **Capital Project and Space Allocation Committee (CaPS) and an Executive Committee** to review all project proposals with a projected total project cost greater than \$100,000 ~~before any expense is incurred (weblink)~~. The CaPS and its Executive Committee membership is intended, collectively, to have expertise in capital planning, construction, design, property and utilities management, finance and budget. To that end, it will include senior staff from the institutional offices responsible for the financing, planning, implementation and maintenance of facilities, as well as, the appropriate academic and divisional representation. The Vice President and Provost and the Vice President, University Operations will receive advice on Level 2 and Level 3 capital projects from the Executive Committee of CaPS.

### All projects requiring short and long term financing

If a project will require financing as part of the funding, the project proposal must be considered by the Business Board.

#### **Project Budget \$3 million or less: (Approval Level 1)**

- Authority to approve projects on the St. George campus, with a value less than \$3 million and for all other applications that fall under the responsibility of the CaPS Committee is delegated to the CaPS Committee established by the Vice-President University Operations
- Authority to approve projects with a value less than \$3 million on the UTM and UTSC campuses is delegated to the UTM Space Planning and Management Committee and the UTSC Campus Design and Development Committee established by the Principal and Vice-President of the respective campus.

#### **Project Budget over \$3 million and up to \$10 million (Approval level 2)**

- Capital projects over \$3 million and up to \$10 million will be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee for projects at the St. George campus and by the respective Campus Affairs Committees and Campus Councils for projects at University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough -and recommended to the Academic Board for consideration. -It is expected that such projects will be placed on the Board's consent agenda and be confirmed by the Executive Committee of the Governing Council. Execution of such projects is approved by the Business Board.~~If a project will require financing as part of the funding, the project proposal must considered by the Business Board.~~

#### **Project Budget over \$10 million ~~and all projects requiring short and long term financing~~ (Approval level 3)**

- Proposals for capital projects exceeding \$10 million must million must be considered by the appropriate Boards and Committees of Governing Council on the joint recommendation of the Vice President and Provost and the Vice President, University Operations. -The Planning and Budget Committee will consider projects at the St. George campus and the respective Campus Affairs Committees and Campus Councils will consider projects at University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough and recommend them to the Academic Board for consideration. Normally, they will require approval of the Governing Council. Execution of such projects is approved by the Business Board.

### **Project Budget Increases**

- For projects requiring Level 3 approval, any budget increase exceeding the lesser of 10% or \$3M of the original total project cost, and where funds are available, must be approved by the Business Board.
- Project budget increases required for projects receiving Level 1 and 2 approval must be approved by the same authority providing the original authorization. In a case where a budget increase pushes the project into the next approval level, and funds are available, the spending increase must be approved by the authority of that higher level.

### **Changes in Scope**

- Irrespective of cost issues, a re-submission to the appropriate approval level is required where significant changes to a space program have been introduced.

## **C. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

The President will delegate responsibility for project implementation to the Vice President, University Operations or the Vice President UTM or UTSC (for Level 1 projects) as appropriate subject to the parameters established through the approval of the Project Planning Report and in consultation with the Project Committee, the Design Review Committee, (weblink) and other relevant bodies established from time to time.

The President is authorized to ensure that appropriate project management procedures are established to ensure proper implementation of approved capital projects. Such procedures must:

- Ensure that the interests of the University and of individual project users are taken into account in all projects.
- Ensure that design standards appropriate to the University are established, reviewed and updated regularly and provided to each Project Committee and to all architects and consultants engaged for any project.
- Ensure that each project which has an exterior design component or public area is reviewed from a design perspective by a committee established for this purpose (the Design Review Committee, weblink). In making this provision, the University seeks to obtain a level of advice commensurate with its desire to build in ways which provide outstanding examples of the work which the design profession can contribute to a university environment.
- Ensure that, in general, projects are completed on time and on budget.
- Ensure that any discrepancies that arise between the project as planned and the project as implementation progresses are resolved in a timely fashion.
- Ensure that procedures for the selection of architects, engineers, other professional services firms and contractors are established and that they comply with the University's procurement policy and with applicable legislation.
- Ensure that all regulatory requirements are met.
- Ensure that any project that is likely to exceed the approved budget has the increase approved by the appropriate level.

- Ensure that project status reports for all projects over \$3 million are provided on a timely basis to project committees, to funding agencies and to the Business Board.

#### **D. PROJECT COMPLETION**

At the completion of a Capital Project, a Project Completion Report is required and submitted to the Business Board. The purpose of the report is to confirm that financial closure of the project has occurred and to identify any budget and schedule variances, positive or negative. (weblink).