

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

January 18, 2010

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Monday, January 18, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Chair)
Professor Wendy Rotenberg (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Denise Belsham
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Joseph Desloges
Ms Shirley Hoy
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Angelo Melino
Professor David Mock
Ms Carole Moore
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Mr. W. John Switzer
Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. Gregory Louis West

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi

Regrets:

Professor Parth Markand Bhatt
Miss Tulika Gupta

Non-voting Assessors:

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

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life
Ms Andrea Carter, Employment Equity Officer and Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act
(AODA) Advisor
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Professor Eugene Fiume, former Chair, Department of Computer Science

Professor Gretchen Kerr, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

Ms Helen Lashiotakis, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

Ms Tanya Lewis, Director, Accessibility Services

Ms. Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

Professor David Zingg, Director, University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies

ITEMS 3, 4, 5, 6 AND 7 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting (October 28, 2009)

Report Number 133 of the meeting of October 28, 2009 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meetings

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

3. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Renovation of Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto at Mississauga

Ms Sisam advised the Committee that the existing chemistry laboratories at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) had been in service since 1970 and had undergone essentially no renovation or modernization since that time. At a cost of \$4.24 million, the project would be fully funded by the University of Toronto at Mississauga and will add 958 net assignable square metres (nasm). The renovation was important for safety and was needed to enhance the student experience. It will also provide some relief for instructional activity permitting the elimination of Saturday classes. It will enable classes to be held from Mondays to Fridays and would allow for better utilization of time for students. The project mirrored the one done at the Davenport wing of the Lash Miller Building on the St. George campus, which had been welcomed by the students. Mr. Donoghue confirmed that the renovation would provide for safer facilities and a more efficient use of space.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That the Project Planning Report for the University of Toronto at Mississauga Renovation of Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "A"](#), be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope, comprising renovation of 958 nasm in the South Building at a total project cost of \$4.24 million be approved with the full funding from the University of Toronto at Mississauga operating budget.

4. University of Toronto at Mississauga Construction of Parking Deck

Mr. Donoghue stated that, in the last three years, student enrollment at UTM had grown by more than 33%. Since 2001, the student population had increased from 5,000 to more than 11,000. With this growth had come remarkable expectations within the community concerning parking on campus. Based on an initial ratio of 30 parking spaces for a population of 100, the current total campus headcount of over 13,000, including faculty and staff, would require 4000 parking spaces. During the early years of the campus growth, a number of initiatives had been successfully put in place to

4. University of Toronto at Mississauga Construction of Parking (cont'd)

ameliorate the effect of the increase in demand for on-campus parking; these included an automated ride-share program, designation of preferential carpool spaces and, most dramatically, improved public transit services.

As a result of the two fast-track construction projects currently underway, the Instructional Centre and the Health Sciences Complex, existing parking spaces had been lost. Approximately 300 spots had been lost with the construction of the Instructional Centre on what had been Lot number 2 – one of the most popular lots on campus. A further and immediate need had materialized for 140 spaces because of the siting of the Medical Academy building. To add to that, there was a temporary demand for 130 spaces related to the construction traffic that had to be accommodated as there was no parking in the surrounding area. This had, therefore, led to a dramatic change in the supply numbers.

The campus leadership had tried to soften the demand by introducing measures such as capping the number of permits issued and establishing waiting lists for parking lots. Utilization studies that had been done showed that during peak hours only 30 to 40 spots were available across seven parking lots. A number of alternatives had been looked at during the summer and fall. The administration had considered the possibility of renting space in the nearby shopping malls. The potential plan had been to rent the space so that students could use the U-Pass, or the University could use shuttle buses to transfer students to campus. However, externally, there had been no interest in that proposal. The administration had also examined economical alternatives to paved parking. However, encroachment of the green space that was a part of the campus landscape was not seen as consistent with UTM values. Apart from these internal issues, there would also have been a lengthy process in seeking permission from the Credit Valley Conservation Authority.

Mr. Donoghue added that it was not possible to build an underground garage, because of the building schedules and cost. The possibility of a fully enclosed garage had also been considered a few years ago but had not been feasible.

Mr. Donoghue stated that a solution to the problem had been developed that would add 252 spaces to the existing parking inventory. By building a single-level parking deck above parking lot 8 at site 3, the environmental impact on the campus would be minimized, and the issue of aesthetics of the parking deck would be addressed.

UTM's Parking Ancillary could: (i) readily carry the cost for the estimated total project of \$6.5 million, financed by an internal University loan and amortized over a ten-year period; (ii) do so with no extraordinary parking fee increase beyond the 3% per annum already planned; (iii) still create growing operational and capital improvement reserves against unforeseen contingencies; and, (iv) within eight years, make a steady contribution toward the Operating Budget. The two small operating deficits projected for the next two years would be more than offset by accumulated operating reserves.

Mr. Donoghue noted that, while there might be an interest by third parties to undertake the required capital investment of \$6.5 million, the incremental interest cost of the necessary return on investment and a longer, 15-year amortization period would add more than \$3 million to the University's overall cost.

The matter had been discussed at length at UTM by the Parking and Transportation sub-committee, the Resource Planning and Priorities Committee, and the Erindale College Council and had received unanimous support. It had been determined that while the project timelines were very aggressive, they could be met through a project completed on a design/build basis with the use of pre-cast technology. Preparations would begin as soon as the spring exam period was over, with a targeted completion date of mid-August.

4. University of Toronto at Mississauga Campus Construction of Parking Deck (cont'd)

In response to questions from a member about the possibility of building an underground lot, the cost of the project, and its urgency, Mr. Donoghue emphasized that UTM remained a commuter campus. Although the University continued to negotiate with Mississauga Transit, public transit remained limited, and the demand for parking spaces was ongoing. It was important to note that UTM differed from the St. George campus, which was supported by an extensive TTC system with more frequent service. With respect to the underground parking option, there had been limitations in terms of opportunity and cost. The possibility of an underground parking lot on the North Soccer Field had been considered. However, apart from the cost, such a project had not been feasible because that was the location for the geothermal plant.

Mr. Donoghue then addressed the issue of parking rates and whether there was a sense how market driven they were. He stated that the rates could be incrementally increased over a ten-year period without any extraordinary increases. The current rates were at the highest level the market could bear, and it would not be feasible to consider any increases over the proposed 3%. Mr. Donoghue referred to the schedule of rates submitted as attachment "F" of the proposal. Mr. Donoghue stated that the decision to use the \$6.5 million had not been made lightly and the proposal was believed to be the most appropriate, given the circumstances.

In response to a question about initiatives such as bike lanes and car pooling, Mr. Donoghue stated that a Bike Share program did exist at UTM. As well, the administration was in ongoing discussion with the City of Mississauga with respect to bike lanes and improvements in transit connections. Mr. Donoghue reiterated that a car pooling program also existed on the UTM campus; there were 100 car pool spaces in the parking lots. Although these were the best spots on campus, initially, they had not been well utilized. However, the car-pool spots were now being used to capacity. While Mr. Donoghue agreed with a member's suggestion that the number of such spaces could be expanded, he commented that, in reality, such initiatives had a marginal impact.

A member suggested that it would be helpful for future project planning reports (PPR) to indicate more clearly whether the proposed structure would be able to support additional levels. Secondary effects addressed in the PPRs should also include an assessment of the impact on parking spots. The member also asked whether future parking requirements had been considered when the storm water management pond had been put in place. Mr. Donoghue replied by stating that there had been no other suitable location for the pond.

In response to the member's question of whether it might be more cost effective to purchase transit passes for staff and faculty than to build the parking facility, Mr. Donoghue reiterated that many members of the UTM community could not use public transit to commute to and from the campus because of limited routes and frequency of service.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT, subject to the concurrence of the Business Board and the University Affairs Board, the proposed construction of a single-level parking deck, on the site of an existing surface parking lot and with a capacity of approximately 250 spaces, be approved at a total cost not to exceed \$6.5 million with funding to be provided by a loan to be repaid by the UTM Parking ancillary over a period of ten (10) years, beginning in fiscal 2010/11.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#).

5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre for Collaborative Interactive Digital Media

Ms Sisam presented a proposal for a new Centre for Collaborative Interactive Digital Media (CCIDM). The Centre will combine the activities of existing laboratories including the Dynamic Graphics Project (DGP), the Knowledge Media Design Institute (KMDI), and other computer systems research groups. The estimated Total Project Cost for the renovation and construction portion of the project was \$3,187,000. Funding sources for the construction of the project included \$1,493,500 each from the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ontario Research Fund (ORF), and \$200,000 from the Faculty of Arts and Science. The funding award would allow for the creation of new space (infill) and the renovation of existing space in the Bahen Centre for Information Technology to accommodate the CCIDM's activities and personnel, as well as the purchase of new equipment for its research initiatives. The variety of laboratories and research spaces of the CCIDM would require approximately 890 nasm. The strategy for accommodating the CCIDM at the Bahen Centre involved: (a) the renovation of approximately 845 gross square metres (gsm) of existing fifth floor space (mainly DGP and systems laboratory space), and (b) the creation of approximately 210 nasm (290 gsm) of new space on the fifth and fourth floors by infilling two new floors within the current three-storey volume of Room 3200 - a Department of Computer Science study space. The construction of the proposed project would occur in two phases. The first phase, the structural infill of the two floor levels, would commence in May 2010 with a projected occupancy by December 2010. The second phase, the interior renovation, would begin in May 2011 with occupancy by December 2011.

A member commented that this was an interesting proposal and asked whether the expected collaborative work with other groups would be formally structured. In response, Professor Fiume, stated that, given the type of work that would be conducted in the Centre, some space would have to be reconfigured on a year-by-year basis to establish different projects. KMDI might choose to develop projects on an *ad hoc* basis to support the academic mission of the Centre.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That the Project Planning Report for the Centre for Collaborative Interactive Digital Media, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "C"](#), be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$3,187,000 with funding as follows:

Canada Foundation for Innovation	\$ 1,493,500
Ontario Research Fund	\$ 1,493,500
Faculty of Arts & Science	\$ 200,000
Total	\$ 3,187,000

6. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Centre for Microsatellite Science and Technology

Ms Sisam said that the Space Flight Laboratory at the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies (UTIAS) facility had also been a recipient of CFI funding. The construction of a new Microsatellite Science and Technology Centre (MSTC) would provide for research assembly and testing facilities, with a total project cost of \$5.4 million. It was expected that approximately 1,115 nasm would be added. The award funding would assist in alleviating the current lack of infrastructure by creating a new facility at the Downsview campus. The project would provide more opportunity for expansion and greater utilization of space.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. That the Project Planning Report for the Microsatellite Science and Technology Centre, a copy of which is attached hereto as [Appendix "D"](#), be approved in principle.
2. That the project scope as identified in the Project Planning Report be approved in principle at a Total Project Cost of \$5,400,000 with funding as follows:

Canada Foundation for Innovation	\$ 2,700,000
<u>Ontario Research Fund</u>	<u>\$ 2,700,000</u>
Total	\$ 5,400,000

7. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program and Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of Physical Health and Education (B.P.H.E.) Program

Ms Garner advised the Committee that the Faculty of Physical Education and Health proposed a new Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) program and a revised Bachelor of Physical Health and Education (B.P.H.E.) program. There was increasing attention to the importance of exercise for health promotion. Recent legislative changes had made Kinesiology a regulated health profession in Ontario. Faculty experts expected each of these factors would increase demand for these programs in the coming years. A core foundational curriculum was proposed for both the B.P.H.E. and the B.Kin. in the first two years. The goal of the curricula in years 3 and 4 was to provide sufficient depth to meet the learning objectives of either programme while also requiring breadth courses to ensure a multidisciplinary curriculum. The B.P.H.E. would require a stronger concentration in the social sciences in the optional choices, the B.Kin. in the biophysical sciences.

The Faculty had consulted broadly with current students, alumni, professionals in the field, and colleagues within and outside the University. The proposal had been approved by the Faculty of Physical Education and Health Council.

There were no resource implications for the University's operating budget from the revised B.P.H.E. and new B.Kin. program. The costs had been discussed with the Planning and Budget Office and had been approved by the Vice-Provost, Academic Operations Office. Costs associated with the upgrade of new equipment and implementation of a transition plan for current first-year students would be covered by the Faculty. There were no proposed changes in the Faculty's overall undergraduate enrolments.

7. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program and Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of Physical Health and Education (B.P.H.E.) Program

(cont'd)

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program, as described in the proposal dated November 27, 2009, be approved commencing for students admitted for September 2009; and
2. THAT the proposed revisions to the Bachelor of Physical Health and Education (B.P.H.E.) program, as described in the proposal dated November 27, 2009, be approved commencing for students admitted for September 2009.

Documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "E"](#).

8. Annual Report: Design Review Committee, 2008-2009

Ms Sisam began by informing the Committee that the Design Review Committee (DRC) comprised external architects and landscape architects who were friends of the University, governors, and faculty from the design profession. This Committee provided a critical review of the capital projects in the design stage. The purpose of the DRC was to ensure that project plans fit within the context of the urban plan of the University. The DRC also took into account the broader concerns and issues articulated in the campus master plans. The University had achieved huge success with its capital projects and had won numerous awards over the years – both nationally and internationally. In part the success could be credited to the consultants and to the review of projects by the DRC.

The external DRC members met on their own time on a monthly basis for three hours. They met again if issues needed to be further reviewed. The members were available for advice and willingly volunteered their time because of their fondness for the University campus.

The Design Review Committee had met eight times between July, 2008 and June, 2009 to review eight projects on the three University of Toronto campuses.

Ms Sisam provided a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the following projects.

University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Instructional Centre. This had been a fast moving Knowledge Infrastructure Program Project valued at \$70 million. This project would create classrooms of varying sizes. The heating for the Centre would be provided by a geothermal plant. The completion date for the project was March 2011.

University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Instructional Centre. The project involves the creation of classroom and other needed space on campus. It was valued at \$78 million and was funded through the Knowledge Infrastructure Program (\$70 million) and operating budget at UTSC (\$8 million). The project marked the first phase north campus expansion of UTSC. The Instructional Centre would also include a café and student space. The projected completion date of this project was March 2011.

St. George Campus Robarts Library. This important revitalization project would address poor and ageing space in the library. Changes through this project, valued at \$25 million, would include a glass enclosure on the entry stairs leading up from St. George Street, creating

8. Annual Report: Design Review Committee, 2008-2009
(cont'd)

a larger lobby and adding more study space. In addition, improvements would occur on many more floors of the building. Ms Sisam stated that, subject to the availability of more funding, a pavilion was planned at the rear of the library along Huron Street. The pavilion would create a reading room and more study space. An addition in this area had been originally planned when the library had been first constructed.

In response to a member's question, Ms Sisam stated that the DRC looked at capital projects valued at \$2 million or more. It also reviewed projects that involved renovations to significant public spaces and that would be of interest to the broad university community. It was important to know that the DRC did not have any budget associated with it. The discussions addressed potential improvements, the cost of which would be within the existing project budget. Further, it was interesting to note that the consultants welcomed the professional advice from the DRC.

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

9. Annual Report: Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Approvals
(a) Annual Report on Approvals on Projects between \$50,000 and \$ 2 Million (2008-09)

Ms Sisam provided information on this report and stated that the one noteworthy change was the increase in the number and value of projects compared to the similar report presented last year. Due, in part, to the success of the Office of the Vice-President, Government, Institutional and Community Relations, the University had received \$63.5 million as one-time-only year-end funding under the Capital Renewal Program (CRP). The University welcomed the funding which had been distributed across the campuses towards projects that would improve services and ensure greater safety. Some funds had also been directed to reduce borrowing costs for eligible projects under construction. The deadline for the completion of the projects was March 2010.

In the discussion that followed, Ms Sisam was asked by a member whether the prices for the projects were coming in at a premium. Ms Sisam replied that though there was competition in the construction industry, projects of this nature appear not to have been affected. The costs were in line with those initially budgeted. This was different from the period of Superbuild funding which was provided at the same time as the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) funding. That was the period when, for example, the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research and the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building had been built. At that time, hospitals and other institutions also received funding through these programs and created a competitive contractor market. Mr. Donoghue noted that part of the reason for the University's success in keeping construction costs down was the speed at which the University moved through the design process. The University was able to get the contractors much earlier. Ms Sisam concluded by saying that in many instances institutions had been awarded funding for buildings when they had not finished the planning process. In comparison, the University had anticipated the current round of funding by bringing project reports for approval to the Governing Council even before the funding had been acquired.

10. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak began her address by acknowledging that the disaster in Haiti had personally touched many members of the University community. The flag at Simcoe Hall had been put at half mast and a Service of Solidarity was to be held at 12 noon on January 21 at the Great Hall in Hart House.

Next, Professor Misak advised the Committee that a memorandum had been sent out to the Deans regarding the endowment payment. She noted that last year had been a difficult year with the loss of the endowment payout. The divisions had struggled and had made great efforts to ensure that student financial aid and support for academic programs remained intact. Professor Misak added that she was pleased to advise that this year, as previously projected; there would be a payout. The deans had been notified that there would be a floor payout rate of \$5.00 per unit in order to allow divisions to engage in their budgeting process for the 2010-2011 year. That was an absolute minimum and the desire was to achieve a number closer to past years. In response to a member's question on how this payout compared with previous years, Professor Misak stated that typically the range would be in the low \$7 per unit. Ms Garner added that, at 5 per cent of market value, the current payout was similar to the previous one in 2008, with the total being close to \$62 million.

Finally, Professor Misak provided an update on a request to the provincial government many months ago. The request had been made for fungibility between masters and doctoral spaces in the graduate expansion plans. In principle, some partial fungibility had been granted. The Planning and Budget office had been working hard to determine how best existing (or planned for) doctoral spots could be replaced with masters spots. There was a tremendous demand for professional masters spaces. Ultimately the decision was made to exchange 250 doctoral spots for 500 masters spaces. Letters had been sent to the deans to advise them of their allocation, pending final approval from the Ministry. This approval was expected to be received by the end of January or in early February.

10(a). Annual Report: Ontario Disability Act Accessibility Plan 2009-2010, University of Toronto

Professor Misak introduced Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity, to present the *Annual Report: Ontario Disability Act Accessibility Plan 2009-2010, University of Toronto*.

Professor Hildyard stated that the University had to work with two pieces of legislation. These were the Ontario Disability Act, 2001 (ODA) and the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disability Act, 2005 (AODA). The report had to cover both aspects and this exercise would have to continue until the earlier legislation was repealed. Under the 2001 Act, the University maintained its four subcommittees to examine Built environment, Pedagogy, Mental Health, and Student Life.

The University had looked a number of initiatives that had been put in place centrally and at the divisional level. In fact, in a number of equity areas the initiatives had come from the divisions.

With respect to the AODA, the University had focused on the approved and anticipated Standards. The first approved Standard was Customer Service, which required every employee and volunteer of the University to be trained in appropriate customer service for persons with disabilities. A pamphlet had been distributed to all employees and volunteers with customer service related activities. Additional more specialized training was available online.

Within the course of this year, two more guidelines were expected to be released – the Employment standard and the Information and Communication standard. It was anticipated that University's existing policies and practices would meet the requirements of the Employment standard.

10(a). Annual Report: Ontario Disability Act Accessibility Plan 2009-2010, University of Toronto
(cont'd)

However for the Information and Communication standard, a fair amount of work would be needed to address issues of accessibility.

There were two other standards – Built Environment and Transportation – that would eventually be released. It was unlikely that these would be introduced by Government in the immediate future.

11. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, March 3, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

12. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Secretary

Chair