

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 119 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
May 22, 2007

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 at 5:00 pm in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Chair)
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and
Provost

Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning
and Budget

Ms Diana A. R. Alli
Mr. Kristofer T. Coward

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor Pekka K. Sinervo

Non-voting Assessors:

Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning
Mr. Nick Zouravloff, Acting Chief Capital
Projects Officer

Ms Carole Moore
Mr. Tim Reid

Regrets:

Professor Stewart Aitchison
Professor John Coleman
Professor Miriam Diamond
Professor Jane Gaskell
Professor Brad Inwood
Professor Gregory Jump
Ms Theresa J. C. Pazonis
Mr. Stephen C. Smith
Mr. Patrick Wong

Secretariat:

Ms Cristina Oke
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

In Attendance:

Mr. Chris Caners, Sustainability Coordinator, Sustainability Office
Mr. Stuart Chan, Work/Study Coordinator, Sustainability Office
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Priorities, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Professor Beth Savan, Centre for Environment; Co-Chair, Environmental Protection Advisory Committee; Director, Sustainability Office
Ms Stephanie Tan, University of Toronto Intramural Sports Council
Ms Ashley Taylor, Greenhouse Gas Inventory Coordinator, Sustainability Office

ITEMS 4, 6, and 7 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting (April 16, 2007)

Report Number 118 of the meeting of April 16, 2007 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Goel deferred making a report to allow the maximum time possible for consideration of the agenda items.

4. Capital Project: Project Planning Report - Relocation of Capital Projects and Facilities and Services

Ms Sisam informed members that the proposed project to relocate Capital Projects and Facilities and Services would permit the University to realize some of its academic planning priorities. She explained that a few years earlier the Faculty of Arts and Science had allocated the Department of Mathematics to the sixth floor of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT)¹. The planned second phase of that project would involve the allocation of the remainder of the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics to space in 215 Huron Street, consolidating the departments². Until now, there had been no opportunity for that move to occur. With the approval of the St. George Examination Facility to be located at 255/257 McCaul Street, the top floor of that building would be renovated to accommodate the two administrative divisions. By relocating the Department of Capital Projects and much of the Department of Facilities and Services, space would be released, allowing for the phase two expansion of the Departments of Mathematics and Statistics.

Ms Sisam noted that the proposed 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.

A member commented that the Office of Environmental Health and Safety was located on the seventh floor of 215 Huron Street and asked whether it would also be relocated. Ms Sisam indicated that there were plans to move the Department of Philosophy from the ninth floor of 215 Huron Street to the Medical Arts Building, thus releasing further space in 215 Huron Street. Reorganization of space in 215 Huron Street would be examined as a future project.

¹ The Project Planning Committee Report for the Department of Mathematics, Phase 1 was approved by the Governing Council on December 16, 2004.

² There is the potential for linking the sixth floor of the BCIT to the seventh floor of 215 Huron by the construction of a bridge.

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

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE 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 be approved and funded through borrowing.

Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

5. Sustainability Office Annual Report, 2007

Ms Sisam said that the Sustainability Office reported jointly to the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and the Office of the Vice-President, Business Affairs. Its mandate was to achieve energy conservation. The Office was led by Dr. Beth Savan, and it included an energetic group of students who were interested in the environment. The Sustainability Office worked with the Department of Facilities and Services and other operational staff and faculty to implement initiatives that would ultimately lead to operational savings.

Ms Sisam noted that principles of environmental sustainability would form an integral part of the design and implementation of the renovation of 255/257 McCaul Street. She stated that the Sustainability Office had originally been funded through a grant from the Toronto Atmosphere Fund and had secured funding from the Student Experience Fund. It was now funded by the Department of Facilities and Services, the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), and Campus and Facilities Planning. Following on the creation of the Environmental Affairs Office at UTM and the Sustainability Office at the St. George campus, UTSC had recently established an analogous office. Tri-campus planning and initiatives would continue to be developed, working towards common goals of energy and resource conservation.

Dr. Savan reported that the Sustainability Office was very pleased with its accomplishments, and she expressed gratitude for the many contributions of its partners. The Office's mission was to create a culture of sustainability at the University that would be reflected in its functions and operations, resulting in tangible environmental, economic and social benefits to the whole University community. Dr. Savan said that the University of Toronto had an opportunity to develop unique approaches to sustainability. Through the tri-campus model, there was a chance to work with faculty, staff and students across all three campuses. All of the initiatives based in the Sustainability Office were rigorously monitored research projects. Through those projects, and thanks to generous funding from external partners and support within the University, it was possible to apply the research results. The Office's work had been widely recognized, and the University of Toronto had been short listed for the City of Toronto's 2006 Green Toronto Awards for excellence in energy conservation.

One of the initiatives highlighted by Dr. Savan was a project to develop an inventory of energy use within buildings on campus. The Greenhouse Gas Inventory initiative, which was coordinated by Ashley Taylor, was being extended from the St. George campus to UTM and UTSC. By obtaining and analyzing historical data, it would become easier to identify areas and buildings on campus

5. Sustainability Office Annual Report, 2007 (cont'd)

where there were opportunities to enhance campus sustainability. Research into transportation and waste was also underway.

Dr. Savan pointed to the achievements of lighting and chiller retrofit projects that had resulted in a 14% decrease in electricity use on campus. Further retrofit projects were now in progress. Through a student-led research project on the St. George campus, Rewire, over 3,000 students and staff had been reached, leading to behaviour change and a 6% - 12% reduction in their consumption of electricity. Dr. Savan emphasized that student engagement was critical to the success of the sustainability initiatives and acknowledged the Sustainability Office staff and students present at the meeting.

Discussion

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following:

(a) Student Participation

A member commented on the positive student experiences facilitated by the Sustainability Office and asked what types of students had been engaged in its initiatives. Dr. Savan indicated that while some graduate students had been involved, the majority were undergraduate students from a range of faculties and disciplines including Applied Science and Engineering, Arts and Science, Management and Law. Approximately one hundred students per year participated on the St. George campus through courses, work-study programs, and part-time employment. There was significant student involvement on the UTM campus, and the recently-established UTSC office also had a goal of student engagement. Professor Savan added that the Sustainability Office worked closely with the University of Toronto Student's Union (UTSU) on projects and that the paper conservation and transportation projects were student initiatives.

(b) Sustainability Ranking

Referring to a report released in January, 2007 by the Sustainable Endowments Institute, a member asked if there was any notable area for improvement for the University, given the grade of B- that it had been assigned. Dr. Savan replied that the Institute had provided a ranking for sustainability of the one hundred best-endowed public and private universities in the United States and Canada. While not many Canadian institutions had been included in the report, the University had placed in the top quartile of the schools evaluated. Of particular note was the A grade received by the university administration for leadership in sustainability. The Institute had drawn attention to investment priorities and shareholder engagement. Professor Goel commented that with improved clarity of communications from the University of Toronto Asset Management (UTAM), it was anticipated that the University's grade in some of the categories where it scored lower would improve in the future. However, it should be noted that the grade of B- was an average grade.

(c) Building by Building Inventory

A member asked whether results of the building by building inventory of energy use would be made available to the public. Dr. Savan stated that the results of the inventory of St. George campus building were available online³.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair thanked Dr. Savan, the staff, and the students present, and he asked them to convey the Committee's thanks to the other participants for their efforts and achievements. He also thanked Ms Sisam for her contributions.

³ http://www.sustainability.utoronto.ca/ghg-inventory/index_html

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 effects⁴, 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.

⁴ Several parking spaces would need to be relocated elsewhere on campus.

7. Capital Project: Interim Project Planning Report – Student Commons (cont'd)

Ms Sisam reported that the Project Planning Committee had recommended a space program of approximately 3300 net assignable square metres, however, that was subject to change once student leaders had consulted with their peers in the Fall 2007. At that time, capital funding and operating costs would be determined. It was expected that students would contribute to the costs of the Student Commons in the form of a levy, proposed through a referendum planned to be held in the fall. Occupancy costs for the facility would be outside of the University's operating budget.

Professor Goel stated that the Project Planning Report was an interim one that considered the assignment of site. The University had made a commitment to the students to 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 UTM and UTSC campuses. The hope was that outstanding issues for both the Varsity Centre and the Student Commons project would be addressed in a timely manner, so that decisions of whether or not to proceed with each project would be made together. If only one of the two projects were to proceed, its design would be impacted, given the proposed shared common elements of the facilities.

Members praised the proposal to provide additional student activity space on campus. However, some concern was expressed about the proposed location on the north end of campus. It was thought that health sciences students, whose course-related activities were generally located on the south end of campus, might feel somewhat removed from the new Student Commons and Varsity Centre.

In response, Professor Goel noted that the Student Commons would be only one large node of student activity, along with others such as Hart House, and centres within the colleges. There had been developments in the Medical Sciences Building for enhanced student use, and a number of health sciences students also made use of space in partner hospitals and affiliated institutions. The accessibility of the nodes was most important, particularly given the University's focus of engaging commuter students, many of whom were Faculty of Arts and Science students, who might not otherwise participate in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities on campus. The proximity to the east-west/north-south subway lines and to the University Avenue and Bloor Street bus routes in the northern part of the campus was a significant advantage.

Professor Sinervo expressed his support for the Student Commons. He noted that further work would need to be carried out so that detailed use of the facility would be provided in the final report, ensuring that students' needs would be met.

The University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU) had prepared a discussion paper and survey of students' needs in March 2007 and had compiled a "wish list". The University would work with student leaders to provide input on the form of the final report.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Interim Project Planning Report for the Student Commons on the St. George Campus be approved in principle, and that a portion of site 12 be assigned for this project, co-locating activities with Varsity Centre for High Performance Sport.
2. THAT approval of the final report be contingent on identification of the total capital project cost, operating costs, funding and governance of the proposed facility.

8. Design Review Committee Annual Report

Ms Sisam presented the 2005-2006 annual report of the Design Review Committee (DRC) for information. She reported that during the period of July, 2005 to June, 2006, the DRC had met nine times to review a total of sixteen different projects on the three University of Toronto campuses. The DRC comprised volunteers from within the University as well as external members of the community who had an interest in the development of the University campuses. The DRC members were dedicated individuals who considered the broader context of interface of University buildings with the campus, the city and the environment. The City of Toronto had recognized the work of the DRC, and it had recently established a municipal design panel modeled on the DRC. The efforts of the DRC had been successful, as evidenced by the numerous awards and recognition of the University's capital projects and open space initiatives on all three campuses.

Among the projects highlighted were the following:

- Recreation, Athletics and Wellness Centre at UTM;
- Centre for Information Technology at UTM;
- Hazel McCallion Academic Learning Centre at UTM;
- Arts and Administration Building at UTSC;
- Philosopher's Walk – Bennett Gates;
- Davenport Garden;
- Varsity Centre;
- Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building;
- Multi Faith Centre.

Members commended the work of the Design Review Committee, noting that many of the spaces that had been created were greatly used and enjoyed by students.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair thanked Ms Sisam and asked her to convey to the members of the Design Review Committee gratitude for their work, which benefited the entire University.

9. Items for Information:

(a) Committee on Barrier Free Access Annual Report

The Committee received for information the Committee on Barrier Free Access Annual Report. There were no questions.

(b) Student Experience Fund, 2007-08

The Chair noted that the allocations from the Student Experience Fund did not require approval by governance, as the amount allocated to the Fund had not been established as one of the Operating Budget Special Funds in the 2006-07 Budget Report. The allocations were presented for information. No questions were raised.

10. Date of the Next Meeting (Fall, 2007)

The Chair reminded members that the meeting had been the final scheduled meeting of the 2006-07 governance year. The meeting schedule for 2007-08 was currently being finalized, and would be available in June.

11. Other Business

(a) Thank you

On behalf of the Governing Council the Chair thanked members of the Committee, and particularly the assessors, members of the Agenda Planning Group, and the Vice-Chair Miriam Diamond, for their diligence and commitment over the past year. He observed that the work of the Committee was crucial to the governance of the University, and that members' efforts were appreciated.

Professor Goel thanked all the members of the Committee, the Chair for his leadership of the Committee, and the Office of the Governing Council Secretariat for their support.

(b) Committee Membership for 2007-08

The Chair informed members that the non-Governing Council membership of the Committee for 2007-08 would be considered for approval by the Academic Board at its meeting on June 4, 2007, while Governing Council membership of the Committee for 2007-08 would be considered for approval by the Governing Council at its meeting on May 30, 2007.

The Chair wished members a safe and restful summer.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 31, 2007