

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

April 1, 2009

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, April 1, 2009 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Chair)

Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost

Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President, Business
Affairs

Professor Safwat Zaky

Professor Denise Belsham

Mr. P.C. Choo

Professor Joseph Desloges

Professor Ronald H. Kluger

Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard

Professor David Mock

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak

Professor Romin Tafarodi

Dr. Sarita Verma

Secretariat:

Ms Alison Webb, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell

Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio

Mr. Ken Davy

Professor Meric Gertler

Ms Shirley Hoy

Professor Gregory Jump

Dr. Young M. Kim

Mr. Tim Reid

Professor Wendy Rotenberg

Mr. Stephen Smith

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate Officer

Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning

In Attendance:

Mr. Olivier Sorin, Member of the Governing Council

Mr. Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities and Services

Mr. Bruce Dodds, Facilities and Services

Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Deputy Secretary of the Governing Council

Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

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

1. Reports of the Previous Meetings (February 25, 2009)

The Chair noted the following amendments to the Report:

Added under item (4), Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama:

In response to a member's question, the Provost advised that she was not aware of any administrative job losses associated with the moves of Centres from the School of Graduate Studies to the faculties. Professor Gertler, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, confirmed this.

Added under item (5), Proposal for a Master of Global Affairs:

A member asked for justification of the proposed tuition of \$15,000. The Provost advised that part of the reason for the increase was the international internship associated with the program.

Report Number 130 of the meeting of February 25, 2009, was approved as amended.

2. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

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

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak advised that the recent Provincial Budget had been a very positive one for the University. While all of the specifics were not yet known, the outline of the Budget provided approximately \$16 million of one-time only funding under the three broad headings of Enrolment, Quality, and Financial Sustainability. The announced one-time only enrolment funding would go towards fully funding the previously discounted BIUs for 2008-2009. This funding was excellent news for undergraduate programs. The formula for distribution of the funding for quality and financial sustainability had not been determined yet, however the goal was to provide help to those divisions that had been hardest hit by the current economic circumstances. More information was expected within the coming weeks.

Professor Misak reminded members of the Federal Infrastructure Program to which universities and colleges have been invited to submit proposals. The University had put forth submissions for priority projects that could be aligned with the parameters of this economic stimulus program. Projects submitted had to have shovels ready to go into the ground almost immediately, and be materially complete by March 2011. She noted that three of the projects that had been submitted to the Government for funding were being considered for approval in principle at this meeting, in advance of knowing whether or not these submissions had been successful in receiving funding. However, in order to meet the strict timeframes of the Federal program it was necessary to take these projects through governance now, with approval conditional on receipt of the funding.

In answer to a member's question regarding the impact of the recently announced Provincial funding on the University's Budget for 2009-10, Professor Misak advised that the major impact would be a decreased need for the \$45 million of deficit funding that had been made available to the faculties.

A member inquired about the increased revenue that would result from the proposed program fee in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Misak informed members that the Faculty of Arts and Science had been considering a program fee in place of the current per course fee for some time. Programs fees were common among other Universities, and other programs within the University of Toronto. A program fee may provide increased revenue, however, that would depend on the subsequent behavior of students. Should a majority of students move to a full course-load upon implementation of the program fee, there would be no substantial increased revenue.

3. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd)

A member inquired whether the one-time funding announced for the discounted BIUs would see funds

distributed to all Undergraduate programs. Professor Zaky advised that the approximately \$3.5 million of additional funds was for the 2008-09 shortfall that resulted from the University receiving only \$0.85 per \$1.00 on the current enrolment. This funding would affect all divisions however it would have no impact on the new Budget for 2009-10.

4. Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design

Ms. Sisam advised members that Governing Council approved a Users Committee report in 1997 of the then School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, addressing the issue of facilities renewal and its role in supporting the School's Academic Plan. The report proposed a \$10 million, multi-phased renewal and renovation of the existing building at 230 College Street, to be implemented as funding permitted. Some of the needed improvements had since occurred, however much remained to be done to the structure that was purpose-built in 1909 for the Royal College of Dental Surgeons.

A Project Planning Committee was reconstituted in 2008 to consider the recommendations from the previous report, and to address the increased space requirements of the new Academic Plan of the recently renamed John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design. The Faculty now offered three masters level programs, and student numbers were increasing. A considerable amount of new space was needed, in terms of quality enhancement, as the existing facilities presented challenges to program expansion, and had no capacity to accommodate either the additional research office, or design studio space necessary.

A space program had now been developed using Council of Ontario Universities (COU) standards, based on the anticipated increases in the number of students. The proposal requested approximately 5,730 nasm of existing and new space on the current site, through the infill of the existing courtyard, and the construction of an additional two floors on the roof. Program space would be allocated for a proposed new program in Architecture and Health Care Design.

Treating the existing building as a material resource to be re-used, was consistent with first principles of sustainability. There were a number of buildings like this one in Toronto that were in need of the same re-skinning in order to reduce energy use. Once complete this building would serve as a demonstration laboratory with respect to sustainability.

This Project Planning Committee had already begun to meet, prior to the Federal Infrastructure Program announcement. Mr. Daniels had made a donation of \$14 million to the Faculty, of which \$6 million had been targeted towards the capital renovation of this building. Additional money was available from previous Provostial commitments, and other funding was also being sought.

This project met the main criteria of the Federal Infrastructure Program and approval was sought subject to receipt of funding. Should this project not be selected the Project Planning Report would remain approved in principle, until other funding or private benefaction could be found.

In response to a member's question about the priority setting process, Profess Misak advised that all of the projects being brought forward today were high priorities for the University. It was necessary to have these Project Planning Committees in place, and these projects approved now, in order to ensure that the University could move quickly should the Federal funding be offered. However, these projects would remain University priorities whether or not this specific funding was forthcoming.

4. Capital Project: [Project Planning Report](#) for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (cont'd)

A member noted the importance for this particular Faculty being housed in a facility of significant inspiration with respect to its landscape, design and architectural aspects. Ms. Sisam agreed and informed members that once approved, the Project Planning Committee would solicit consultants. There would be a two-stage selection process that would ensure the Committee was well aware of what would occur from a design standpoint. The Design Review Committee would also be involved, as would the Faculty itself, which felt very strongly about the design. She noted however that consideration of design was subjective, and while the intention was to ensure the design was exemplary, the thrust of this report dealt with functionality which continued to be a serious impediment to the teaching and research of the students and faculty in the current facility.

The project has been planned and estimated to cost \$20 million based on the fundamentals of a detailed program, room data sheets describing specifications, and review of the existing building fabric. This procedure was consistent with the preparation of all project planning reports. Ms. Sisam advised that she was confident this project would produce a building that covered all aspects of quality of design and function.

In response to a question about other projects submitted under the Federal Infrastructure Program, Ms. Sisam advised that there were a total of seven projects identified as priorities, and proposals for each had been forwarded to the Federal Government. Two proposals were for large buildings valued at approximately \$70 million each, one on each of the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses. Project Planning Committees for these buildings had been struck in the fall of 2008, and were still at work. Project Planning Reports for these projects would come forward in the next cycle. Project Planning Committees for four smaller projects, identified by the University as priorities, were included later on this agenda for information. These Committees would also report back at the next meeting.

In response to a member's question, the Provost advised that the funding for the proposed Medical Sciences Building project was anticipated to come from a different ministry envelope.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the Faculty's programs at its present location, 230 College Street.
2. THAT the project scope for Phase 1, comprising an addition of approximately 1250 net assignable square metres or 2023 gross square metres, be approved at a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding.
3. THAT the project scope for subsequent phases of renovations be brought forward to implement through the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate for components valued at less than \$2 million, and those exceeding \$2 million in accordance with the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects.

5. Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus

Ms Riggall advised that this was another project that had come together as a result of the announcement of the Federal Infrastructure Program. There was a specific mention in the funding announcement that physical infrastructure, including utilities infrastructure, would be eligible for these grants. The University therefore took the opportunity to bundle together a set of requirements into one project. All of these projects would be required in the future to support the growing demand for utilities services on the St. George campus. Most however, would have waited until the need was immediate and driven by either the construction of a new building, or the beginning of brown-outs. The Federal program provided the opportunity to plan ahead

These projects were entirely contingent on the receipt of the funding. If funding did not materialize, they would not go forward until such time as the need became more urgent.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the [Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects](#) be approved, at a total cost not to exceed \$15.9 million, and assuming receipt of funding from the government economic stimulus program:

- Government of Canada \$8.0M
- Government of Ontario \$7.9M

6. Capital Project: Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute Project Change of Scope

Ms. Sisam advised that this renovation project to provide interdisciplinary design studio space within the unfinished attic space in the Mining building had been seen by the Committee previously. The estimated total cost of the project, when originally approved in June 2008, was \$12,150,000 and included high priority roof renovations. Other identified restoration and renovation items were identified at the time. Funding was however not assigned for their implementation.

The project had since been reviewed and it was determined that external deferred maintenance items that had originally been excluded should be added, as should a proposal for photovoltaic panels to increase the energy efficiency in this building. These additional items, together with the escalation in time of tender increased the total project cost to \$20 million.

This project was being brought forward subject to approval of funding from the Federal Infrastructure Program. Should funding not be received this project would remain approved in principle until funding became available from private benefaction.

In response to a member's question about whether it was coincidental that the two projects considered today were both valued at \$20 million, Professor Misak advised that the University had certainly considered what it could reasonably assume the projected envelope value would be, and which faculties had projects to meet all of the criteria, including the need to be materially complete by March 2011. It was, however, coincidental that four projects of approximately the same value were determined to be of the highest priority.

A member asked about the high cost per square metre for this renovation. Mr. Shabbar advised that the proposed project would improve the building's accessibility with the addition of an interior elevator shaft that would have no impact on the exterior appearance of the building. This was costly, yet important, as the Mining Building was a designated building in the Inventory of Heritage

6. Capital Project: Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute Project Change of Scope (cont'd)

Properties and any changes to the exterior would have to be reviewed by the Heritage Preservation Services of the City of Toronto.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

1. THAT the [Project Planning Report for the Civil Engineering Interdisciplinary Design Studios](#) be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, comprising renovations to approximately 630 net assignable square meters and 1,130 gross square meters, be increased to a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding, to include high priority repairs, maintenance and restoration, and items addressing sustainability.

7. Capital Project: Project Planning Committees: Terms of Reference and Membership

Members received, for information, the Terms of Reference and Membership for the following four Project Planning Committees:

- a) Physics Research and Instructional Laboratory Revitalization in the McLennan Physical Laboratories Building
- b) Chemistry Research and Instructional Laboratory Revitalization in the Lash Miller Building
- c) Chemistry Undergraduate Teaching Laboratories at the University of Toronto Mississauga
- d) Faculty Offices in the Science Wing at the University of Toronto Mississauga.

A member asked whether it was reasonable to expect that these projects would be materially complete by March 2011, given that the Project Planning Committees were only just being struck. Ms. Sisam and Mr. Shabbar both assured members that these particular renovation projects had been selected because they could be completed within twenty-four months. Mr. Shabbar further noted that advice had been sought from industry experts, and all necessary due diligence had been done to confirm this.

The Chair stated that a debt of gratitude was owed to all those who had worked so diligently to bring these projects forward. The timelines had been very short and many long hours had gone into these applications

8. Date of the Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Thursday, May 7, 2009 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

9. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Secretary

Chair