

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 121 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**  
**October 24, 2007**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, October 24, 2007 at 4:10 pm in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Avrum Gotlieb (Chair)  
Professor Miriam Diamond (Vice-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. Ryan Matthew Campbell  
Professor John Coleman  
Professor David Cook  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Ms Carole Moore  
Mr. Tim Reid  
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
Professor Pekka K. Sinervo  
Mr. Stephen Smith

Professor Brenda McCabe  
Professor David Mock  
Dr. Wendy Rotenberg

**Non-voting Assessors:**

Dr. Tim McTiernan, Interim Vice-President,  
Research  
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,  
Campus and Facilities Planning  
Mr. Nadeem Shabbar, Chief Real Estate  
Officer

**Regrets:**

Mr. Ken Davy  
Mr. Arya Ghadimi  
Professor Glen Jones  
Professor Gregory Jump

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Matthew Lafond, Secretary

**In Attendance:**

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga  
Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost  
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
Professor Richard Peltier, University Professor, Department of Physics  
Ms Shirley Roll, Director, Facilities Management and Space Planning, Faculty of Medicine  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Governing Council  
Dr. Catherine Whiteside, Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, and Dean,  
Faculty of Medicine

ITEMS 4, 5 AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting (September 18, 2007)**

Report Number 120 of the meeting of September 18, 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**

**(a) *Towards 2030***

Professor Goel reported that the next phase of the *Towards 2030* initiative was ready to be launched. This phase involved further consultation and deliberation that would be conducted by several Task Forces whose areas of focus would include the following.

- Long-term Enrollment Strategy: Would consider where the University was heading over the next several decades, the composition of its student population, and the distribution across the three campuses.
- University Resources: Would consider enrollment, revenue, and diversification of revenue sources. Would also consider ancillary issues such as space requirements and future liabilities.
- Institutional Organization: Would examine issues in the organization of the University, including the relationships between the central administration and the academic divisions, the colleges and the federated universities, the affiliated hospitals, and tri-campus issues.
- Governance: Would consider how governance at the University of Toronto might be improved, for example, by re-examining the relationship between the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees and with the Divisional Councils.
- External Issues and Context: Would consider what was expected of universities and their students in the long-term.

**(b) Budget**

Professor Goel noted that work on the budget for the upcoming year had started. He stated that this was the first year that a complete budget was being prepared under the new budget model and noted that a meeting would be held with each academic division to consider its five-year budget framework.

**(c) Provincial Election**

Professor Goel commented that it was expected that the Premier of Ontario would name the new Cabinet by the end of the month; however, it could be several weeks before the Speech from the Throne was delivered. He noted that the provincial budget would normally be tabled some months after the Throne Speech. Consequently, the University would likely be required to prepare the 2008-2009 budget prior to having firm details on government funding for the upcoming year.

There were no questions arising from the Report.

#### **4. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Medical Academy**

The Chair welcomed Dr. Catherine Whiteside, Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions, and Dean, Faculty of Medicine, and Ms Shirley Roll, Director, Facilities Management and Space Planning, Faculty of Medicine, to the meeting.

Ms Sisam informed members that the Planning and Budget Committee had approved the Project Planning Report for the Medical Academy at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) in October 2006. At that time, the capital project had been valued at \$20.107 million. Renovations to the Medical Sciences Building (MSB) on the St. George campus, including refurbishing two large lecture theatres, providing renovated anatomy instructional facilities, and renovations for the Discovery Commons (which provided videoconferencing support for the program), had been completed for the start of the 2007/2008 academic year. In addition, a classroom with videoconferencing capabilities had been created at UTM through refurbishment of the Council Chambers.

It had originally been intended that space in the South Building on the UTM campus, which would have become vacant when the Hazel McCallion Academic Learning Centre was completed, would accommodate the Medical Academy. With the deferral of the original Medical Academy project this space was assigned for other purposes by UTM. This had allowed the Project Planning Committee to reconsider possible building site options for the new Academy on the UTM campus.

The current Project Planning Report proposed to create a stand-alone building for the Medical Academy to address long-term space requirements, including taking advantage of further opportunities for undergraduate medical expansion, which would allow the UTM Medical Academy to reach its full complement sooner than originally anticipated.

The scope of the project was almost 3000 net assignable square metres (nasm), with a total cost of \$36.155 million. Of that total, \$25.476 million was attributable to the Mississauga Medical Academy project, and \$10.679 million to UTM.

Ms Sisam advised that \$8.637 million of provincial government funding remained available for the project. The balance of the Mississauga Academy portion, \$16.839 million, was expected to be funded as part of additional medical expansion and would be raised through advancement. The Faculty of Medicine was prepared to take contingent financing to support any shortfalls. The UTM portion of the project, \$10.679 million, would be raised through borrowing, paid from the UTM operating budget.

Dr. Whiteside noted that this was the best plan for the Medical Academy at UTM. The intent was to eventually enroll 54 first-year students in the program. Dr. Whiteside noted that the government will want to expand the number of new medical students in Ontario, and that the University of Toronto was prepared to help the province by accommodating an appropriate share of this growth.

A member inquired whether the construction of the Medical Academy building would have an impact on parking at the UTM campus. Professor Orchard replied that a small number of spaces would be affected. Ms Sisam noted that the building site was currently occupied by portables and a few parking spaces, however, the parking office would accommodate future need through operational efficiencies.

**4. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Medical Academy (cont'd)**

A member noted that the annual operating costs of \$400,000 to \$500,000 per year of the Medical Academy amounted to approximately \$3000 per student. She inquired whether that was the norm for medical schools. Professor Goel replied that the figure included the entire operating cost for the building, including the UTM portion of the project. The building would service many activities.

A member asked about the long-term security of annualized payments from the provincial government. Professor Goel noted that the government had utilized that form of financing for capital projects in many transfer sectors since the 2005 budget. A stream of payments had been calculated per-student and added to government grants. While the long-term funding was not guaranteed, it was quite likely that future governments would continue the payments. Ms Riggall noted that her office had been working to accommodate this funding method without increasing the University's debt capacity.

A member asked about the timing of the project. Ms Sisam indicated that the project was ready to be implemented as soon as approval was granted, and it was scheduled to be completed in 2010.

A member asked about the relatively high cost of training medical students and whether the University received adequate funding to cover these expenses. Professor Goel replied that since the 2005 provincial budget, the University had received substantial additional funding to cover the costs of medical student expansion. The member asked whether the University would benefit from an economy of scale in further expansion. Dr. Whiteside noted that there were such benefits, and that the Medical Academy would have the necessary clinical capacity for the intended growth. Professor Goel added that some of the more specialized and expensive elements of the program, such as anatomy instruction, would remain on the St. George campus.

A member asked how the number of intended new students was determined and whether future expansion would be possible. Dr. Whiteside responded that 54 was an aggregate of the numbers used in small group teaching and an estimate of capacity. The school would incrementally reach 54 new students per year, based on available resources. She noted that this was the same size as the Northern Ontario School of Medicine. The facility would have the capacity to accommodate greater numbers of students if necessary. She added that the school was fortunate to have a number of large hospitals in the area.

A member noted that she had met many students at UTM who wanted to attend medical school, and that the project would enhance student life on the UTM campus.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Medical Academy Building at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope of 2,980 net assignable square metres (5,960 gross square metres) for the Medical Academy Building having a total estimated project cost of \$36.155 million be approved.

**4. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Medical Academy (cont'd)**

3. THAT the \$36.155 million funding required for the UTM Medical Academy Building comprise the following:
  - i) For the Mississauga Academy portion (totalling \$25.476 million):
    - a. Provincial funding in the form of annualized payments having a present value of \$8.637 million, and
    - b. \$16.839 million in contingency financing carried by the Faculty of Medicine.
  - ii) For the University of Toronto at Mississauga portion:  
Funding of \$10.679 million through borrowing, paid from the UTM operating budget.

**5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Storm Water Management Pond**

The Chair welcomed Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga, to the meeting.

Ms Sisam noted that for the past seven years, UTM had experienced expansion of its facilities to accommodate enrollment growth. This expansion had been monitored by the Credit Valley Conservation authority, which had identified the effect on the watershed of the Credit River. In order to continue expansion, the Conservation authority and the City of Mississauga required UTM to create a Storm Water Management (SWM) facility that would satisfy water quality and erosion control. The proposed SWM pond would gather and filter storm water back to the Credit River. Ms Sisam noted that the proposed Medical Academy had triggered this requirement. She also indicated that the provision of the SWM pond sufficiently addressed all identified future expansion needs of UTM.

The proposed site for the SWM pond was currently in use as a parking lot. Ms Sisam noted that the parking spaces in this lot were the least-used on campus, and that parking could be accommodated in existing facilities, however, parking would continue to be monitored.

The total cost of the project was estimated to be \$2.7 million. Of this total, \$650,000 was to be apportioned to the Medical Academy, \$450,000 to UTM Parking Services, and \$1.6 million to be allocated from borrowing, repaid from the UTM operating budget.

A member noted that the last parking review for the campus was in 2005, and the next was scheduled for 2009/10. He asked whether there had been any thought to moving this date forward so that parking needs could be addressed in a more timely fashion if necessary. Professor Orchard replied that demand for parking had not increased with the recent increase in enrollment, due to several initiatives at the school, including providing students with access to transit passes and extending class scheduling to reduce load at peak times. He indicated that an earlier formal review would be unnecessary, but reiterated that the situation would be monitored on an ongoing basis. The member asked about the rationale for allocating \$450,000 of the project to UTM Parking Services. Professor Orchard replied that surface parking lots had created much of the hard surface area which necessitated SWM facilities.

A member noted that the report called for the pond to be dredged after 17 years; however, the Ministry of the Environment recommended dredging every 10 years. Ms Sisam replied that the

**5. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) Storm Water Management Pond (cont'd)**

University would comply with the necessary requirements based on appropriate guidelines.

A member asked whether there would be a fence around the pond to address safety and liability concerns. Ms Sisam replied that there were no plans to erect a fence. Professor Orchard noted that there had been a pond on campus for 40 years which had not proven to be hazardous. However, there would be a grading into the proposed SWM pond, and the surrounding area would be a site of naturalization, with abundant ground cover.

A member asked how the proposed SWM pond differed from the existing pond. Professor Orchard noted that the existing pond had been built 40 years ago, and it did not have the capacity currently required by UTM.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for a Storm Water Management Pond at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) for \$2.7 million, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved in principle.
2. THAT a maximum of \$1.6 million be allocated from borrowing to be repaid from the UTM operating budget.

**6. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – SciNet High Performance Computing Facility**

The Chair welcomed Professor Richard Peltier, University Professor, Department of Physics, to the meeting.

Ms Sisam advised the Committee that the project was the latest of several Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and provincial grants that would allow a significant increase in High Performance Computing (HPC) capabilities. SciNet would create a network widely accessible to both members of the University of Toronto community and to the wider Canadian research community. The highest levels of use would be in the Faculties of Medicine, Applied Science and Engineering, Arts and Science, and at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. The relevant divisions and Faculties would be providing funding, in addition to the government grants.

Ms Sisam noted that the entire system would require approximately three megawatts of power, and it was therefore impractical to locate the facility on campus. A number of locations had been considered off-campus and it had been decided to house the facility in leased space at 7700 Keele Street. A lease which matched the current five-year funding term of the grant had been executed, and it could be extended if the grant were renewed. Space on campus (at 256 McCaul Street) would also be provided for associated technical support.

The total capital expenditure estimated for the SciNet project was \$32.5 million. Of this, \$5.88 million was the total project cost for renovations to 7700 Keele Street (\$4.77 million) and 256 McCaul Street (\$1.11 million). The balance of the capital budget was directed towards the purchase of equipment. Ms Sisam pointed out that no borrowing was required. Participating divisions would cover any resulting shortfalls in funding.

**6. Capital Project: Project Planning Report – SciNet High Performance Computing Facility (cont'd)**

Professor Peltier noted that the latest CFI proposal had been the culmination of two previous proposals. Both proposals had yielded funds that had been used to acquire the computers currently used by individual research groups at the University, but those machines were no longer competitive. The proposed SciNet project would allow a single facility to be built, housing three computers and a mass storage device. The Project Planning Committee had attempted to find a location close to campus, however, the main constraint had been the exceptional power demand. Professor Peltier advised that the space on Keele Street could accommodate those demands. He added that although the project was scheduled to be operational by Fall 2008, planning would need to begin soon; the Keele and McCaul Street facilities had to be operational at the same time. Professor Peltier emphasized that the University had a major commitment to the ComputeCanada group with respect to timelines of completion and the sharing of equipment.

A member asked whether, given the substantial leasehold improvements planned for 7700 Keele Street, the University could have negotiated a longer renewal option. Ms Riggall replied that the initial term was five years, with a five- year renewal option. In her opinion, there were multiple renewal options. Professor Goel explained that because a grant renewal was not guaranteed, the initial lease term had been matched to the duration of the current grant.

Ms Riggall advised that before the lease had been signed, there had been a comparison of the cost of the lease option against use of existing space on campus. Over five years, it was estimated that the total savings would be approximately \$4 million.

A member asked whether renovation of the space at 256 McCaul Street would disrupt the operation of CIUT Radio, should they move into that building. Professor Goel responded that the SciNet facility would be located on a different floor, and there would be no resulting disruption.

Dean Sinervo noted that the SciNet project was tied to the teaching and research mission of the University, and that the facility would be essential in contributing to the educational experience of students at the University. He noted that several HPC systems had been utilized at the University of Toronto with varying success; the SciNet system would be historic in bringing together researchers across all relevant divisions. He pointed out that the plan was the best way of leveraging the resources available to the University.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the SciNet project, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope for leasehold improvements at 7700 Keele Street consisting of 1,100 square metres with a total project cost of \$4,771,970 be approved.
3. THAT the project scope for 256 McCaul Street of approximately of 320 net assignable square metres with a total project cost of \$1,110,620 be approved.

**7. Capital Project: Project Planning Committee – Membership and Terms of Reference – Robarts Library Master Plan**

Members received for information the Membership and Terms of Reference for the Project Planning Committee for the Robarts Library Master Plan.

A member suggested that the Committee membership include a Chief Librarian from the federated Universities.

There were no questions.

**8. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, November 28, 2007 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

**9. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

October 28, 2007