



UNIVERSITY OF
KING'S
COLLEGE • HALIFAX

The University of King's College
CAMPUS MASTER PLAN
2016

Approved by the Board of Governors
10 MARCH 2016

The University of King's College Campus Master Plan 2016

The 'King's Experience' is defined by many factors: a rare quality of education, broadening life experiences, rich history and traditions, lifetime friendships, and a unique collegial environment, all in a beautiful campus with splendid buildings ringing the quadrangle.

The campus buildings are the platform through which King's delivers this experience, and they are also at the heart of the University. Unfortunately building maintenance and upgrades over the years have not followed a consistent path. The 5 residence Bays for example are largely in their original condition, systems are at or near end of life, and upgrades can no longer be deferred. There are many other issues and some significant new requirements as well. Bringing these all together in a coherent plan is essential if King's is to position for the future and provide our wonderful students with the experience they deserve.

The University's Strategic Plan 2013-2016 identified 'Improving Physical Facilities' as one of its key strategic objectives and specified 5 priorities relating to facilities improvement: a Campus Master Plan, a plan to address deferred maintenance, improved physical accessibility, improved energy efficiency, and a financing strategy to support the Campus Master Plan.

I am therefore very pleased to present the "Campus Master Plan 2016" which was approved by the Board of Governors on 10 March 2016. It addresses all of these priorities in a clear, succinct and practical manner and places the emphasis squarely on looking after our students. The Campus Master Plan sets the stage for King's to embark upon a long-awaited capital campaign and will be our facilities roadmap for many years to come.

I convey my thanks and those of the whole University to the Campus Planning Committee which has produced the Campus Master Plan and to all who have contributed to the committee's work.



George Cooper
President and Vice-Chancellor
University of King's College
March 2016

Campus Master Plan 2016 Table of Contents

- I Executive Summary 3
- II The Process Followed by the Campus Planning Committee 5
- III Requirements Summary Table 9
- IV The King’s Facilities Requirements 10
- V Managing Deferred Maintenance and Capital Requirements 17
- VI A Note on the Library 18
- VII Communications 18
- VIII An Overall Financial Strategy for the Campus Master Plan 2016 19
- IX Conclusion 19

I Executive Summary

The Campus Master Plan 2016 (CMP) is ultimately about the students of this University. Renewing the facilities to ensure their safety, comfort and enhanced learning and life experiences at King's is essential and long overdue.

The CMP builds on the extensive work of the November 2008 'Report of the PGS Sub-Committee on Space' and the June 2013 'Strategic Plan 2013-2016'. A lengthy list of facilities requirements was extracted from these documents. The list was reviewed in detail and requirements which had already been addressed, were overtaken by events, or deemed to reflect maintenance, administrative or policy matters were removed. A short list of current issues resulted, the core of which is eight facilities requirements. A survey was conducted by the CPC student representative which affirmed the short list and provided important student insights into facilities issues. The short list was then reviewed by the CPC against agreed assessment criteria and the requirements grouped as:

Priority 1 - Must be addressed immediately

Total cost \$20.2 M (\$16-18M capital campaign goal)

- Accessibility (Alex Hall entrance and 1st floor upgrade): \$0.5M
- Residence Renewal (Upgrades can no longer be deferred. The Bays are largely in original condition with systems at or near end of life. Reconstruct the four remaining Bays in sequence, modernize the East side of Alex Hall, convert the Roost to other use): \$9.7M (of which \$6-8M is the capital campaign goal)
- Wardroom upgrade: (\$0.6M project scheduled for summer 2016) donor funded
- J-School Consolidation and Reconfiguration (Option 'a' is new construction adjacent to King's in cooperation with Dalhousie, Option 'b', the contingency plan, is to convert the King's Gym to the J-School, with the athletics program relocating to suitable alternate facilities): \$10M capital campaign goal. The majority of these are proposed for implementation over 5 years (2016-2021).

Priority 2 - Should be addressed as soon as resources are available

Total cost \$2.0 M

- Energy efficiency (in progress through an energy performance contract with financing option): \$1.2M
- Gym Renewal (in progress through in-house work): Priority work \$0.8M

Priority 3 - May be addressed in the longer term

No funds required now

- Storage (being addressed in-house and with some culture change required to reduce hoarding. Off-site storage is a future option if necessary):\$ 0
- Greening the King's Campus ('sod the Quad') a longstanding goal but until alternate parking is available no action can be taken: \$ 0

Deferred Maintenance for King's totals \$9.2M, with much potential overlap with capital projects. Rather than spending \$1M per year on deferred maintenance to maintain the status quo, King's should address it through building renewal wherever possible. The CPC should continue to be involved in this area and ensure alignment with capital projects.

The Library, while not requiring capital investment, is one of King's most impressive facilities, and appears to have space in the basement with development potential. Student use, e.g. as study space, should be the first requirement if this is addressed in future.

A communications plan to reflect the Board's intent regarding the CMP will be required. An overall financial strategy for the CMP, including capital campaign goals and other funding requirements should be addressed by the Board's Finance, Audit and Risk Committee.

Conclusion

Facilities renewal is timely and important in every sense. The CMP identifies a total requirement of \$22.2 M in capital investment, of which \$20.2 M is Priority 1 (essential and immediate). At least \$16-18M of this will require sponsor funding, with roughly \$4.2-6.2M to be addressed though other sources. These figures will evolve. As the CMP is ultimately about the students, its successful implementation is ultimately about risk management. A major investment to improve facilities, address essential requirements and make King's more competitive will entail financial burden and some risk. It will also demonstrate confidence in the future and support increased enrollment goals. The alternative, not to invest sufficiently in infrastructure, will inevitably entail cost and risk as well.... perhaps greater risk.

The Board of Governors approved implementation of the Campus Master Plan 2016, aligned to the anticipated Capital Campaign, and to be guided by an overall financial strategy at its meeting of 10 March 2016.

II The Process Followed by the Campus Planning Committee

1. **Committee members.** Glenn Davidson (Chair), Adriane Abbott, George Cooper, Tim Currie, Alex Doyle, Jim Fitzpatrick (to Dec 15), Dale Godsoe, Nick Hatt, Andy Lynch, Alex McCann, Scott McRae, Alex McVittie, Bonnie Sands, Joy Shand, Ian Stewart
2. **Organization.** The Campus Planning Committee (CPC) began work on the Campus Master Plan (CMP) in September 2015, adopting the following principles:
 - Remember that the CMP is ultimately about the students of this University. Renewing the facilities to ensure their safety, comfort and enhanced learning and life experiences at King's is essential and long overdue. Students who have a happy and fulfilling experience at King's are also the University's greatest advocates.
 - Use the priorities in the Strategic Plan as the basic direction
 - Avoid duplicating work which has previously been done
 - Work to an agreed set of assumptions
 - Examine all options then reach decisions in a logical way
 - Produce a concise practical report with achievable recommendations
3. Residence Sub-Committee chaired by Andy Lynch was formed in September to address the immediate issue of North Pole Bay which had been declared unfit for occupancy in the 2015-2016 academic year. Its mandate was to develop a plan for the reconstruction of North Pole Bay which could serve as a model for the other Bays, and to address other residence requirements [Note: The plan was completed in November 2015, funds for the work were approved by the Board at its December 2015 meeting, and occupancy will resume in summer 2016].
4. A Non-Residence Sub-Committee chaired by Glenn Davidson was formed at the same time to address all facilities issues other than the residences.
5. Both sub-committees brought their results to the CPC for discussion and decision during its fall meetings. Detailed minutes were kept of these meetings.

6. Establishing the facilities requirements.

The Committee's first task was to determine the actual requirements. The Strategic Plan 2013-2016 was reviewed in detail, notably Strategic Priority 4: "Improving Physical Facilities". The main source of detailed information was the 70 page "Final Report of the Property Grounds and Safety (PGS) Sub-Committee on Space" (Emmitt Kelly, Chair) dated November 27, 2008" (to be available on the King's website – Public Documents). Both documents had been prepared after extensive consultation and reflected an enormous amount of work.

7. Central to the requirement was determining whether there is sufficient office and classroom space. The PGS report proved of great assistance. The report was prepared in 2008 when the King's student body was approximately 1150 and King's optimal enrollment for viability was assessed by the then-President to be between 1200 - 1300. A study within the report noted that, apart from the School of Journalism, there generally appeared to be enough classroom space on campus to support these student numbers. Policies and practice regarding allocation and use of classroom space were deemed a bigger issue than space itself. Similar conclusions were reached regarding office space acknowledging that it was being managed through "compromises and ingenious squeezes".
8. Given that the December 2015 student enrollment was 1006, i.e. about 150 lower than in 2008, and that there are no proposals to open new programs at present, the CPC concluded that that the PGS report's assessment would remain valid for several years and that creating new office or classroom space was not an immediate facilities requirement. The CPC has however identified ways in which additional office and classroom space can be made available for future requirements. These are linked to recommendations in Section IV below regarding the Angels' Roost and the J-School.
9. Based on the PGS report's extensive treatment of space requirements the Committee concluded that a campus space study was not required at present.
10. The PGS report was reviewed line by line and a detailed summary of its recommendations was prepared. These were combined with the facilities requirements from the Strategic Plan. The consolidated list was then examined by the CPC to identify and remove those requirements which:
 - have been addressed since 2008 (a significant number);

- have been overtaken by events and are no longer relevant;
- reflect maintenance concerns rather than capital requirements; or
- identify management or administrative issues rather than facilities requirements.

The result was a short list of outstanding facilities requirements which, not surprisingly, included some of the larger issues identified in the PGS report.

11. Throughout the CPC's work the student representatives played a central role and provided invaluable insight and advice. In November 2015, after the CPC had produced the consolidated list, Joy Shand personally conducted a survey to gather input on facilities requirements and produced an excellent report (to be available on the King's website – Public Documents). The report in brief concluded that once enrolled, students tend not to leave King's because of the state of the facilities. However the poor condition of some facilities, especially those of key importance to the students, such as the Wardroom, reinforced student perceptions that they are undervalued by the University. The survey respondents rated enhanced green space in the Quad, Wardroom upgrade, improved accessibility and energy efficiency as top concerns. The survey findings affirmed the short list.

12. **The Committee's Findings.** The CPC took the survey input together with the short list described above and determined that the essential facilities issues for King's could be distilled down to three process issues and eight capital requirements.

13. The 3 outstanding process issues are:

- produce a Campus Master Plan
- deal with deferred maintenance in a structured manner
- restore the designed use of buildings specifically the A&A and the gym.

The first two are part of the mandate of this document. The last refers to the ongoing use of the 'Angels' Roost' as a residence within the A&A building and the presence of faculty offices in the gym; these are addressed in Section IV paras 29, 30 and 48, 49 respectively.

14. The eight outstanding facilities requirements are:

- accessibility
- energy efficiency
- greening the King's campus
- gym renewal

- School of Journalism consolidation and reconfiguration
- residence renewal
- storage space increase
- Wardroom upgrade

[Note: 'Day students requirements' was initially included as a 9th item, however since all of the major concerns regarding Day Students were addressed under other requirements, it was removed as a separate item].

15. **Prioritization.** The Committee then applied a prioritization process to the facilities requirements, using agreed assessment criteria to rank them as:

Priority 1: Must be addressed immediately

Priority 2: Should be addressed as soon as resources are available;

Priority 3: May be addressed in the longer term.

16. **The result was the following priority ranking, reflecting a consensus decision by the Committee:**

Priority 1: Accessibility, Residence renewal, Wardroom upgrade, J-School consolidation and reconfiguration

Priority 2: Energy efficiency, Gym renewal

Priority 3: Storage space increase, Greening the King's campus

III Requirements Summary Table

This table summarizes the information detailed in Section IV

Priority	Requirement	Details	Timeframe	Capital Cost
Priority 1	Accessibility	Ramp, chairlift & 1 st floor upgrade Alex Hall	2016	\$0.5 M
	Residence Renewal	North Pole Bay cost \$1.9M	Summer 2016	Financed
		Cochran Bay	Next to be addressed in 2017	Sponsored or financed \$2.0 M
		Tri Bay (Chapel, Middle, Radical)	One per year 2018-2020	Sponsored Project \$6.0M
		Alex Hall – East Side modernized	After the Bays	\$1.7 M
		Angels’ Roost – convert to non-residence use	After Cochran Bay	In-house project
	Wardroom Upgrade	Cost \$.6M	Summer 2016	Donor-funded
	J-School	Primary option new construction; Secondary King’s Gym	Completion in 3-5 years: 2019-2021	Sponsored Project \$10.0
	Sub-total of new capital funds reqd			\$20.2 M total (\$16-18 M sponsored)
Priority 2	Energy Efficiency	Energy performance contract with financing option	2016	\$1.2 M (funding option may not require capital)
	Gym renewal	In-house work	In progress	\$0.8 M
	Sub-total			\$2.0 M
Priority 3	Storage	No capital cost		Nil
	Greening the campus	‘Sod the Quad’	No action at present	Nil
	Sub-total			Nil

Total: \$22.2M identified requirement of which at least \$16-18M should be targeted for funding through the capital campaign. The balance of \$4.2-6.2M will need to be funded through other sources.

IV The King's Facilities Requirements

17. Each requirement was discussed in detail by the CPC. Options were considered, additional information obtained when required, and a recommended option or way ahead was determined together with an indicative cost estimate.

Priority 1 Requirements (Total Cost \$20.2 M)

Accessibility

18. The CMP addresses only physical accessibility at King's. The main challenge is the residences, none of which now meet applicable building code requirements for accessibility. Code aside, there is also a moral and social imperative to improve access. From the information available to the CPC it is understood that not all residences need to be accessible so long as a certain proportion of the total residence rooms is so deemed. For King's this is important since the basic design of the Bays greatly limits what can practically be done. It is also timely, as North Pole Bay can be granted a compliance waiver after reconstruction when the University has a plan in place to meet its overall accessibility requirement.
19. After considering options, the CPC concluded that the most effective solution is to make Alex Hall the accessible residence for King's. This can be achieved through improving the entrance with an exterior ramp and a chairlift to the first floor, and modifying the rooms and washrooms on the East wing of the first floor to accessible standards. Options will need to be explored to determine which chairlift design will best serve students' needs.
20. **Cost.** The cost is estimated at roughly \$0.5M. Projects to improve accessibility may be attractive candidates for future government grants or incentives.
21. **Recommendation: Accessibility is the highest priority facilities requirement. The Alex Hall improvements should be implemented now, beginning in 2016.**

Residence renewal The Bays, the Angels' Roost and Alexandra Hall

22. **The five Bays** all date from 1930 and are largely in their original condition. The service systems, over 85 years old, are at or near end of life. The Bays' quirky charm has faded and they are now old, tired and becoming squalid. As a residential College facing intense competition for enrolment King's must act to fix the Bays now.

23. North Pole Bay was declared uninhabitable for 2015-16 due to water ingress and other problems. It is a matter of time until another Bay reaches a similar point. Each Bay has a substantial deferred maintenance package (\$0.613M for NP Bay alone), which if fully implemented would only maintain the status quo. Full reconstruction of the Bays will eliminate the deferred maintenance, ensure current fire and building code compliance in key areas, and provide a better layout with contemporary high standard accommodation. This represents the only practical and cost effective option for the Bays. The Board recognized this with its December 2015 decision to authorize the reconstruction of NP Bay.
24. As the first to be reconstructed, NP Bay serves as the planning model for the other Bays. Although each Bay is slightly different, the new NP Bay layout (all single rooms, improved washrooms on each floor, and a common room for the Bay) can readily be adapted. Practical experience with the reconstruction of NP Bay will offer possibilities for some further design enhancements. The intent should be to achieve a similar standard in all 5 Bays insofar as possible.
25. **Work Sequence.** NP Bay work will be completed in the summer of 2016. The next to be reconstructed should be Cochran Bay in 2017, which would bring the A&A building and the 'bookend' North Pole and Cochran Bays up to a consistent standard. The TriBay building (Chapel, Middle and Radical Bays) should be addressed next, one Bay per year (2018, 2019, 2020).
26. **Cost and Financing.** The NP Bay work is budgeted at up to \$1.9M. The other Bays will require less mechanical work than NP Bay and costs may be somewhat less. For prudent planning approximately \$2M per Bay should be budgeted.
27. NP Bay is being funded through bank financing. Cochran Bay may also have to be funded through this approach as its sponsor appeal may be limited. The TriBay may have greater appeal for sponsor funding, as it is a large separate building of substantial interest and character. Given the estimated cost of up to \$6M, sponsor funding may be essential in order for this work to be accomplished.

Cost: Cochran Bay financed or sponsored \$2M; TriBay sponsored funding \$6M

- 28. Recommendation: Plan to complete the remaining four Bays based on the new NP Bay design, at a rate of one Bay per year. Cochran Bay should be completed after NP Bay optimally in 2017, with the remaining 3 Bays following in 2018-2020. The TriBay and perhaps Cochran Bay should be included in the goals of the capital campaign.**

29. **The Angels' Roost.** 'The Roost' is a small student residence which occupies the top floor of the A&A building. It consists of 12 single rooms, common washrooms and a common recreation space/ kitchenette area. It was recently updated through in-house work conducted by the facilities staff. The 2008 PGS report recommended that the Roost cease to be used as a residence, and that the A&A building revert to 'design purpose' i.e. administration, offices, classrooms and meeting space. A number of practical reasons support this recommendation including building and student security, alternate uses for this A&A space and consolidation of residences. The student rooms in the Roost could readily be converted to office or study space through a small in-house project limited to door replacement. Removing these 12 rooms from the total residence inventory would entail some lost revenue, but the improvement in building and student security would be a significant offset. When the new Bay configuration is implemented, upper year or foreign students who have often been concentrated in the Roost could be assigned to a suitable Bay for relative quiet and privacy. **Cost** for the in-house work would be very minimal (replacing 12 doors).

30. Recommendation: Cease to use the Roost as student accommodation and convert the area to office or study space. This should coincide with the completion of reconstruction work in Cochran Bay.

31. **Alexandra Hall.** Alex Hall was built in 1962 and while ageing, its condition is better than the Bays. A flood in early 2014 precipitated the upgrade of rooms and washrooms on the West side of Alex Hall, while retaining the original layout. The East side, which is largely 1960s original and of limited appeal to students, needs to be modernized to at least the same standard as the West side. This 'finish the job' requirement complements the 'Accessibility' project described above for the first floor. It also provides an important opportunity to redesign the rooms on the East side and make them more effective and attractive to students. **Cost** is estimated at \$1.7M.

32. Recommendation: Upgrade the East side of Alex Hall to an improved contemporary standard. This work should be completed after the more pressing work on the Bays.

The Wardroom Upgrade

33. The Wardroom is at the centre of King's social life and fulfills other key functions as a study and meeting space, lunch area and food service facility. It is perhaps the

single most important space on campus for King's students, particularly day students. The Wardroom is very heavily used and badly in need of a complete upgrade. Students have identified a range of requirements for the Wardroom including more seating, more electrical outlets, better wearing furniture and so on. The University has developed a Wardroom upgrade plan which will meet or exceed all of the students' requirements at an estimated cost of approximately \$0.6M. Sponsor funding for the project is being arranged, and the work is planned to be complete in the summer of 2016. **Cost.** No capital funding from internal College resources is required for the Wardroom at this time.

34. Recommendation: Proceed with the sponsor-funded Wardroom upgrade in 2016. Given the heavy usage of the Wardroom, an annual plan for routine furniture renewal and other maintenance is required.

The School of Journalism (J-School) Consolidation and Reconfiguration

35. The J-School and the Foundation Year Program (FYP) are King's 'flagship' programs. While King's has long offered one of the top journalism programs in the country, its cramped and dated J-School facilities are a growing liability as the journalism field and industry standards are evolving and the main Canadian competitors have impressive modern schools.

36. The King's J-School was founded in 1978 and initially housed under Prince Hall. Since 1991 it has been in the A&A building which has been modified over time as the J-School has grown (from 360 students in 2008 to 594 in 2015) and its requirements have evolved. The modifications have always been ad-hoc and the J-School's physical facilities are now inadequate to support the program.

37. There are three major requirements:

- a) More space. There is no student meeting or work space apart from sofas outside the Director's office, there is no staff conference or meeting room, office and teaching space is cramped, there are no office spaces available for contract professors, and there is no space to support new requirements;
- b) Consolidation. The school is spread between the 3rd floor and basement of the A&A building, with offices, labs and classrooms on the 3rd floor, and studios, classrooms and offices in the basement. This greatly hinders current journalistic practice which relies on frequent and often casual interaction and consultation, a different environment from that of other programs;
- c) Reconfiguration. The J-School is still organized with separate print, television, radio and IT sections, while the industry and university competition have

moved to multi-media newsrooms. Providing a similar capacity for King's is essential.

38. The need to provide better facilities for the J-School has been recognized for some time. A preliminary architectural assessment was completed in 2008 to identify longer term space requirements. In 2012 a proposal was developed for a new building to house a planned Canadian Institute for Collaborative Journalism centred on the King's J-School. The need for "dedicated space for the School of Journalism" was specified in the Strategic Plan 2013-2016.

39. In preparing this Campus Master Plan the CPC devoted substantial work to the J-School requirement and examined a range of options. These included:

- a) adding 1-2 floors above Prince Hall and the Link - rejected after a structural engineering assessment showed it to be impractical; and
- b) reconfiguring the A&A building through major reconstruction (including taking over the 2nd floor) – rejected because it would be extremely disruptive to the entire College, would limit design options, would not offer growth potential for the J-School, and most fundamentally would not be attractive for sponsor funding and hence was not affordable.

40. The CPC concluded that there are only two realistic options:

- a) **Construct a new J-School building** on the Dalhousie property between King's and Oxford Street, preferably adjacent to the NAB. This is the optimal solution, offering space designed to purpose, high program visibility and a major boost to King's competitive advantage, growth potential, continued use of shared space with other King's programs and strong potential for a cooperative project with Dalhousie. It would also free up the current J-School space in the A&A building and create flexibility to address other opportunities including: relocation of the bookstore from the NAB basement hallway to a permanent home, additional office, classroom and meeting space, student study space, chapel/choir uses, and the potential to accommodate future program options. A new building would offer maximum attraction for potential sponsors, an essential consideration as sponsor funding is the only way to realize the requirement. This is the preferred option.

[The caveat of course is that King's does not own the site in question. An initial discussion with Dalhousie in January 2016 was very positive and demonstrated interest in investigating possibilities for a cooperative building project].

- b) **Convert the King's gym to the J-School building.** This has the advantage of a building which is already part of the King's campus. It is well situated for visibility with the public and Dalhousie, and the building could readily be reconstructed to meet J-School requirements, including the multi-media newsroom. It would ensure good competitive advantage and also eliminate the large deferred maintenance obligation (\$1.9 M) pending for the gym. Freeing up the current J-School space in the A&A building would provide the same flexibility to address other opportunities as described in option 'a'. This option would lend itself well to sponsor funding.

[The caveat is that the King's athletic program would need to be moved to an alternate facility that could facilitate varsity sports, offering similar quality, look and feel to King's. The availability of such a facility, and potential terms of use would need to be determined, and are necessary for this option to be viable].

41. **Cost.** The CPC set a planning ceiling of \$10M on the J-School requirement. The intent is to work within that level, however the figure is of necessity somewhat arbitrary. The eventual cost would obviously be affected by many variables including the option to be pursued, the terms of any cooperative project with Dalhousie and design specifics including architectural cohesion with the King's campus. Reconstructing the King's gym would be less expensive than new construction to some degree, however there would be incremental operational costs associated with running the athletics program at an alternate site. Moving the J-School from the A&A would also entail some cost, as would conversion of the former J-School space in the A&A to other purposes. The cost of the latter would depend on the specific requirements to be addressed. The actual project proposal should identify the 'all up' implementation costs. To reiterate a point made above, the J-School requirements can only be addressed with sponsor funding and it will therefore need to be a central part of the capital campaign.
42. **Timeframe.** To maintain King's competitive advantage and improve recruiting, the new J-School intent should be confirmed as soon as possible, with the goal of having the project completed in 3 to 5 years from now i.e. 2019 to 2021
43. **Recommendation: Open negotiations with Dalhousie for a cooperative building project to house the King's J-School with the goal of project completion between 2019 - 2021. The total cost to King's should not exceed \$10M. The fall back option is to convert the King's gym to the J-School building and move the athletic program, including varsity sports, to alternate facilities. The J-School project should be a central part of the King's capital campaign.**

Priority 2 Requirements (Total Cost \$2.0 M)

Energy Efficiency

44. King's is not an energy efficient campus. Well illustrated by the number of windows opened on any winter day to offset the output of the heating system. This is only one example and there are many others. The impact is not only wasted energy and increased operating cost, but a message that the University is out of step with global and national environmental concerns.
45. The facilities improvements recommended in the CMP will all embrace energy efficiency as a principle, beginning with the reconstructed Bay residences. In the immediate term, King's is negotiating an energy performance contract to begin in 2016 which will result in significant savings and increased energy efficiency. It will also eliminate approximately \$1M in deferred maintenance.
46. **Cost.** The contract will entail a cost of up to \$1.2M and include a financing option which would obviate the need for capital outlay and recover the contract cost through energy savings of \$.175 M per year in about 7 years. Self-financing or third-party financing are also options, and would realize some net annual savings immediately.
- 47. Recommendation: If the energy performance contract is successfully concluded proceed with implementation immediately. Review financing options.**

Gym renewal

48. The King's gym has been undergoing a series of upgrades through in-house work by the facilities department. Current planned work is estimated at approximately \$0.8M, which is part of the estimated \$1.9M total deferred maintenance obligation for the gym. Some non-athletics faculty offices continue to be located in the gym. As noted above conversion of the gym to the J-School building is the fall-back option, if new construction is not forthcoming. **Cost.** The current capital requirement is \$0.8M for in-house work.
- 49. Recommendation: Limit in-house work on the gym to 'finish the job' and essential requirements until the way ahead is determined for the J-School. When this is clear, faculty offices now in the gym should be a priority for relocation to the A&A building when space becomes available.**

Priority 3 Requirements (No capital cost at present)

Storage space increase

50. Although storage appears as a frequent unresolved requirement in the PGS report, the CPC does not consider that capital investment is required. In-house work has already improved general storage space in the NAB ‘penthouse’, improvement of day students’ locker facilities and other minor storage requirements can be addressed through planned maintenance. A forthcoming records retention policy will help with file management. Off-site storage offers a simple option for many institutional storage needs and should be investigated as a matter of policy. The CPC also noted that storage is something of a cultural issue at King’s, and there appears to be a systemic reluctance to part with anything which contributes to storage concerns.

51. Recommendation: No capital expenditure. Address storage requirements through routine maintenance and in-house work. Off-site storage is an option if required. Stop hoarding.

Greening the King’s campus or ‘Sod the Quad’

52. This longstanding idea involves reducing or eliminating the parking area in front of the A&A building and increasing the green area. It was a top priority for students in the recent survey. However until alternate parking arrangements can be identified, e.g. if Dalhousie were to construct a parking garage near King’s, no action can be taken and no capital investment can be planned.

53. Recommendation: No capital expenditure. Monitor future opportunities.

V Managing Deferred Maintenance and Capital Requirements

54. Deferred maintenance is an ongoing issue at King’s as in any institution with heritage buildings. The challenge arises when ‘deferred’ in fact means ‘postponed until it becomes a crisis’. This has often been the case at King’s over the years. There is now a good understanding of the deferred maintenance requirements, and facilities plans are helping deal with the most urgent issues and prioritize the remainder. The total deferred maintenance requirement for King’s is estimated at roughly \$9.2M and there is much potential overlap with proposed capital projects. Without a capital program, King’s will need to spend about \$1M per year on

deferred maintenance just to maintain the status quo. The better approach is to address deferred maintenance through building renewal wherever possible.

55. In terms of deferred maintenance ‘governance’, the CPC should continue to work closely with the Bursar and Facilities Director and to be involved in assessing both major deferred maintenance requirements and unforeseen major maintenance arisings. The CPC should ensure that such work is aligned with capital projects wherever possible and provide advice and recommendations to the Administration, Finance Audit and Risk Committee and Board of Governors. This is already working well in practice.

VI A Note on the Library

56. During its consultations the CPC determined that while there are ongoing maintenance issues for the Library, it did not represent one of the identified capital requirements of the CMP. Nonetheless its importance to the University merits a brief observation. The King’s Library is one of the most impressive and beautiful spaces on campus. It also appears to have substantial space in the basement which could be more effectively used e.g. through better, vertical, storage arrangements in the archives. If the basement book stacks could then move to some of the archive space, a light and beautiful student study space could be created on the basement level. The benefit for students would be substantial and the cost of such conversion would be very modest. The Committee recommends that student use, such as that suggested here, be considered as the first requirement if conversion of the Library basement is considered at any point in the future.

VII Communications

57. In developing a communications strategy for the Campus Master Plan 2016, the following points may be considered:

- The Plan directly reflects the consultations which took place for the 2008 Report on Space, the Strategic Plan 2013-2016 and the 2015 Student Survey of Facilities. All of the issues addressed in the Plan are derived from these consultations;
- The Plan addresses the five priorities for facilities improvement identified in the Strategic Plan 2013-2016;
- The Plan sets the stage for the capital campaign and will be King’s facilities’ roadmap for many years to come;

- Once the Board has decided how it will approach the Plan, messaging to the King's Community should focus on communicating the Board's intent with respect to the Plan's recommendations rather than engaging a new round of consultations.

VIII An Overall Financial Strategy for the Campus Master Plan 2016

58. The Campus Master Plan identifies a total requirement of approximately \$22.2M in capital investment, of which \$20.2M is Priority 1 (essential and immediate). The CPC considers that at least \$16-18M of the total should be the target of sponsor funding in the capital campaign, leaving roughly \$4.2-6.2M to be addressed through other sources. These figures are very significant and will evolve further. The requirements have however been identified through a very deliberate and detailed process and reflect the Committee's considered recommendations.
59. An overall financial strategy for the CMP, including capital campaign goals and other funding requirements should be addressed by the Board's Finance, Audit and Risk Committee.

IX Conclusion

60. The Campus Master Plan is ultimately about the students of this University. Renewing the facilities to ensure their safety, comfort and enhanced learning and life experiences at King's is essential and long overdue. Students who have a happy and fulfilling experience at King's are also the University's greatest advocates. Implementation of this plan is timely and important in every sense.
61. Successful implementation of the Campus Master Plan is ultimately about risk management. A major investment to improve facilities, address essential requirements and make King's more competitive will entail financial burden and some risk. It will also demonstrate confidence in the future and support increased enrolment goals. The alternative, not to invest sufficiently in infrastructure, will inevitably entail cost and risk as well.... perhaps greater risk than the former.
62. On 10 March 2016, the Board of Governors passed the motion to '**...approve the Campus Master Plan 2016 for implementation in alignment with the anticipated Capital Campaign and that the Finance Audit and Risk Committee address an overall financial strategy for the Campus Master Plan**'.