Society Interrogatory #2

Interrogatory

Reference:
Exhibit D3-1-2, Attachment 2, Clarington Corporate Campus Business Case Summary.

The Campus BCS indicates under Business Need that OPG intends to accommodate approximately 2,400 employees in 1,680 workspaces, with approximately 30% of staff assumed to be out of the office at any point in time. Under Key Risks the BCS indicates: "As part of the on-going evolution of OPG's workplace needs, there is a risk that the assumed size of the new office building will need to be modified."

a) Please explain how OPG arrived at this 30% assumption? For example, is the assumption based on any studies or surveys, internal or external to OPG? If so, please describe them.
b) How is OPG planning to control the flow of employees in such a space constrained environment? For example. will there be a management process in place to direct employees if the office space is over capacity, or will overflow space be provided?
c) Please explain how "a corporate campus will facilitate increased collaboration" if 30% of employees are out of the office at any given time.
d) Is the assumed size of the building still a risk to the project? If so, has OPG's mitigation plan changed since the BCS was approved?

Response

a) The 30% assumption is based on internal occupancy reviews and general industry practices.

b) The design of the new building will not be a "space constrained environment." The space will be properly designed based on modern design principles which includes less barriers, promotes circulation and connection to other employees, and provides a variety of work settings including meeting, collaborative, and private work spaces. There will be sufficient seating to accommodate all employees assigned to the space.

c) OPG's non-plant based staff are currently spread among 12 different leased office locations around the Greater Toronto Area, the OPG-owned Kipling Ave. office and the Region of Niagara. Moving most of the employees from these sites together at the new campus will facilitate increased collaboration.

d) Yes, changes in assumptions, dependencies and scope are still a risk to the project. The mitigation plan has not changed.