

---

---

**Prospectus for a New Residence Hall**  
**The University of Texas at Austin**

February 5, 1998

---

---

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SECTION 1.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>OBJECTIVES FOR A NEW RESIDENCE HALL .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROJECT NEEDS JUSTIFICATION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR HOUSING FRESHMAN .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SECTION 2.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PRIVATIZATION OF ON-CAMPUS HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>HOUSING TYPES CONSIDERED.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>LIST OF PRIVATE DORMITORIES IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO CAMPUS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SECTION 3.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>PRELIMINARY NEEDS ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>SECTION 4.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>BENCHMARK SURVEY OF NEW RESIDENCE HALLS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>SECTION 5.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>COST BREAKDOWN OF A NEW 800 BED FACILITY .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE NEW RESIDENCE HALL .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>ANNUAL BUDGET FOR DHFS WITH NEW HALL .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>DIVISION OF HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE 7 YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT     PLAN - 1998-2004 .....</b>	<b>21</b>

Note on the Prospectus:

The information contained in this prospectus is based on preliminary site suggestions by Cesar Pelli in the Campus Master Plan and informal programming efforts done within the Division of Housing and Food Service in order to provide detail to the Board of Regents in our request to accelerate it's position in the Capital Improvement Plan. When approval is granted to proceed and professionals are commissioned, information in this packet will be superceded.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The proposed new residence hall for The University of Texas Austin campus has been a long desired goal of the administration of this component. It is needed to fulfill the mission of The University to focus on the freshman experience, improve retention and graduation rates and provide a greater sense of on-campus community within the student body.

- A new residence hall will be a solid step in achieving the objectives of The University
  - a) Provide housing for 75% of the first-time freshmen (this is the percentage of new freshmen who desire to live on campus)
  - b) Begin to comply with the Campus Master Plan recommendation to double housing available on campus in ten years
  - c) Provide faculty and staff professional quality on-campus housing for seminars and workshops during the summer sessions

**Details .....Section 1**
  
- Consideration was given to the different types of housing needed, types of construction possible, sites, both on and off campus, and financial opportunities for using private developers. It was decided the highest need at this time was for an on-campus community living facility, using quality design and construction techniques compliant with the Campus Master Plan, that assisted in providing the type of housing needed for academic year and summer usage. For this type of project, use of a private developer was not considered the best route, but a Design/Build type of contract was selected to speed construction due to demand.

**Details.....Section 2**
  
- A preliminary program was drawn up by a committee of staff, faculty and students. This committee decided that the type of housing needed was double rooms with private baths or suite configurations with support areas of the type now standard in quality institutions.

**Details.....Section 3**
  
- Benchmarking was done with similar projects around the state and across the nation. Averages show a completed and furnished facility will cost approximately \$40,000 per bed without the construction of a major new dining facility.

**Details.....Section 4**
  
- Cost analysis was done for the new self-supporting facility based on the benchmarks and detailed program and a preliminary budget scenario was outlined. Projections at this time show an estimated \$3,300 room rate (estimated +/- 10%) per long session charge to make the new facility feasible.

**Details.....Section 5**

The University feels strongly that the program outlined correctly assesses the needs of The University of Texas at Austin and its future student residents. It will be a project built with quality, including state of the art use of technology in data networks, fire protection, security and infrastructure; a place that can be a center of university community life, with faculty apartments and versatile community spaces; and a building that will be an asset to this campus for future generations.

## SECTION 1

### OBJECTIVES FOR A NEW RESIDENCE HALL

- Assist in meeting The University goal of housing 75% of 6,000 first-time freshman on campus by increasing number of beds available by 1,600 (in 2 phases), to 6,900. The Division of Housing and Food Service (DHFS) currently houses approximately 54% (2,875) of new freshmen in its 5,300 existing spaces.
- Begin to comply with The University's Campus Master Plan done by Cesar Pelli, which proposes doubling the total on-campus housing available in the next 10 years.
- Build a self-supporting facility that will not impact the rates to other students yet be considerably more affordable than private dormitories.
- Build a residential housing facility that has a sense of community and tradition.
- Build housing on the UT Austin campus (where the greatest need exists) that can more easily and economically be served by existing infrastructure and staff, and that does not further exacerbate the commuter problems on campus.
- Provide a residence hall that will have the quality of the other structures on campus, blending with the architectural style of the campus, and which will have a life span similar to those existing facilities.
- Address the needs and expectations of our current students in their residence halls for university computer network linkage, cable, private temperature control, Micro-Fridge, security and more privacy and comfort.
- Provide professional seminar and workshop housing during the summer sessions for faculty, students and staff.

### PROJECT NEEDS JUSTIFICATION

The current University Campus Master Plan outlines an ambitious goal to double housing available on campus in ten years to fill the demand of the student population. In addition, surveys of current students indicate that reasonably priced housing on campus continues to be a factor in making their college selection.

Currently 5,300 beds are available in on-campus housing. This number has held constant since 1969 when the Jester Center was opened. Since then enrollment has increased approximately 15,000 (40%) while housing has not followed suit. It is the desire of the University administration to house 75% of the first-time freshmen. This percentage is based on data that shows 75% of new freshmen will take advantage of on-campus housing if it is available. First-time freshmen enrollment in the current year is approximately 6,000 suggesting provision of housing for 4,500 of these individuals is needed. In addition, provision of housing for upper class students who want to stay in the University residential community due to cost, ease of living arrangements, proximity to classes or community atmosphere gives a mixed community which provides a more

DHFS currently houses 2,500 non-“new freshmen”. New construction would allow us to begin to cover both these demands.

The number of applications for housing from new students has continued to increase 1,000 per year for the last four years. The 1998/99 academic year is showing a projected increase in applicants of 20% over last year, probably to reach 11,000 before the beginning of the school year. Students must often wait well into the summer before the Division is able to offer them housing contracts. Many students cannot wait to finalize housing plans for their University tenure, and drop themselves from consideration. Existing housing on campus can simply not accommodate this demand. The estimated increase in accepted freshmen in the next academic year may strain facilities even further

Based on the long-range recommendations of the Campus Master Plan and in response to the demand for housing in the current housing market outlined above, the University administration recommends that study begin for doubling of on-campus housing units over the next ten years. Also, it seems imperative that some construction be pursued immediately. This first step should be the addition of 1,600 beds added in 2 phases of approximately 800 beds each, enough new units to fill the freshmen initiative need. Research has shown halls of this size or smaller optimize the student experience by facilitating a sense of community which is intrinsic to our design. The form of this housing should be double rooms with private baths in communal living arrangements. This is based on a detailed analysis and description of the facility and the rooms completed by a committee of students, faculty and staff. (See Section 3)

University housing provides an economical yet secure and convenient living environment. Convenient and attractive University housing influences the kind of student the University attracts and keeps. It also impacts the type of citizen the University eventually produces. Therefore, any new housing should continue to develop the goal of providing a physical environment conducive to maximum intellectual stimulation and academic achievement and scholarship, in addition to promotion of emotional, physical, social and spiritual growth. New housing should strive to develop a sense of community, foster the development of small, identifiable groups, provide adequate privacy, and stimulate an awareness of the University environment as a cohesive whole. The Division of Housing and Food Service wants to fulfill this mission.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR HOUSING FRESHMAN**

- The goal is to provide housing for 75% of the first-time freshmen on campus in addition to housing upperclassmen that also desire to live in the halls. This would be accomplished with a 2-phase addition to the on-campus housing stock. Total first-time freshmen for the current academic year was approximately 6,000, so the goal is to house 4,500.

	<u>Total Housed</u>	<u>Freshmen Housed</u>	<u>As a % of 6,000 New Freshmen</u>
1997/98 - Current number of beds	5,318	2,875	54%
Additional beds -Phase 1 - 800	800	800	
Additional beds -Phase 2 - 800	800	800	
<b>Total number of beds after both phases are complete:</b>	<b>6,918</b>	<b>4,475</b>	<b>75%</b>

## SECTION 2

### **PRIVATIZATION OF ON-CAMPUS HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

The following is an examination of the privatized development option that could be considered for the proposed new residence hall on the main campus of The University of Texas at Austin. Much of the research presented was available through the Association for College and University Housing Officers – International and from presentations at the Southeast Association of Housing Officers Annual Conference in February 1996.

#### **Advantages**

- Capital costs move to the private sector
- University shares in cash flow
- Project reverts to the University free of debt at end of lease period, typically 25-30 years

#### **Disadvantages**

- Developers pay taxes and must realize a profit, thus rates will be higher
- Possible decreased educational, social, cultural and programmatic focus
- Developments typically built for 20-30 year life span vs. 75-100 years.
- Difficult to monitor and evaluate management performance
- Institution still retains the responsibility for quality service
- Increased staff turnover, since wages and benefits may be lower
- Decreased support and amenity space (i.e. lounges, computer labs, etc) as these do not produce revenue
- University must guarantee occupancy or allow developer to rent to the community
- “Absentee landlord” mind set
- Newly authorized delivery methods (in this case, design/build construction) eliminate faster delivery time developers could previously offer.

#### **Contractual Considerations**

- Architectural standards and construction methods must be well defined to tie developer to the desired product
- Financial solvency of developer must be determined
- Protection against the developer taking the proceeds out of the project rather than re-investing in the care and maintenance of the development must be addressed
- Protection against the developer deciding to sell the development must be provided
- Must be able to modify or terminate the contract under specifically defined circumstances
- Protection from developer’s negligence, breaches of security, and issues of liability must be addressed
- Protection against unreasonable rental rate increases must be provided

## Research

1. The following items are excerpts from a presentation by Gene Luna, Director of Housing at the University of South Carolina at the 1996 Southeast Association of Housing Officers Annual Conference.

Coopers and Lybrand, *Contract management or self-operation: a decision making guide for higher education*, 1993, Six critical factors in privatization decisions.

- Financial – the direct and indirect cost to the institution
- Human Resources – the effect on employees within and outside the functional area
- Mission and Culture – the impact of choosing an alternative that is not consistent with the institution's historical mission and culture
- Management Control and Efficiency – the institution's ability to control the direction and operational priorities of the development and the implications of choosing a management philosophy that features decreased control
- Service Quality – the effect on meeting the needs of the primary customers
- Legal and ethical Questions – the level of risk and potential liability posed, potential conflicts of interest, tax ramifications, and the potential pitfalls and power of the contract
- Biddison & Hier, Trusteeship (May/June, 1996), Consider Privatized Housing – When.
- Housing is not considered central to the core mission and strategic vision of the institution
- Housing revenues and/or occupancy have been on a downward trend for three or more years
- The potential to increase current revenues is projected to be substantial enough to cover the university's revenue targets and the developers fee for services
- Internally and externally driven funding cuts have reduced staff levels below a critical mass – or will in the near term

2. The following statement appeared in an article entitled *Building College Housing in Partnership with the Private Sector* in the April 1993 ACUHO-I Talking Stick by Leo Lauterbach, Vice President of Special Projects, Moody-Woodley Management Company, Dayton, Ohio.

“To keep the project within acceptable budgets that can be supported by student rents, one would probably have to forgo features such as central hallways, common lounges, elevators, and steel and concrete structural systems”.

3. The following is an analysis of privatized development at the University of Texas at Dallas and Prairie View A&M University.  
UT Dallas

UT Dallas has approximately 800 apartments that were privately developed, owned and managed on university property. Plans are underway to construct 100 additional apartments. These will not be owned by the developer, but rather by the University. The University is also in the process of purchasing some of the units that were previously built by the developer. The university-developed apartments will occupy a site of approximately 4 acres and will not include community amenities such as a clubhouse, as these are already in place.

The original developments did not include any student development functions, including staffing. More recent developments have a student development component. A Housing Committee hears complaints and advises the developer's management. The University's Internal Auditor reviews the financial aspects of the development. The Residence Life Office is currently pleased with the management and maintenance of the developments.

These developments are the only housing options offered by UT Dallas. There are no traditional residence halls. At the time that privatized development was considered the University had land and insufficient financial resources to construct university owned apartments.

#### Prairie View A&M

Prairie View A&M University has completed two phases of apartment construction with a private developer. They are in the process of constructing a third phase. These are all located on campus. They have traditional residence halls that are in need of renovations and have insufficient funds to perform the needed work. They have entered into the privatized development in order to take the worst of these halls off line and still retain the number of students housed on campus.

The development standards used were modified residential standards and do not completely meet typical State of Texas requirements. The properties are amortized for 25 years, at which time the University will retain full ownership. The Housing Office is very well satisfied with the developer and the management of their apartments. Some staffing and training issues have evolved, but none that couldn't be easily resolved. Prairie View A&M's housing expansions have mirrored UT Dallas in that they also had available land and limited financial resources.

The developer at Prairie View A&M is American Campus Lifestyles, Austin, Texas. In their Summer/Fall 1997 newsletter, it was stated that Phase II of Prairie View A&M's apartment project was financed for \$21 million and houses 648 students, which is a per student cost of \$32,407. The development includes a clubhouse with computer lab, lounge, and exercise space.

**Recommendation:**

The construction of a residence hall on the main campus of The University of Texas at Austin will be a major step in fulfilling the recommendations of the Campus Master Plan to double the occupancy of university housing. There exist a limited number of sites to construct this first residence hall and subsequent others. These available sites have a limited area available for construction and therefore lend themselves to traditional residence halls designs. Additionally, campus structures must adhere to the strict developmental and aesthetic guidelines of the University and the Campus Master Plan. Privatized developments would be much more suited to an apartment arrangement where the site lends itself to low rise development with less stringent design parameters and where the type and quality of student development programs are not as critical. The primary advantage of privatizing the development of university housing is financial in nature and a route selected primarily by institutions unable to justify or capable of providing the up front expenses. Since the financial assessment done by the Division of Housing and Food Service confirms that a traditionally funded development can and will pay for itself, it is recommended that a privatized development not be considered at this time.

**HOUSING TYPES CONSIDERED**

**A. Communal off-campus housing Eliminated at this time because:**

- The goal of this housing project is to create an on-campus community with greater identity and loyalty and provide the atmosphere most advantageous for freshman success. Off-campus housing cannot provide this.
- On campus is the most desirable interim step in living experience as expressed by freshman parents due to security, community, supervision and support.
- Serious commuting problems already exist for students trying to reach and park on campus. Proximity is paramount.
- 4,126 beds in private dormitory developments already exist to address the needs of the students who do not wish to live on campus and participate in the University resident community and can afford the additional charges of a private facility. (See the following enclosure of private dormitories in the campus area.)
- Cost of running a remote operation requiring staff, supplies and food service would not be as economical as on campus.
- Outsourcing the construction or running of the new facility removes much of the review and control of the housing product and the operating style while still bearing the label of a University of Texas sponsored establishment.

B. Apartment structures. Eliminated at this time because:

- Though additional apartment housing for graduate students is needed, an apartment style complex does not address the primary goal of providing on-campus housing at this time.
- As the desire is to build on campus, this type of construction does not blend with the style and quality of current campus structures. Nor do currently offered sites on campus contain square footage necessary for the increase in footprint of this type of structure. UT Dallas' project is 24 units per acre. At this density, to build 800 units we would need 33 acres if land.
- Apartment living does not include many of the advantages of the traditional supported lifestyle and community atmosphere needed for the successful freshmen experience. Most are built without amenities such as meeting spaces, network wiring, and support spaces such as exercise lounges or computer labs.
- Adequate numbers of apartments already exist to address the needs of the undergraduate students who desire that kind of living experience.

C. On-campus community living facility. Selected because

- It emphasizes development of the student through adequate community space and designs for a more academically involved lifestyle. (Student lounges will also serve as breakout rooms for seminars and workshops hosted on campus during the summer.)
- Rooms can be provided with the technology to better support the needs of this generation in their living and academic pursuits. This will include data networks, phone lines, cable TV connections, and Micro-Fridges.
- Fire and personal security can be provided through full sprinkled facilities and access controlled by security video cameras and card readers tied into University databases.
- It can be designed with private baths in double rooms to increase privacy of residence hall living. (85% of current residents have had their own bath and 90% have a private room at home.)
- It can be built in the style of the surrounding campus structures and in compliance with the guidelines set out in the Campus Master Plan.
- Food and retail options on first floor to can serve not only residents but all students involved in that area of campus.

**LIST OF PRIVATE DORMITORIES IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO CAMPUS**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Manager</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Freshmen</b>	<b>Price per month</b>
Abbey House 408 W. 17th Austin, 78705 no Web site available	Stephen McNally 474-2408	9	3	\$265-495 (no meals)
Castilian 2323 San Antonio Austin, 78705 www.rentnet.com	Rose Marie VanScoy 478-9811	716	573	\$685-720
Contessa East 2706 Nueces Austin, 78705 Contessa West and Barrone 2707 Rio Grande Austin, 78705 http://www.contessa.com	Maria Cisne 476-4648	714	500	\$584-810  \$623-898
Dobie Center 2021 Guadalupe Austin, 78705 www.dobiecenter.com	Todd Engstrom 505-1000	947	616	\$725-1156
Goodall Wooten 2112 Guadalupe Austin, 78705 www.goodallwooten.com	Louise Guye 472-1343r	140	70	\$333-569 (no meals)
Hardin House 2206 Rio Grande Austin, 78705 www.hardinhouse.com	Patricia Baier 472-6717	200	190	
Ma Maison Women's 2222 Pearl St. Austin, 78705 mm@jump.net	Michelle Ralls 474-2224	65	32	\$350-700 (no meals)
Madison House 709 W. 22nd Austin, 78705 http://www.madisonhouse.com	Terrence Reese 478-9891	150	120	\$554-688
Madison III and Belair 900 W. 22nd Austin, 78705 http://www.madisonhouse.com	Terrence Reese 478-9891	200	40	\$385-641
Scottish Rite 210 W. 27th Austin, 78705 www.srd.org.	Suzi Holt 476-9131	265	199	
The White House Women's 2819 Rio Grande Austin, 78705 no website available	Floyd Martine 476-5657	110	44	\$690-890
Tower Manor 1908 University Austin, 78705 no website available	June Reese 478-2185	35	7	\$330-381 (no meals)
University Towers 801 W. 24th Austin, 78705 www.citysearch.com	Ugene Olson 472-5846	575	518	\$765-1428
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4,126</b>	<b>2,912</b>	

## SECTION 3

### PRELIMINARY NEEDS ANALYSIS

#### DIVISION OF HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE

New Residence Hall

Preliminary Needs

1/8/98

#### **History**

The Division of Housing and Food Service has operated at 100% occupancy for the last 12 years and is unable to meet the University housing goals with existing facilities. These goals include 1) increasing the percentage of first-time freshmen housed to 75% of the entering class and 2) doubling the total number of students we house on campus (to be done over the next ten years). We currently house approximately 50% of the 6,000 first-time freshmen. These goals, combined with the demand for existing housing, define the need for new residence space.

#### **Identified Goals**

A preliminary description of the type of building being considered by the Division for the Phase 1 of development is attached, with highlights below:

- An 800 bed residence
- Building will house undergraduates
- A minimal in-building Food Service (deli, snack bar, etc.) combined with traditional options at Jester Dining Center
- Nine month student use combined with a first class summer conference facility use designed into the facility
- Two person rooms with private baths
- Individually controlled HVAC systems
- State of the art technology design integrated into all factors of construction
- A strict adherence to the architectural standards delineated in the Campus Master Plan, combined with a world class architectural design
- Elevators to provide reasonable access during peak times
- ADA compliance, all signage Braille
- Energy efficient design, materials and fixtures
- Integrated card access/video security system

#### **Current Project Status**

The University is working with Cesar Pelli to perform an in depth feasibility study of alternative site locations. The study includes analysis of other construction slated for the area and the interrelations of such buildings to provide a planned whole.

In adherence with UT Systems requirements an ad-hoc committee is being formed for the purpose of overseeing the entire project and providing university-wide input. Its first order of business will be to assist the Division in choosing a planning consultant for that required phase, as required by Regents Rules prior to actual design.

**A. Residence Rooms**

1. Approx. 200 s.f. to 240 s.f. per double occupancy
2. Private bath in each room
3. Shower enclosure unit, no bathtub
4. Movable furniture, no built-ins
5. Individually controlled overhead lighting as well as task lighting
6. Operable windows at all rooms
7. Phone, cable TV outlet, and data line per each occupant. Separate circuit for computer
8. Individually controlled HVAC at each room
9. Hard flooring (no carpet in room)
10. Provide space for bicycle storage (possibly hanging)
11. ADA compliance
12. Non structural wall construction, cost/benefit analysis on priorities #1 & #2
  1. block
  2. plaster on lathe
13. Integrated tack strip for each resident
14. Mini blinds
15. Exterior room # with replaceable name tags
16. All rooms sprinkled
17. Hard wired smoke detectors
18. 800 beds total

19. Individual closets
20. Provisions for future technology expansion
21. Steel security screens on all windows
22. Message board on or adjacent to all doors
23. Fire escape maps on inside of all doors

**B. Apartments. These will be used as living areas for Hall Coordinators and for special needs, faculty in residence, conferences.**

1. Four units
  2. Two bedroom apartments
  3. 700 s. f.
  4. Living/dining area with adjacent kitchenette
  5. Locate in an area differentiated from resident rooms
  6. 1<sup>st</sup> floor apartment with private entrance
  7. Private bathroom with bathtub/shower
  8. Movable furniture, no built-ins
  9. Central overhead lighting as well as task lighting
  10. Windows at all rooms
  11. Phone, cable TV outlet. and data line in each room. Separate circuit for computer.
  12. Individually controlled HVAC
  13. Hard flooring or carpet
  14. ADA compliance-all rooms
  15. Non structural wall construction, cost/benefit analysis on priorities #1 and #2
    1. block
    2. plaster on lathe
- 3.

16. Integrated tack strip in each room.
17. Mini-blinds
18. Exterior room # with replaceable name tags
19. All rooms sprinkled
20. Hard wired smoke detectors
21. Adequate cabinet and closet space
22. Steel security screens on all windows
23. Fire escape map on inside of all doors
24. Washer/dryer connection for compact unit

**C. Staff living areas / Resident Assistants**

1. Single occupancy room of 160 s. f.
2. Furnished as a single with a small sitting / counseling area
3. One such dedicated space for each 20 standard rooms
4. Locate in the center of residence area, not at ends of halls
5. Same room considerations as residence rooms in Section A

**D. Support Facilities by student living area-Meaning the group of rooms considered a unit or cluster size with its own support systems. Size or number to be determined. An industry standard is approximately 25 rooms or 50 residents.**

1. Study / community lounges
2. Custodial room
3. Storage room (custodial and maintenance)
4. Nearby recycling center & trash room
6. Small guest restroom, ADA compliant

The needs for this smaller unit vs. needs met by larger community wide programs/facilities must be analyzed. Examples are vending machines at each area or centralized at a few points in building.

**E. Building wide support**

1. Formal lounge
2. Recreation area/Exercise room
3. Study lounge
4. Smaller meeting rooms
5. Computer lab
6. Music room
7. Post office
8. Vending area
9. TV room
10. Public rest rooms
11. Outside patios / terraces / picnic areas
12. Large conference room with ability for partitioning, kitchen facilities and state-of-the art audio/visual and lighting
13. Laundry with ironing area
14. Security at entry point to each living area

**F. Facility Support**

1. Express food service options with limited seating
2. Convenience Store
3. Building services office (custodial, maintenance)
4. Facilities maintenance shop & storage area
5. Supply room

6. Storage rooms: catering, food, custodial, furniture, office supplies
7. Linen room
8. Men's & women's locker rooms & rest rooms with showers
9. Staff break room
10. Receiving room / dock
11. Trash room
12. Recycling room
13. ATM capability

**G. Administrative Support**

1. Residence life staff offices
2. Security system monitoring station
3. Central 24 hr. desk/office

**H. Access**

1. As much parking as possible.
2. Good move in / move out access for 800 residents at one time
3. Facilities support access
4. Delivery access
5. Emergency vehicle access
6. Conference approach, drop off, parking
7. Card access security system for entire building Security cameras at entrances.
8. Security phones
9. Emergency vehicle access
10. One formal entrance with 24 hr. desk. Other required points of egress as necessary.

SECTION 4

**BENCHMARK SURVEY OF NEW RESIDENCE HALLS**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Architect</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u># of Students</u>	<u>Total Project Cost</u>	<u>Comp. Date</u>	<u>Gross Sq.Ft.</u>	<u>Cost per Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>Gross Sq.Ft. per Student</u>	<u>Cost Per Student</u>
Texas Tech University	Lottie Krishan & Short	Residence Hall	362	\$14,200,000	Aug-99	140,000	\$101	387	\$39,226
Texas Christian University	Lottie Krishan & Short	Residence Hall	264	\$11,038,000	Jan-99	80,940	\$136	333	\$41,811
Southwestern University	Hasting & Chavetta	Residence Hall	124	\$4,644,000	Aug-97	36,000	\$129	290	\$37,451
Purdue University	Scholer Corp.	Residence Hall + Food Service	800	\$36,000,000 (includes furn.)	Aug-93	315,200	\$114	394	\$45,000
University of North Carolina-Charlotte	Little & Associates	Residence Hall	404	\$14,434,000 (includes furn.)	Aug-99	165,338	\$87	409	\$35,643
St. John's University	Einhorn Yafee Prescott	Residence Hall	700	\$30,000,000	Aug-99	240,000	\$125	343	\$42,857
Lafayette College	Einhorn Yafee Prescott	Residence Hall	116	\$5,200,000	Aug-98	37,600	\$138	324	\$44,828
Georgetown University	Einhorn Yafee Prescott	Residence Hall	750	\$50,000,000	Aug-00	247,000	\$202	330	\$67,000
Eastern Connecticut Univ.	Herbert S. Newman	Residence Hall	448	\$18,500,000	Dec-98	175,000	\$106	390	\$41,295
Western Connecticut Univ.	Herbert S. Newman	Residence Hall	425	\$18,500,000	Dec-98	180,000	\$103	423	\$43,529
University Of South Carolina	Robert Stern & Co.	Residence Hall	400	\$15,300,000 (includes furn.)	Aug-97	143,000	\$107	358	\$38,250
University Of South Carolina	Sasaki & Assoc.	Residence Hall	440	\$19,200,000	Aug-00	135,000	\$142	307	\$43,636
Illinois Wesleyan University	BLDD Architects	Residence Hall	118	\$6,600,000 (includes furn.)	Aug-97	54,255	\$122	460	\$54,255
UT Austin's proposed facility		Residence Hall + minor Food Service	800	\$36,000,000 (includes furn.)	Aug-2000	268,660	\$134	336	\$45,000

## SECTION 5

### COST BREAKDOWN OF A NEW 800 BED FACILITY

<u>Cost</u>	<u>Estimated amounts</u>	<u>Price per bed</u>
Construction of Facility	27,000,000	33,750
Furnishings and Equipment	2,340,000	2,925
Fees	1,846,000	2,308
EMS and material testing	1,292,000	1,615
OFPC charge	750,000	937
Contingencies	2,933,000	3,666
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$36,161,000</b>	<b>\$45,201</b>

### BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE NEW RESIDENCE HALL

#### Notes on the following budget:

- Rates for new rooms will be higher than other residences on campus, approximately \$3,300 (actual may vary +/- 10%) compared to \$2,500 (approximate, extrapolating from existing rates) for long session.
- Rates for new rooms during summer seminars and workshops will be \$35/night per bed (actual may vary from \$35-50).
- The Division of Housing and Food Service (DHFS) is striving to make this new hall self-supporting in order to minimize impact on other needed construction and on the rates for older residences. Only if necessary, a minor equalization charge may be added to existing residence hall room rates to assist in repayment. This is not reflected in this budget and we do not intend to do this unless absolutely necessary.
- Meal plan rates will continue unaffected by new residence hall construction. Current proposed rate for 1998/99 is \$2,119 for the highest meal plan.
- DHFS will use between \$4,000,000 and \$6,000,000 from reserves to begin construction, depending on the Gross Maximum Price. The following budget is based on issuance of \$30,000,000 worth of revenue bonds to finance the remainder at 5.5% interest, giving a debt service of approximately \$2,500,000 per year for 20 years and a required 15% coverage based on that debt service of \$375,000 annually to reserves.
- The Division of Housing and Food Service is currently working with the Development Office concerning solicitation efforts to raise funds to offset the cost of this project. As that effort has just been initiated, possible contributions from outside sources are not used in this analysis.

**ANNUAL BUDGET FOR DHFS WITH NEW HALL**

<u>ESTIMATED INCOME</u>	<b>New Hall Per student charge in Fall of 2000</b>	<b>New Residence Hall Budget</b>	<b>1998/99 Existing Hall proposed per student charge</b>	<b>1998/99 Existing Halls Budget</b>	<b>Combined budgets</b>
Room charges	800 at \$3,300	2,640,000	5,064 at \$2,243 195 at \$3,589	12,656,449	15,296,449
Summer session professional seminar and workshop housing income	\$35/bed per night ½ full for 40 nights	575,000		754,030	1,329,030
Retail operations and miscellaneous income		229,200		877,082	1,106,282
Vacancy loss		(79,200)		(229,691)	(308,891)
Meal plan charges	800 at \$2,200		5,259 at		
		<u>1,760,000</u>	\$1790-\$2,119	<u>11,680,253</u>	<u>13,440,253</u>
<b>Total Estimated Income</b>		<b>5,125,000</b>		<b>25,738,123</b>	<b>30,863,123</b>
 <b><u>BUDGETED EXPENSES</u></b>					
Salaries		338,181		8,010,014	8,348,195
Food Cost		880,000		3,594,608	4,474,608
Supplies and Services		83,620		1,984,564	2,068,184
Fringe Benefits and premium sharing		92,735		2,295,216	2,387,951
Utilities		532,968		3,409,337	3,942,305
Telephone		73,140		504,414	577,554
Property and Comprehensive Ins		4,856		44,835	49,691
DO Office Expense		(72,840)		(287,000)	(359,840)
Facilities Maintenance		259,955		4,374,170	4,634,125
Equipment		<u>20,000</u>		<u>464,071</u>	<u>484,071</u>
<b>Total Budgeted Expenses</b>		<b>2,212,615</b>		<b>24,394,229</b>	<b>26,606,844</b>
 Transfers					
Debt Service		2,500,000		768,095	3,268,095
Parking & Traffic		6,360		414,660	421,020
University Administrative Fee on expenses		25,500		129,505	155,005
Coverage required by Debt Service to reserves (15%)		<u>375,000</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>375,000</u>
<b>Total Annual Expenses for new facility</b>		<b>5,119,475</b>		<b>25,706,489</b>	<b>30,825,964</b>
<b>EXCESS INCOME AFTER TRANSFERS</b>		<b><u>5,525</u></b>		<b><u>31,634</u></b>	<b><u>37,159</u></b>

**DIVISION OF HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE 7 YEAR CAPITAL  
IMPROVEMENT PLAN - 1998-2004**

**Summary of new projects for the years 1998-2004**

Fire and Life Safety Improvements	\$5,100,000
Food Service Facility improvements	\$12,505,000
New on-campus residence hall construction – 2 Phases	\$8,750,000
New graduate housing at apartment complex sites	\$2,000,000
Landscape improvements	\$1,200,000

**Detail of new projects by year**

1998

Fire Alarm Upgrade Jester Food Service	\$100,000
Fire Alarm Upgrade Jester East & West	\$500,000
Landscape Upgrade Jester Amphitheater	\$300,000
Jester Food Service Upgrade - Phase I (Satellite food venues)	\$300,000
New Residence Hall Expenditure - Phase I	\$500,000

1999

Fire Alarm Upgrade Jester East & West (Continuation)	\$500,000
Landscape Upgrade 21 <sup>st</sup> Street	\$300,000
Jester Food Service Upgrade - Phase II (Continuation)	\$300,000
Littlefield Grab & Go	\$300,000
New Residence Hall Expenditure - Phase I	\$3,500,000

2000

Jester Fire Sprinkler Installation - Phase I	\$750,000
Jester Food Service Upgrade - Phase III (1 <sup>st</sup> Floor)	\$4,250,000
Landscape Upgrade WRH Quad	\$300,000
New Residence Hall Expenditure - Phase I	\$100,000
New Graduate Apartments Expenditure	\$250,000

2001

Jester Fire Sprinkler Installation - Phase II	\$750,000
Jester Food Service Upgrade - Phase IV (2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor)	\$4,500,000
New Graduate Apartments Expenditure	\$1,750,000

2002

Jester Fire Sprinkler Installation - Phase III	\$750,000
Jester Food Service Upgrade - Phase V (Ground Floor)	\$2,855,000
New Residence Hall Expenditure - Phase II	\$600,000

\* Note: Routine and preventive maintenance projects not included. They are budgeted under annual operating expenses.