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8.1. COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PROCESS

The design team worked with a committee of individuals identified by U.T. Austin to explore potential relocation scenarios for the graduate student housing facilities currently provided on the Brackenridge Tract, assuming that the Board of Regents with U.T. Austin will continue to feel that there should be designated facilities for this purpose as part of the long term strategy of The University of Texas. The design team visited the sites and saw representative units, met with the University Tenants’ Advisory Board, and had collaborative planning sessions with U.T. Austin representatives. The following report summarizes the activities of this joint group and the conclusions of the study.

8.1.1. TEAM

The U.T. Austin representatives included:
- Victoria Rodriguez, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies
- John Dalton, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies
- Bradley Carpenter, President of the Graduate Student Assembly
- Sonica Reagins-Lilly, Dean of Students and Senior Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
- Floyd Hoelting, Director, Division of Housing and Food Services
- Randy Porter, Associate Director, Division of Housing and Food Services
- Sheril Smith, Manager, Division of Housing and Food Services
- Laurie Mackey, Associate Director, Division of Housing and Food Services

8.1.2. EXISTING U.T. AUSTIN GRADUATE STUDENT HOUSING

There are currently 715 graduate student housing units. 515 units are located on the Brackenridge Tract: 315 in the Brackenridge Apartments and 200 in the Colorado Apartments. An additional 200 units are located on the Gateway parcel, located nearby on 6th Street east of MoPac. There is a mix of one and two-bedroom apartments in the Colorado and Gateway Apartments and one, two, and three-bedroom units available within the Brackenridge Apartments.
8.1.2.1. THE BRACKENRIDGE APARTMENTS

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PROCESS
The Brackenridge Apartments consist of 49 one and two-story modular precast concrete apartment buildings and a freestanding single-story office and maintenance building. Continuous reinforced concrete foundations support the precast concrete walls above. The roofs are wood-framed and bear on the modular concrete panels. Roofing is composition shingles. The superstructure and roofs are unremarkable; foundation vents are unremarkable. A multi-million dollar renovation program was begun, but put on hold pending the outcome of the Conceptual Master Plan for Development project.

**PROJECT FACTS**
- **Year completed**: 1984
- **Site Availability**: 2009
- **Site Area**: 54.7 AC
- **Buildings Area**: 290,560 sf
- **Number of Units**: 315
- **Height**: 1-2 Stories
- **Parking**: 224 spaces

**AMENITIES**
- Playgrounds
- Community Garden
- Laundry Facilities
- U.T. Austin Shuttle Stop

### Unit mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th># Units(%)</th>
<th>2008 Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>785 sf</td>
<td>56 (17.5%)</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>835 sf</td>
<td>212 (67%)</td>
<td>$561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>1010 sf</td>
<td>47 (15.5%)</td>
<td>$715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>315 (100%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaborative Planning Process**

[Diagram of floor plans for 1 Bedroom, 2 Bedroom, 3 Bedroom units]

**Aerial view**

**Site features**
8.1.2.2. THE COLORADO APARTMENTS

Collaborative Planning Process

Colorado Apartments site plans

Bus Stops

Colorado Apartments Field Laboratory
The Colorado Apartments consist of 13 two-story brick apartment buildings and a single-story, free-standing building housing a community meeting space and laundry facilities. Masonry bearing walls support concrete second floor and roof slabs; exterior stair structures are steel and concrete. Site grading is inadequate to provide proper drainage away from foundations.

PROJECT FACTS
Year completed.................................... 1962
Site Availability...................................... 1999
Site Area........................................... 20.9 AC
Buildings Area................................. 120,287 sf
Number of Units.................................... 200
Height.............................................. 2 Stories
Parking............................................. 219 spaces

AMENITIES
Playgrounds
Community Garden
Laundry Facilities
Community meeting space
U.T. Austin Shuttle Stop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit mix</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th># Units(%)</th>
<th>2008 Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BR 572 sf</td>
<td>48 (24%)</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR 659 sf</td>
<td>152 (76%)</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>200(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aerial view
Site features

A 1 Bedroom - 572 sf
2 Bedroom - 659 sf
Dining 9.5 x 7.5
Kitchen 7 x 9
Bedroom 12 x 10
Living Room 13.5 x 12

B Kitchen 6 x 7
Dining 9.5 x 7.5
Bedroom 10 x 5.5
Living Room 12 x 14

C Kitchen 9 x 7.5
Living Room 15 x 13
Bedroom 12 x 10
Bedroom 12 x 14

D Bedroom 11 x 9
Kitchen 7.5 x 14
Living Room 10.5 x 14
Bedroom 9 x 10.5
Bedroom 9.5 x 12
Bedroom 11 x 9

COLORADO APARTMENTS 2501 Lake Austin Boulevard

CoLorado aparTmenTs
2501 Lake Austin Boulevard

AUSTIN, TEXAS
8.1.2.3. THE GATEWAY APARTMENTS

Gateway Apartments site plan

Collaborative Planning Process

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM: Brackenridge Tract
AUSTIN, TEXAS

June 2009 - Project Report page 8.6
The Gateway Apartments are located off the Brackenridge Tract and consist of 19 two and three-story brick buildings. Structures are wood-frame with brick veneer. An existing county-run Infant Parent Program Training Center, a division of Austin Travis County Mental Health Mental Retardation Center, is located at the northern end of the site occupying 6 acres. The six acres are leased to the County through 2085. The site is underutilized due to its relatively steep topography.

PROJECT FACTS
Year completed ........................................ 1972
Site Availability ........................................ n/a
Site Area .................................................. 25.7 AC
Buildings Area ......................................... 165,000 sf
Number of Units ........................................... 200
Height ...................................................... 2-3 Stories
Parking ................................................... 219 spaces

AMENITIES
Playground
Community garden
Tennis/basketball courts
“Club”/event facility
U.T. Austin Shuttle Stop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th># Units(%)</th>
<th>2008 Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>582 sf</td>
<td>150 (75%)</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>749 sf</td>
<td>50 (25%)</td>
<td>$561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C O L L A B O R A T I V E P L A N N I N G P R O C E S S
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8.1.3. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

The following issues and considerations were identified and used in evaluating the existing facilities, policies, locations, and potential future options:

**Strategic Use:** Graduate student housing is important to recruiting the best students. Many of them are from overseas and their decision to come is eased if they don’t have to immediately search for housing in a new city/state/country. Over 70% of the graduate student housing units were populated by foreign students in 2008.

Currently, applicants are taken on a first-come, first-served basis and there is a seven-year limit that is allowed, unless waived by the Graduate Dean on appeal application. A desire to limit the length-of-stay period in order to serve more students, and that the deans be allotted some units to strengthen their offers to the very best graduate student applicants, was expressed in the meetings chaired by Graduate Dean Dr. Victoria Rodriguez.

There are currently 56 undergraduates, mostly upperclassmen, in the “graduate” student housing. Is this the best use of these units, given that these upperclassmen undergraduates were already settled elsewhere? Is it better to leave graduate student housing for incoming/earlier-years graduate students?

**Competitor Institutions:** U.T. Austin aspires to be the finest public research university in the country. Many of U.T. Austin’s competitor institutions provide graduate housing. Table I compares U.T. Austin to its competitor institutions in the ratio of units provided per Full-Time Enrollment (FTE) graduate student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Grad Housing Units</th>
<th>Grad FTE</th>
<th>Ratio: Units to Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 spots for single graduate students</td>
<td>1,050 spots for students with families (majority are graduate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>2007, 12,635</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,365 units for single graduate students</td>
<td>1,575 units for families (graduate and undergraduate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan – Ann Arbor</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>2008, 11,307</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwood (Studies – 3 bedrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8,177</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(That is all the housing UNC-Chapel Hill owns for graduate students per UNC Housing Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>13,042</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,040 Units Eagle Heights (1-2-3 bedrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 units Harvey Street (1-2 bedrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148 units University Heights (9-18bedrooms / 90-2bedrooms / 50-1bedrooms) priorit: graduate families / student families / aademic staff and faculty families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Studies to 3-bedrooms – located in 3-story walk-up and elevator buildings up to 12-stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community:** The Tenants’ Advisory Board and the collaborative planning group speak fondly of the sense of community in each of the Colorado, Gateway, and Brackenridge Apartments, particularly for the foreign students coming to this city/state/country for the first time, (especially their spouses who often do not speak English) who otherwise can feel adrift in the new city/country. Consequently, the groups strongly favor continuing to provide graduate student units, as their competitors do, rather than a subsidy program that would work on the open market around town, not aggregating the units.

**Mathews Elementary School:** Based on interviews, foreign married students with children are glad to be in Mathews’ district. The school has provided teachers fluent in Korean, Chinese, etc. and school officials and parents welcome and accommodate diversity. All three current graduate housing sites are zoned for Mathews; Gateway is located across the street. 150 students go to Mathews as a consideration, therefore, is more important if they could not be handled until at least six months into the future. More units are desired.

**Number of Units:** Currently there are 715 units (Gateway 200, Colorado 200, Brackenridge 315). There is a paid backlog of over 300 applicants, and it is presumed there are others who do not apply when they are told that they could not be handled until at least six months into the future. More units are desired.

**Quality of Units:** The current units are spare. To minimize costs, any new units should also be economical.

**Proximity to Campus:** All other things equal, greater proximity to campus is a major expressed benefit.

**Benefit to Surrounding Community:** Graduate student housing is appreciated by the West Austin Neighborhood Group and the City because it is affordable housing, provides cultural and ethnic diversity to the community, and has low car traffic.

**Economical Use of Land:** Land owned by U.T. Austin is a finite asset, and the least amount necessary should be used for graduate student housing. The purpose of relocating the Brackenridge and Colorado apartments is to free up their land (74 acres) for higher/better use and residual land value. To the extent The University of Texas at Austin pays for land to build these units elsewhere, it detracts from residual land value of the leasing of the Brackenridge Tract. The amount, if any, that U.T. Austin must bond that will not be carried by subsequent graduate student rent payments, plus the value of any more U.T. Austin land used to hold graduate housing, is termed the “Net New Cost.”

**Locations:** In considering alternative locations, sites not now owned by the U.T. Austin were not considered, because of the cost of acquisition. The team considered all University properties in Austin, especially Gateway, Pickle Research Center, lands adjacent to the main campus but east of I-35, and land adjacent to Intramurals. The team did not include sites on the Main Campus, which are few and should be reserved for academic space growth over the coming decades.

**Staging:** The goal, on an net Present Value (NPV) basis, would be to free up the Colorado and Brackenridge sites as soon as possible while providing the new units before Colorado and Brackenridge are taken off-line. Whether this could be done is open for decision. Rebuilding all 715 units on Gateway (one of the options considered) would require demolition of the 200 units now there. If this option is chosen, and if it is desired to leave the Brackenridge and Colorado apartments in place until the new construction on Gateway is complete, there is normal turnover of 160 units annually excluding Gateway. Additionally, Simmons Hall on the U.T. Austin campus could be converted to 95 graduate units at a cost of $2MM, thereby accommodating all those who would be in Gateway’s 200 units at the time of its removal from service.

**Rents:** Rents are currently approximately half those of the Austin market. This is possible primarily because the construction debt service has been retired on all of
Brackenridge, Colorado, and Gateway. If The University of Texas at Austin rebuilds, the new construction costs must be amortized, and a question for the Regents will be whether to charge the rents required to amortize all those costs – which would approximate market rents – or to commit some portion of the funds realized from the leasing of the Brackenridge and Colorado sites as a write down against the new units’ cost, so that rents in the new units would be somewhere below market.

Currently, the units are assigned first-come, first-served, so there is no connection between the below-market rent and a student’s (in)ability to pay (nor of that student’s academic standing and potential among all graduate students, as The University of Texas at Austin seeks “the best students”). In any event, with such a limited supply, and in an era of necessarily high tuition, is it fully fair to benefit some (especially if they are able to pay) at the expense of all? The first-come, first-served approach benefits those in the know, but would it not be better to reserve all the net residual value of the Brackenridge and Colorado parcels, for use by the institution through the endowment, rather than reducing rents, and to not favor any specific group? Could not those in need then have their needs addressed via their stipend?
8.2. HOUSING AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Examples of housing provided by competitor institutions were looked at to inform the programming and design of any new or replacement graduate student housing, as well as the evaluation of the existing units.

8.2.1. CALHOUN LOFTS

University of Houston

This is a graduate and professional student housing complex located on the main campus within a precinct that includes the Business School and the Colleges of Law and Engineering. The complex includes ground floor communal and retail uses.

PROJECT FACTS

Year Completed .................................. 2009
Number of Units .................................. 744
Number of Beds .................................. 984
Unit Types:
  Studio ........................................... 341 sf
  One Bedroom ................................. 492 sf
  Two Bedroom ................................. 668 sf
Height ........................................... 7-10 stories

AMENITIES

Study lounges, theatre room, roof terraces, sky lounge, fitness center, laundry facilities, coffee bar, private courtyard, computer lab, meeting spaces, special-event kitchen

PROJECT TEAM

Architect ......................... Kirksey Architects
8.2.2. GRADUATE HOUSING
The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

7900 Cambridge
Year Completed: 1982
Unit Types:
- One Bedroom: 570-680 sf
- Two Bedroom: 960 sf
- Three Bedroom: 1,060 sf
Height: 2 stories

1885 El Paseo
Year Completed: 2005
Number of Units: 306
Unit Types:
- One Bedroom: 490-693 sf
- Two Bedroom: 870-1,056 sf
- Three Bedroom: 1,060 sf
Height: 4 stories

PROJECT TEAM
Architect: Kirksey Architects

AMENITIES
24-Hour maintenance, commons room, swimming pool, proximity to child, development center, proximity to recreation center
8.2.3. UNIVERSITY VILLAGE
University of California, Berkeley

Over 900 townhouses and apartments were organized into eight neighborhoods, clustering families into small courts with no more than 25 families in each. The project includes housing plans which allowed continuous use of The Village. A network of auto-free green spaces connect the neighborhoods to the Village Center and all of the streets are lined with trellised front porches and bay windows.

PROJECT FACTS
Year Completed............................................ 2009
Site Area.................................................. 58 AC
Density...................................................... 17 DU/AC
Number of Units........................................... 760
Unit Types – West Village:
   One Bedroom............................................ 635 sf
   Two Bedroom.......................................... 786-806 sf
   Three Bedroom........................................... 1,002 sf
Unit Types – East Village:
   Townhouses (2BR)................................. 1,040-1,197 sf
   2 Bedroom.............................................. 987 sf
   3 Bedroom.............................................. 1,085-1,103 sf
Height......................................................... 2-3 stories

AMENITIES
Community garden, community center, family resource center, kid’s teaching garden, computer center, laundry facilities, child care center, and café

PROJECT TEAM
Architect.................................................. Pyatok Architects
Developer.............................................. Allen & O’hara

HOUSING AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS
The University of Texas System: Brackenridge Tract
Austin, Texas
8.2.4. NORTH CAMPUS HOUSING
University of California, San Diego

This primarily low-rise student housing complex engenders a sense of community while offering respite from typical college mundane. The dormitory buildings are situated around a series of internal courts and gardens that provide comfortable places for gathering or meditation. Special emphasis was placed on pedestrian circulation paths, further underscoring the sense of community.

PROJECT FACTS
Year Completed: 2009
Site Area: 6.4 AC
Number of Beds: 1,016
Height: 3 & 14 stories

AMENITIES:
Administration office, conference facilities, laundry facilities, satellite bookstore, café, and mailroom

PROJECT TEAM
Architects: Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
8.2.5. 10 AKRON STREET
Harvard University

PROJECT FACTS
Year Completed ........................................ 2008
Site Area .................................................. 4 AC
Density ................................................... 38 DU/AC
Number of Units ........................................ 151
Number of Beds .......................................... 215
Unit Types:
   Studio .................................................. 300 sf
   One Bedroom Convertible ......................... 614sf
Height ...................................................... 3-7 stories

AMENITIES
Administration office, conference facilities,
laundry facilities, satellite bookstore, café,
and mailroom

PROJECT TEAM
Architect .......... Kyu Sung Woo Architects

riversidehousing.harvard.edu/photopopup.php?photoid=5&photodir=memorial_drive
Banks Street View


Memorial Drive View

HOUSING AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM: Brackenridge Tract
AUSTIN, TEXAS
8.2.6. 5 COWPERTHWAIT STREET
Harvard University

PROJECT FACTS
Year Completed.............................2007
Site Area.........................................4.8 AC
Number of Units..............................145
Number of Beds...............................200
Unit Types:
Studio ...........................................322 sf
One Bedroom..................................509 sf
One Bedroom Convertible..................584 sf
Two Bedroom..................................694 sf
Two Bedroom Convertible...................987 sf
Height.............................................6 stories

AMENITIES
Fitness room, study lounges, laundry fa-
cilities, common rooms, landscaped yard,
LEED-NC Gold, building office, underground
parking garage, bicycle storage area

PROJECT TEAM
Architects .................. Elkus Manfredi Architects
Landscape Architect .......... Halvorson Design

© Google earth Pro & CRP
© Harvard Real Estate Services - http://www.hres.harvard.edu/RRE/NewWeb/Brochure/Affiliated/Complexes/5Cowpcommon.htm
8.2.7. MUNGER RESIDENCE
Stanford University

PROJECT FACTS
Year Completed.................................... 2009
Site Area........................................... 14.4 AC
Number of Units.................................... 358
Number of Beds.................................... 600
Height............................................. 4-5 stories

AMENITIES
Underground parking garage, café/kitchen,
meeting space, convenience store, exercise
area, operational center

PROJECT TEAM
Architect ....................... Cody Anderson Wasney
8.3. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The Collaborative Team identified and analyzed a variety of future scenarios, including a number of additional sites for consideration in those scenarios that relocate the graduate student housing off the Brackenridge Tract. The analysis for each of the sites was based on program assumptions and a set of planning criteria and goals described in the next page.

RELOCATION SCENARIOS

1. Maintain existing conditions of facilities.
2. Construct 200 apartments in the Brackenridge Complex to replace the Colorado Apartments.
3. Construct additional apartments on the Gateway Apartments site to replace the 200 units of Colorado Apartments and 315 units of Brackenridge Apartments.
4. Construct apartments on the Lions Golf Course portion of the Brackenridge Tract to replace the 200 units of Colorado Apartments and 315 units of Brackenridge Apartments.
5. Construct apartments in the Pickle Research Center to replace the 200 units of Colorado Apartments and 315 units of Brackenridge Apartments.
7. Construct replacement apartments on property adjacent to the Intramural Fields.
8. Construct replacement apartments on The University of Texas at Austin property of the Blacklands Neighborhood.
10. Construct replacement apartments within the West Campus Neighborhood.
8.3.1. PROGRAM ASSUMPTIONS

For purposes of the analyses, it was assumed that the total program is 715 units, the same number as exist today on the two Brackenridge Tract sites and the Gateway site. If a particular location is determined to have a greater capacity, the additional potential number of units would be identified. A mix of efficiency, one bedroom, two bedroom, and three bedroom units is assumed, with the existing average square footage of 896 gross square feet per unit. Parking is assumed at a minimum ratio of 0.88 space per unit.

In addition to the living units, the program includes service and support spaces and amenities. Support spaces included the graduate student housing office and a maintenance and storage facility.

8.3.2. PLANNING CRITERIA AND GOALS

The evaluation of the scenarios and sites was based on the following criteria and goals:

Affordability: Many graduate students cannot afford market rate housing and one of the purposes for providing it is to attract the best candidates, regardless of their economic status. Whether through reduced rents, adjustments to stipends, or some other method, the housing must be affordable to those unable to pay full cost.

Accessibility: Proximity to campus, or, at least, the ability to get to it quickly and easily, is an important consideration. It should be served by transit.

Inclusivity: The housing should allow for diversity: multi-cultural, gender-neutral, and racially, economically, and socially mixed.

Scale: Housing trend is toward “village” settings: family-friendly and communal.

Schools: Housing should be close to elementary and middle schools, as well as child care, playgrounds, and park facilities. Continuing the relationship that has been built with Mathews Elementary would be a significant benefit.

Amenities: Proximity to laundry facilities, grocery store, general retail, restaurants, parks, playgrounds, child care, and other daily needs and amenities, if not located on-site, is needed.

Safety: A secure environment and safe areas for children to play are essential.

Product Diversity: Variety of apartment sizes is needed for the diverse requirements of graduate students: married and single, foreign and native, etc. Choice among different types is desirable.

Sustainability: Pro-environmental and “green” building design principles should be adhered to.

Cost: The costs of the units must be consistent with the revenue available from rents and other sources, if any, as well as with demands of the market-place for such things as size, quality, and character. Land must be owned by U.T. Austin to avoid land acquisition costs that could significantly reduce the economic advantages of relocating the housing from the Brackenridge Tract.

Phasing: Availability of the site and the ability to free land on the Brackenridge Tract for redevelopment is an important consideration.

Recruitment: The housing should be used to facilitate, expand, and deepen the graduate student experience and strengthen the opportunity to recruit the “best and the brightest.”

### ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

**APARTMENT TYPES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1982-84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLORADO APARTMENTS 200 DU</strong></td>
<td><strong>GATEWAY APARTMENTS 200 DU</strong></td>
<td><strong>BRACKENRIDGE APARTMENTS 315 DU</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net SF</td>
<td>Gross SF (125 %)</td>
<td>Mix of Units</td>
<td>Net SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>572 sf</td>
<td>715 sf</td>
<td>48 DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>659 sf</td>
<td>824 sf</td>
<td>162 DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>867 sf</td>
<td>1082 sf</td>
<td>250 DU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADUATE AND MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXISTING</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROPOSED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement Housing Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNIT MIX AND SIZE BASED ON CURRENT BRACKENRIDGE 715 DU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRACKENRIDGE APARTMENTS 315 DU</strong></td>
<td><strong>U.T. AUSTIN/RANDY PORTER 715 DU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net SF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gross SF (125 %)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 sf</td>
<td>750 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting rooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,010 sf</td>
<td>1,262.5 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen &amp; dining</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 sf</td>
<td>779 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 sf</td>
<td>797 gsf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXISTING</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROPOSED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td>5,800 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance storage</strong></td>
<td>11,800 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community center</strong></td>
<td>3,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting rooms</strong></td>
<td>2,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen &amp; dining</strong></td>
<td>3,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office staff</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance staff</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance vehicles</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance carts</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance forklift</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following scenarios and alternative sites were considered by the collaborative planning team. Only those options for each site that maintained, with Gateway, the total existing count of 715 units were considered. Also, only land currently owned by the University was considered.

### 8.3.3.1. BRACKENRIDGE LOCATIONS
We did not investigate retaining, or infilling more units on, either the Brackenridge Apartment or Colorado Apartment sites, because that would represent a poor use of land on a residual land value basis – they are prime sites for redevelopment. This would be the case in any other area of the Tract, such as the golf course, in addition to presenting a phasing issue as most other portions of the Tract are not available for development until 2019 or beyond.
8.3.3.2. PICKLE RESEARCH CAMPUS (WEST TRACT)

Pickle was considered to be a non-residential environment. However, the westerly parcel is unused, heavily treed, and has commercial, rather than industrial-like neighbors. A study done for this portion of the site determined that more than the 515 units on the Brackenridge Tract could be accommodated. Consolidation provides a more economical management model.

It was determined that the area was not suitable for this type of residential use, it is too far from the campus, and there is a decrease in the accessibility to off-site amenities. The quality of life for the students would decline.
The fields would provide ample area for consolidating the housing; however, there is no alternative location for the fields, which must be retained. There is a small unused area adjoining the playing fields but this has insufficient land area to accommodate any of the housing in a viable way.
8.3.3.4. BLACKLANDS

Blacklands is an irregular and somewhat fragmented assemblage of land east of I-35 across from the southeast corner of the campus. Assuming that the 200 units would remain at Gateway, the 515 units required cannot be adequately provided on this property, much less the needed office and support, a consolidated community, or additional units. In addition, the area is not perceived to be appropriate for residential use and the University has other more appropriate uses planned, which limit the area available and would make the remaining sites even less viable.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM: Brackenridge Tract
AUSTIN, TEXAS
Graduate Housing | Average Unit Size | Number of DU | Program Area | Parking Provided |
---|---|---|---|---|
Block A-1 | 896 gsf | 80 | 71,680 sf | 81 |
Block A-2 | 896 gsf | 68 | 60,928 sf | 65 |
Block A-3 | 896 gsf | 84 | 75,264 sf | 81 |
Block A-4 | 896 gsf | 84 | 75,264 sf | 81 |
Block A-5 | 896 gsf | 45 | 48,384 sf | 52 |
Total: 361 DU | | | 360 cars |

Parking Program | Required Ratio | Required Stalls | Provided Stalls |
---|---|---|---|
Graduate Housing | .88 cars/du | 318 | 360 |

Total Site Area: 36.94 AC
Total Available Site Area (as of today): 11.13 AC
Total Units: 361 DU
Density: 32 DU/AC
Total Parking: 360 Cars
8.3.3.5. SIMKINS HALL

This out-dated residence hall on the main campus is certainly well-located. Site constraints limit redevelopment of any significant size and the U.T. Austin’s priority for use of campus space may be in conflict. However, the existing building, if renovated and updated, could provide temporary graduate student housing during the transition from Brackenridge to another site, to accelerate the phasing. It also may provide additional housing in the longer term for some types of graduate students other than those married and/or with children.
8.3.3.6. GATEWAY APARTMENTS

The Gateway apartment complex was studied to determine what could be infilled to increase the capacity of the site, but the full 715 units could not be accommodated. However, additional study indicated that more than 715 units could be provided if the site were rebuilt.

The operation is consolidated for a more economical management model and the community is maintained in the same general vicinity and in close proximity to Mathews Elementary. Rebuilding provides an opportunity for a more appropriate and diverse mix of apartment types.

On the other hand, there is additional cost for construction due to the dramatic topography of the site and the need to rebuild the existing 200 units.
Existing Conditions: Site Photos

A. West Gateway Drive
B. West Gateway Residences
C. West Gateway Residential Parking
D. West Gateway Drive
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Existing Conditions: Site Photos

- Infant Parent Program Training Center Playground
- East Gateway Residences View North
- West Gateway Drive View South
- Community Garden
- Bridge and Basketball Courts
- Creek and Bridge
- Gateway Housing View South
- Bridge and Basketball Courts
- Community Garden

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
EXISTING CONDITIONS: SITE ANALYSIS

Total Land Area: 25.7 AC
Graduate Housing Land Area: 19.7 AC
ATCMHMR Land Area: 6 AC
(Austin Travis County Mental Health Mental Retardation Center)
Current Units: 200 DU
Current Density: 10 DU/AC

Existing Zoning Categories
SF-3
Maximum Height: 40'
Maximum Bldg. Coverage: 40%
MF-1
Maximum Height: 40'
Maximum Bldg. Coverage: 45%
Maximum Density: 17 DU/AC
MF-3
Maximum Height: 40'
Maximum Bldg. Coverage: 55%
Maximum Density: 36 DU/AC
MF-4
Maximum Height: 60'
Maximum Bldg. Coverage: 60%
Maximum Density: 36-54 DU/AC
LO (Limited Office District)

Assumed Zoning Compliance*
- MF-1: 17 DU/AC
- MF-3 to MF-4: 36 DU/AC

*Zoning to be clarified. Replacement housing study is based on the assumed zoning above enabling higher density.
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**Proposed Scenario: Illustrative**

**Section A.**

W. 6th Street View of Proposed Graduate Housing Scenario

1. Infant Parent Program Training Center of Austin Travis County Mental Health Mental Retardation Center
2. Playground Court with Laundry and other Residential Amenities
3. Other Playgrounds
4. Housing Administration
5. Housing Maintenance
The unit count goal assumes the replacement of 315 units at the Brackenridge Apartments site and 200 units at the Colorado Apartments site together with Gateway’s existing 200 units for a minimum of 715 units of graduate housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Summary</th>
<th>Graduate Housing</th>
<th>Average Unit Size</th>
<th>Number of DU</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Parking Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block A-1</td>
<td>896 gsf</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12,232 sf</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A-2</td>
<td>896 gsf</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>151,424 sf</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A-3</td>
<td>896 gsf</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>154,112 sf</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A-4</td>
<td>896 gsf</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>152,320 sf</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A-5</td>
<td>896 gsf</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71,680 sf</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A-6</td>
<td>896 gsf</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50,176 sf</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A-7</td>
<td>896 gsf</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32,256 sf</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>825 DU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>767 cars</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Diagram**

- **Graduate Housing**: 726 stalls, 0.88 cars/DU provided ratio
- **Housing Administration & Maintenance**: 47 stalls, 3 cars/1,000 sf provided ratio

**Parking Total**: 773 cars, 814 stalls

**Alternatives Analysis**

- Diagram showing parking requirements and distances to existing buildings.
Proposed Scenario: Illustrative
PROPOSED SCENARIO: MASSING STUDIES

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
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PROPOSED SCENARIO: STRUCTURAL PARKING ANALYSIS

1. 54% Open (440'/950')
2. 20% Open (180'/880')
3. 55% Open (330'/740')
4. 58% Open (310'/740')
5. 70% Open (135'/455')
6. 100% Open
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8.4. OPERATIONAL POLICIES

Recommendation a
Discontinue first-come, first-served policy for vacant units, and allocate the units to the deans as part of recruitment packages for the best students.

Recommendation b
Establish a three-year limit on residency. This is sufficient time to get acclimated to Austin, complete one's courses and comps, and get hired in a professor's research lab. The length-of-term limit could be enforced 1) immediately, 2) with one-year's notice, or 3) upon turnover. If this is last preferred, it would allow the now-specialized opportunity to pass through the system unaffected.

Even with the right to remain seven years, the annual average turnover in the 715 units for the last five years is 225, for an average length of stay of 3.15 years; yet in 2008, 140 units are occupied more than 3 years.

So there is also turnover occurring on one or two year bases. If the maximum stay were changed to 3 years, annual turnover would be absorbed by foreign governments’ sponsors, some costs would be transferred to the academic departments in increased stipends for students actually in need.

This will achieve for U.T. Austin the full economic value of the Colorado and Brackenridge parcels.

8.4.1. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.4.2. RENTS

Recommendation c
Set rents at the level required to amortize the bonds. This will result in higher-than-current rents, as noted below, but today’s below-market units serve—and in essence make closed-lottery winners of—fewer than 10% of the graduate student body, and with any regard to special academic potential, or to need or to ability to pay. If the units are used by the Deans to recruit the best students, some of the higher rents will be absorbed by foreign governments’ sponsors, some costs would be transferred to the academic departments in increased stipends for students actually in need.

Recommendation d
Set rents at the level required to amortize the bonds. This will result in higher-than-current rents, as noted below, but today’s below-market units serve—and in essence make closed-lottery winners of—fewer than 10% of the graduate student body, and with any regard to special academic potential, or to need or to ability to pay. If the units are used by the Deans to recruit the best students, some of the higher rents will be absorbed by foreign governments’ sponsors, some costs would be transferred to the academic departments in increased stipends for students actually in need.

This will achieve for U.T. Austin the full economic value of the Colorado and Brackenridge parcels.

8.4.3. LOCATION OF UNITS

Recommendation e
Demolish and build anew on Gateway, to as many units as can be well-sited in a primarily four-to-five-story stick-built economic construction. This provides 825 units retaining the Parent Learning Center as is. These units can be so configured to provide much better and secured children’s play areas than now at Gateway (though not the open lawns of Brackenridge and Colorado).

This would:

a. Start with the demolition of the existing Gateway units, with the use of turnover and Simkins to serve those now in Gateway for the period of construction; and
b. Require a 33-month period of programming, design, demolition, construction, and commissioning, and then demolition of Colorado and Brackenridge which—assuming decision by the Regents in mid-2009—could start design January 2010 and provide occupancy for Fall 2012 (with made-available land for redevelopment on the Colorado and Brackenridge sites by January 2013)

Current rents (also prorated to 715 units) produce a $500,000 surplus over cost of operations (there will be also some operational savings by having all the units in one location). Using 5.625% money (DSC 6.6807 for 30 years) capitalizes that to $755MM. The gap between current rents and market rates? we believe so: the sense of community, the adjacency to Mathews, the child play areas, the security in finding a place, are all better than market. A financial discount from market is, for many, especially from away, less important than simply the guaranteed availability of the unit.

There are two UT-derived ways of estimating project cost:

1. Use U.T. Austin estimated replacement costs (prorated to 715 units) from UT building data base and inflate at 5% per year: $60MM and demolition of $6.5MM, and $15,000 / car for 630 cars ($9.45 MM): Total $77.5MM.

2. Use The University of Texas System estimated total project cost per gross square foot (Source: The University of Texas System’s Office of Facilities Planning and Construction), which is $125 for the beginning of our schedule, plus the parking and Parent Learning Center’s total of $11 MM and the demolition. The total for our current $75,847 GSF would thus be $833MM, including the $11 MM. Grand total $89.5MM.

Recommendation f
The Regents empower an appropriate committee, including from among the deans who might use the graduate student housing in the offers to students, to report back by October 31, 2009 on: a) the nature of the graduate students to be served (e.g. married and unmarried, married only, married with children only—or the mix among those) and b) the resulting desired mix among 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom units—whether the focus is on graduate students generally, married graduate students more specifically, or married graduate students with children most specifically.

Recommendation g
Currently, students sign a one-year contract, early in the calendar year, for the period July 1 to June 30. During the period of the Gateway site’s renewal, the Regents decide, on or about each January 1, beginning in 2010, whether to re-lease the Brackenridge or Colorado units for the subsequent lease year of July 1-June 30, or whether favorable market conditions warrant the clearing of the site(s) for delivery for redevelopment by the following September.

8.4.4. SUMMARY

Implementing Recommendations a through g would:

a. Provide more graduate student units than currently, with even greater availability because of improved turnover;

b. Use those units strategically to assist U.T. Austin to draw the best students;

c. Treat all graduate students equally and fairly in terms of ability to pay;

d. Enhance the sense of community in the graduate student complex, including improved and secured child play areas compared to today’s Gateway, and increased proximity to the campus and to Mathews;

Achieve fullest value of the land asset, on a net present value basis.
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