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In August 2003, Texas A&M University ("TAMU," "A&M," or "the University") engaged Brailsford & Dunlavey ("B&D," facility planning and project management) with Graeber, Simmons & Cowan (architecture), Shah Smith (engineering), TBG Partners (landscape architecture), and Flynn Construction (cost estimation) to develop a Campus Student Housing Master Plan that considers the University’s needs for the next few decades. This planning process involved a strategic analysis to determine University objectives for its residential life system; a detailed market analysis to measure the nature and extent of demand for on-campus housing and the characteristics of off-campus competition; an assessment of existing housing facilities to determine whether and how they could be adapted to better respond to University objectives and campus demand; a conceptual-level analysis of the design and campus planning implications of housing improvements; and a financial analysis to develop a viable phasing strategy for the redevelopment of the housing system’s physical plant.

This resulting master plan document presents a vision of the future of student housing at Texas A&M University. This vision was based on a balance of the University’s mission, goals, standards, and operational realities with student preferences and qualitative and quantitative demand aspects of market demand. The overall goals for the Campus Student Housing Master Plan are:

- To create a student housing system known to be among the best in the nation and the world.
- To provide a mix of unit types that will be responsive to contemporary student preferences and thereby support the retention of students in on-campus housing.
- To develop facilities that will meet the high standards of the University’s Council on the Built Environment and will be in compliance with the Campus Master Plan.
- To form strong residential ‘neighborhoods’ that will incorporate an appropriate hierarchy of support spaces including dining, social, recreational, and educational spaces.
- To foster the development of a range of living-learning opportunities by providing for the incorporation of an extensive array of academic support facilities within the residential buildings and neighborhoods. These facilities will enable the Department of Residence Life and academic departments to create a variety of programs that will enhance both the educational and residential experiences of Texas A&M students.
This report sets forth the project team's recommendations with respect to the configuration of housing units, the conceptual design of residential neighborhoods, the provision of residential support facilities, the accommodation of living-learning facilities, the long-term phasing of the replacement of existing facilities, and the parameters for financial feasibility, including project funding and building operational considerations. The recommendations contained herein represent the professional opinions of B&D personnel and other project team members based on assumptions and conditions detailed in this report. B&D analysts have conducted research using both primary and secondary information sources which are deemed to be reliable, but whose accuracy B&D cannot guarantee. Due to variations in national and global economic and legal conditions, actual project costs, revenues, and demand projections may vary and these variations could be material.

This report is structured and developed within a framework emphasizing pragmatism and ease of implementation, and the team's intent is for this document to serve as an integral tool in guiding Texas A&M University in the redevelopment of its on-campus housing facilities. Additionally, it should be noted that this document is the culmination of a series of research and analysis exercises and resulting work product, which has been submitted to the University previously. The earlier supporting documents are noted below.

Supporting Documents*:
- Condition Surveys: Corps, Ramp, Balcony, Commons & Modular Dorm Styles and Univ. Apartments, Previous Submission, June 22, 2004 (Field Surveys completed second week of August, 2003)
- Corps of Cadets Housing Master Plan, Previous Submission, December 16, 2003
- Conceptual Plans: Ramp, Balcony, Commons & Modular Dorm Styles, Previous Submission, June 22, 2004
- Campus Student Housing Master Plan: Market Analysis Report, Previous Submission, August 30, 2004
- The Leading Edge Nationwide Project Summaries, Previous Submission, March 1, 2005
- Estimated Construction Costs, Previous Submission, August 16, 2005
- Draft Campus Student Housing Master Plan, Previous Submission, January 2006

*Not all of the items listed are included as part of this document
The role of student housing on college and university campuses across America today has evolved dramatically in recent decades; whereas, in the past, student housing was merely an accommodation of basic living needs, today’s residence life facilities and programs are opportunities for innovation and differentiation that are integral to each institution’s strategies for student recruitment, retention, development, and education.

Although many examples of innovation and exploration can be cited from other institutions, there remains an opportunity for a standard to be set by Texas A&M that is unmatched by the offerings of any other institution. The standard envisioned is consistent with the University’s Mission, Vision and Values, as well as the Vision 2020 strategic plan.

This vision is inspired by lessons derived from successful experiments in “living-learning” environments at other institutions. These lessons suggest an opportunity at Texas A&M for partnerships between the Department of Residence Life and various schools and academic programs, enabling the development of new student housing projects that integrate the educational and outside-the-classroom living experiences.

This plan recommends a prototypical architectural program for a “living-learning” center that can be adapted to various new housing projects and the actual schools or academic divisions with which partnerships are achieved.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Campus Housing Master Plan is intended to demonstrate the following points:

• This plan further recommends a phased approach to the overall improvement of student housing at Texas A&M, incorporating the findings of market research, analysis of existing building conditions, and rigorous financial analysis of project opportunities to give specific definition to a series of proposed projects.

• It is recommended that most existing student housing buildings on campus be replaced within the next 40 years. Concept plans for new construction emphasize the addition of modern, suite-style living units, as well as the incorporation of community-building elements at the building and neighborhood level. Design and construction are intended to conform to the requirements of the Council on the Built Environment.

• Renovation or replacement of the existing Northside and Southside neighborhoods, along with the development of a new Westside and Southside neighborhoods, are recommended to occur between 2008 and 2046.

• It is recommended that new apartments with appropriate community facilities be developed to replace all existing apartment units.

• It is recommended that the Corps of Cadets residence halls be renovated and expanded to better accommodate Corps needs.

• The implementation of all of these projects over the 43-year timeframe is financially feasible, based on analysis completed by the University’s Office of Budget & Analytical Services.
I. A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

STUDENT HOUSING TODAY

The role of student housing on college and university campuses across America has evolved dramatically in recent decades. Although residence life systems everywhere have faced growing competition from off-campus housing alternatives, institutions have increasingly recognized the value of the on-campus residential experience to the long-term involvement of students (and, thus, future alumni) in campus life, as well as the educational benefits of a more integrated residential and academic experience. All of these factors have coalesced to focus attention on transforming campus housing systems from the “status quo” of the past to opportunities for innovation and differentiation. Once merely systems of accommodations for the basic human needs to sleep, bathe, and eat, the residence life facilities and programs of today are becoming integral to the institution’s strategies for the recruitment, retention, development, and education of its students.

Research conducted for this assignment and many others across North America has shown that the characteristics of the “leading edge” housing facilities of today include:

- Projects built within the last 5 years (as new construction vs. renovation)
- Facilities that break from more traditional campus housing ideas and styles (such as apartment-style living with shared common living areas, single private bedrooms, and no more than 1 or 2 sharing a bath vs. the more traditional double-loaded corridor with “dormitory-style” shared bedrooms and common bathrooms)
- Facilities that have achieved an increased dialogue or connection with existing buildings on campus (i.e., have created neighborhoods or communities of students that did not previously exist);
- Facilities that, since their opening, have created a "destination point" for students;
- Facilities that have created a positive connection to the academic community or with faculty;
- Facilities that incorporate a wide variety of amenities important to today’s students (outdoor plazas, convenient parking, cafes, wellness centers, learning communities, convenience stores, wireless zones, classrooms, etc.)

Summit Suites, Trinity College
Hartford, CT
A NEW STANDARD FOR THE NATION

Within this context of change and innovation in student housing, colleges and universities are experimenting with new ways to achieve institutional objectives for the recruitment, retention, and development of students through a variety of building and program initiatives. Yet, this plan asserts that there remains an opportunity for a standard to be set by Texas A&M that is unmatched by the offerings of any other institution.

This plan is designed, in concept and detail, to support and enhance the stated goals of Vision 2020, the University’s guiding strategic plan for the opening of the 21st century. Among the aspirations cited in Vision 2020 (particularly within Imperative 3: Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience) are:

- Recruit the best students
- Attain a 95% freshmen retention rate
- Increase the quality, frequency, and regularity of student-faculty interaction
- Develop an infrastructure to provide enrichment opportunities to all students
- Substantially enrich the honors programs and quadruple the number of undergraduate students involved in them
- Establish specialized dormitories for 25 percent of the undergraduate population

These goals suggest a role for student housing in partnership with academic programs via “living-learning” environments. Experiments in such facilities and projects undertaken by other institutions have pointed the way for Texas A&M to establish the new “cutting edge” of living-learning. It is the intent of this Campus Housing Master Plan to chart that course.

“ . . . We will seek excellence in everything we do. We will define excellence by a broad universe of national and global standards, and by objective standards of achievement and/or contribution. We will measure ourselves by those standards and we will reach out to colleagues in academia, government, and industry to understand how we can learn, benefit, and contribute.”

- Vision 2020
WHAT IS “LIVING-LEARNING”?  

“Living-learning” ideas are the focus of much research, analysis and experimentation for collegiate residence life programs across the U.S. The term “living-learning” is used to describe a number of different concepts for the design of residence facilities and the integration of academic and student affairs goals into a more holistic approach to student development. These concepts vary greatly from one campus to another, but they tend to exhibit a number of characteristics in common.

Goals of Learning Communities:
Most living-learning programs strive to:

• Aid in the recruitment of the best students, who might otherwise choose to attend a competitive institution of a smaller size
• Nurture students to enhance retention and success
• Increase opportunities for productive academic and social connections between faculty and students
• Increase opportunities for academic enrichment experiences

Common Characteristics of Living Learning Programs¹
Most living-learning Programs:

• Involve undergraduate students who live together in a discrete portion of a residence hall (or entire hall)
• Have staff and resources dedicated for that program only
• Bring members together for the common purpose of learning
• Participate in academic and/or extra-curricular programming designed especially for them
• Are learner-centered and wholly nurturing for all of its members

Importance of Living-Learning Communities
Living-learning programs are designed for their participants to experience:

• Positive peer interactions in person
• Positive residence hall climate
• Higher likelihood to engage in mentoring relationships with faculty
• Perceive their residence hall climate as academically and socially supportive
• Exhibit stronger transition to college, academic achievement and retention outcomes
• Higher levels of civic engagement and empowerment
• Higher college grade-point average (GPA)
• Lower levels of binge drinking
• Greater likelihood to pursue:

¹ National Study of Living-Learning Programs, 2004 Report of Findings
Association of College & University Housing Officers - International
- Practicum/internship
- Study abroad
- Research with professor
- Senior capstone/thesis

Types of Living-Learning Programs

- Civic/Social Leadership Programs
  - Civic-Engagement Programs
  - Leadership Programs
  - Service Learning/Social Justice Programs

- Cultural Programs
  - International/Global Programs
  - Language Programs
  - Multicultural/Diversity Programs

- Disciplinary Programs
  - Business
  - Education
  - Engineering & Computer Science
  - Health Sciences
  - Humanities
  - General Science
  - Social Science

- Fine & Creative Arts Programs
- General Academic Programs
- Honors Programs
- Multi-Disciplinary Programs
- Outdoor Recreation Program
- Research Program
- Residential Colleges
- Transition Programs
  - New Student Transition Programs
  - Career/Major Exploration Programs

- Upper-Division Programs
- Wellness/Healthy Living Programs
- Women’s Programs
  - Women in Leadership Programs
  - Women in Math, Science, and Engineering Programs
**EXAMPLES OF EFFECTIVE LIVING-LEARNING PROGRAMS**

The universe of living-learning programs may be sorted into a range of five models, from the "co-curricular affinity housing" that now exists at most institutions to a full "residential college," at once the most traditional but intensive form of living-learning. Each of these models exhibits a unique combination of key characteristics, as summarized in the chart below.

### Chart: Characteristics of Living-Learning Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Co-curricular Housing</th>
<th>Academic Affinity Housing</th>
<th>FYE / Honors</th>
<th>Living-Learning Center</th>
<th>Residential College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Optional, self-selecting; students grouped by academic major or academic focus</td>
<td>Optional, self-selecting; students grouped by academic major or academic focus</td>
<td>May be required or &quot;highly encouraged&quot; for some students</td>
<td>Typically required based on enrollment in college</td>
<td>Typically required based on academic focus/college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Focus</td>
<td>May host sections of related courses or smaller related courses</td>
<td>Hosts some of all of associated courses</td>
<td>Hosts a variety of courses associated with living-learning community</td>
<td>Hosts all of the courses offered by the college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Requires only limited support space in addition to residential space, residential and support spaces could be shared, residential areas could be non-exclusive, personnel programs may have specialized support facilities</td>
<td>Additional and/or unique academic support space is preferred, does not require exclusive residential area</td>
<td>More successful if the program has a dedicated facility or part of a facility, requires academic space to host any courses in-house</td>
<td>Dedicated, exclusive building or complex; hosts full range of academic and support facilities; fully comprehensive academic and social environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Involvement</td>
<td>Run by Residence Life, often in association with academics, RAs from within the program with academic faculty support</td>
<td>Run by Residence Life, with some academic support, RAs from within the program with academic faculty support</td>
<td>Facility managed by Residence Life, program typically administered by academics, requires extensive faculty support and possibly some faculty dedicated to the program</td>
<td>Run by academic college with some support from Student Affairs/Residence Life, all faculty are dedicated to the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Programs</td>
<td>Major-specific programs (engineering, fine arts, architecture, pre-professional programs), interdisciplinary programs (business, medical, technology)</td>
<td>Students grouped by co-curricular interest, foster or sponsor activities in interest area, intended to provide an attractive Res Life experience</td>
<td>Freshmen and transfer students, Honors College/program</td>
<td>Class of Residential Colleges at Cambridge, Yale, Princeton; newer residential colleges at UC, Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research conducted for this plan highlighted ten particularly noteworthy examples of Living-Learning programs being implemented today:

1. University of Alabama  
   - Blount Undergraduate Initiative
2. Oregon State University  
   - Austin Entrepreneurship Program
3. Cornell University  
   - Mews Hall, Court Hall, Cook House
4. University of California Los Angeles  
   - DeNeve Plaza
5. University of Southern California  
   - Parkside Suites and Apartments
6. Washburn University  
   - Living Learning Center
7. Case Western Reserve University  
   - The Village at 115
8. University of Idaho  
   - Living Learning Community
9. Duke University  
   - East Campus First Year Experience
10. University of North Carolina Chapel Hill  
   - Connected Learning Program

Of these ten living-learning programs, eight have relatively new dedicated facilities. Among these new facilities, all opened between 2000 and 2005, and the average building included 280 beds at an average of 320 square feet per bed. Units in these new developments represented a mix of traditional, semi-suite, suite, and apartment room types. The average project costs were $205 per square foot for generally very high construction quality. Following are summaries of program and facility information collected on each of these programs.

The **Blount Undergraduate Initiative** is a liberal arts residential college at the **University of Alabama** that is made up of a complex of three buildings, two primarily academic and office buildings and one residential building. The Blount residence hall has 180 beds in 62,600 square feet. The residence hall opened in 2000 and includes floor lounges, computer labs, a TV lounge, faculty offices, four large classrooms, and a faculty-in-residence apartment. The Blount program is designed as a residential college for all class levels, but the residence hall is reserved primarily for freshmen.
Oregon State University's Austin Entrepreneurship Program is a living-learning center based in the renovated Weatherford Hall that focuses on business and engineering majors but is open to all students. The program offers an Entrepreneurship minor and also hosts an entrepreneur club. Weatherford Hall has 275 beds in 79,000 gross square feet and reopened in 2004 after a complete $20 million renovation. The original traditional unit type layout with a mix of singles and doubles was retained. The renovated facility includes a library, business incubator rooms, case rooms/classrooms, a “board room” for meetings and conferences, a faculty apartment, and a café.

The Residential Initiative at Cornell University is a campus-wide plan to reorganize the University’s residential experience. The plan, which is more than half complete, involves housing all freshmen in new and renovated facilities in the North Campus area that will be designed to support a comprehensive first-year experience program. After freshman year, students will have the option to live in one of 5 “houses” currently being developed to replace older traditional style halls in the West Campus. All units in the new North Campus facilities are designed with traditional-style rooms and the West Campus houses are all designed with suites. North Campus buildings, with approximately 280 beds in 90,000 square feet each, were constructed for approximately $15 million each and include classrooms, seminar rooms, offices, study rooms, lounges, and faculty apartments. The West Campus houses average 375 beds in 140,000 to 150,000 square feet and will cost approximately $35 million for each house. The houses will each typically include dining rooms, community rooms, seminar rooms, music rooms, faculty offices, computer labs, and faculty apartments.

The living-learning programs in two of the six buildings at De Neve Plaza at the University of California – Los Angeles offer a variety of academic affinity housing options for freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. The focus areas of the programs involved generally include Arts, Community Service, Intercultural Experience, and Social Justice. The living-learning programs include 575 beds in semi-suite double-occupancy rooms in buildings that were opened in 2000 as part of a larger $63 million, 371,000 square foot residential project. The living-learning
programs have access to dining service facilities, classrooms, lounges, and recreational/fitness space.

The Parkside Suites and Apartments at the University of Southern California host the International Residential College program that offers an interdisciplinary international and multi-cultural program for students in all class levels. The suites include 400 beds in a 134,000 square foot building that opened in 2002 and houses all freshmen enrolled in the program. The International Residential College also has two associated older apartment buildings for 280 upperclass and graduate students in the program. The suites building includes study rooms, seminar rooms, classrooms, music rooms, lounges, recreation space, and faculty apartments.

The Living-Learning Center at Washburn University houses a liberal arts program with a core curriculum emphasizing leadership that is open to all students but is targeted towards incoming freshmen. The $19 million building opened in 2001 and includes 396 beds in 118,000 square feet. All units are four-person, double-occupancy suites. The living-learning programs have seminar rooms, computer labs, reading rooms, study rooms, lounges, and recreation space available for their use.

The Village at 115 is a new living-learning center at Case Western Reserve University that is designed to be an attractive residential and academic opportunity for upperclassmen. The $126 million project opened in 2005 and includes three buildings with a total of seven “houses” and a total of 750 beds. All units are apartments with single bedrooms. Apartment sizes range from efficiencies up to nine-bedroom units. The Village at 115 also hosts a café.

Conclusion: This analysis demonstrated that the factors contributing to excellence in a living-learning program are at least as much programmatic as they are facility-oriented. This finding highlights the degree of administrative and academic support required to make a living-learning program successful and sustainable. A comprehensive range of dedicated facilities can certainly make a good program better, but cannot on its own create a top living-learning
program. This analysis also found that even among the most recent and comprehensive living-learning centers, the range of support facilities offered are generally very flexible and generic academic spaces. While this allows for flexibility in programming within a building over time, it does not allow for highly specialized programs. A campus that could develop living-learning centers with a comprehensive range of facilities that included the general academic support facilities as well as highly specialized facilities for programs such as engineering, hard sciences, or performing arts would immediately be recognized as a top living-learning campus.
A "CUTTING EDGE" MODEL FOR TEXAS A&M

Based on this research, a fundamental building block was conceived for the Campus Housing Master Plan – the prototype living-learning center. This concept describes a residence hall experience that is designed and built around a programmatic partnership between the Department of Residence Life and a specific academic department. In each such facility, the requisite residential facilities and amenities would be developed with integral key academic support facilities appropriate to that department and designed in partnership with its faculty. The architectural program at right offers an example of a living-learning center for one of the most space-intensive disciplines – the fine arts. This prototype program offers an illustration of the range of spaces that can be accommodated in each of the identified living-learning centers included in the Master Plan. This outline program is not intended to be a recommendation for a specific living-learning program, but rather an example of the types of facilities that could be provided to supported programs.

This prototype provides a baseline for a series of partnerships that can be established by the Residence Life Department with various schools and academic departments within the University to develop one such living-learning center at a time. In this manner, progressively over time the Residence Life system at Texas A&M would transition to a predominance of living-learning centers, ultimately comprising a living-learning program at Texas A&M that would be recognized as one of the best in the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Element</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Area (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Total Area (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Director Apartment (1 bdrm &amp; bath)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Director’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA/Student Staff Room w/ Private Bath</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Office Suite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Offices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Office Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy/Supply Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Spaces Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Entry Lobby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Room (lounge/gallery)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Lounge (per 50 residents)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Study Lounge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Spaces Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living/Learning Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Classroom/Seminar Room</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Box Theater and Support Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Dance Performance Studio and Support Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture/Modeling Studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/Metal/Stone Shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Studio/Darkroom/Computer Lab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Music Practice Room/Sound Studio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Music Practice Room</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance/Counselor Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital/Lab Studio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Imaging Studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby Area Recital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Support Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor/Resident Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Advisor/Academic Support Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist-in-Residence Apartment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist-in-Residence Studio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Student Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop/Small Vending Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living/Learning Spaces Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping Closet/Trash</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Storage/Loading Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair’s Bathroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Spaces Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Square Feet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Square Feet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUILDING ON TRADITION TO REACH FOR THE FUTURE

As a large and diverse institution, Texas A&M University has many facets and is known for a multitude of strengths. Highly visible among these is A&M's unique sense of tradition. Precious few institutions inspire quite the same reverence among students and alumni for the lore, the rituals, and even the campus buildings themselves, as A&M. While this respect for the past may initially appear to contrast with a vision for the future (which necessarily requires change), the Campus Housing Master Plan proposes a framework within which respect for the past and tradition is incorporated into every investment in growth and development. While buildings themselves may change, the strengths of the A&M culture and programs can be built into and even enhanced by structures that support and nurture their future growth.
II. CAMPUS STUDENT HOUSING MASTER PLAN OVERVIEW

The Texas A&M Campus Student Housing Master Plan focuses on creating a residential life infrastructure that will appropriately respond to student demand, provide an attractive mix of unit, building and neighborhood amenities, and accommodate the planning vision of living-learning opportunities that will be among the finest available anywhere. This plan was developed based on these objectives, the findings from the market analysis, the constraints of the Campus Master Plan, and the realities imposed by the financial analysis. To best achieve these overall goals, and because the final plan was not limited to renovating existing buildings, it was determined that most existing buildings should ultimately be replaced. The Campus Student Housing Master Plan includes plans covering the Residence Halls, the University Apartments, and the Corps of Cadets Residence Halls. Complete sets of conceptual drawings, including proposed site plans, unit type and prototype building floor plans, and building elevations, are available as parts of this Master Plan under separate covers for each of the three planning areas.

The Master Plan generally entails the replacement or renovation of all of the existing Northside and Southside residential buildings and the development of a new Westside and Southside neighborhoods between 2008 and 2045, when additional debt capacity becomes available to the Department of Residence Life. Each of these residence hall neighborhoods will host a “Commons” building to support community-wide amenities and dining service operations. Extensive living-learning programs, designed to be among the very best in the world, are envisioned in multiple residence halls in each of these neighborhoods, with the opportunity for additional large-scale or small-scale living-learning options throughout the planned new residential buildings to be accommodated as academic support warrants. The residence hall units will be suites to match survey-tested demand.

New apartments will be developed and constructed on a site adjacent to existing University Apartments site to replace all existing apartment units. Appropriate community facilities will be provided to meet the needs of the graduate and family student population.

The Corps of Cadets residence halls will be renovated and expanded to better accommodate their needs.

All buildings will be designed to conform with the requirements of the Council on the Built Environment and will be of very durable, yet economical, construction with exterior materials and massing designed to better blend into the current and planned fabric of the A&M campus than current residential structures.

The Campus Student Housing Master Plan was developed in parallel with a detailed financial model to ensure that each phase of the proposed development program is financially feasible. The costs of debt service related to proposed demolition and construction and the operations of all new facilities are balanced at each phase of development by the revenues associated with the occupancy of the existing and new facilities. While the rental structure of the new facilities will have to be adjusted to reflect the costs of new construction, the overall room costs are intended to be competitive with the off-campus market.
PLAN OVERVIEW: RESIDENCE HALLS

The Residence Halls planning area includes three separate and distinct neighborhoods: the existing Southside and Northside neighborhoods and the proposed new Westside neighborhood.

The Southside neighborhood plan includes the replacement of the ten existing residence halls housing over 3,400 students in suite style units (in Modular, Commons and Ramp building types) and the construction of seven new buildings that would house approximately 3,300 students in suite style units. A new neighborhood Commons building to accommodate dining and neighborhood-level services is included in the plans for the Southside area, as are two substantial living-learning facilities that would be designed in conjunction with the residential facilities.
The Northside plan includes footprints for eleven new residential buildings, three of which would include extensive living-learning facilities. These new buildings would house approximately 2,600 students in suite units, eventually replacing the existing seventeen buildings currently able to house approximately 3,700 students in a combination of traditional and semi-suite units in Modular, Corridor, Balcony, and Ramp building types. Existing dining and other neighborhood support spaces (specifically, Sbisa Dining Center and its associated facilities) are assumed to remain in their current locations to serve the Northside residents.
The proposed Westside neighborhood would house approximately 2,200 students in seven new residential buildings located in an area fairly close to central campus on the West side of Wellborn Road that has been identified as a future housing site in the University Master Plan. The Westside neighborhood plans include two living-learning facilities that would be incorporated within the residential buildings and a neighborhood Commons building for dining and other resident services.
Four-level vs. Five-level Buildings

All of the building layouts in the Campus Student Housing Master Plan are illustrated as footprints that can represent either four-level or five-level buildings. The Campus Master Plan limits most new campus buildings to four stories, however this includes academic and lab spaces with floor-to-floor heights of fourteen to eighteen feet. With somewhat shorter floor-to-floor requirements in residential buildings, a five-level building could be designed to be no higher than 75 feet and therefore still be within an acceptable range based on Campus Master Plan standards. The phasing plan developed as part of the financial analysis allows for each building footprint to be developed as a four- or five-level building and adjusts the bed count accordingly.

Non-Residential Space Assumptions

The phasing plan detailed on page 28 was used to determine the total bed count of each building and each neighborhood based on assumptions of square feet per bed for unit types designed in each building, and the total amount of non-residential spaces included in each building. The assumptions for square feet per bed for each of the various unit types are illustrated with the phasing plan. The amount of non-residential space provided in each building was based on building floor plans that were developed to include a full range of support facilities including lounge, study, recreational, office, storage, and other support spaces. The total amount of this type of space was determined as a percentage of the floor plate of each building floor plan developed. The final assumption for this space allocation was based on the largest percentage of non-residential space among the various floor plans. This amount was found to be 30% of one floor and was used for both four-level and five-level buildings. Thirty percent (30%) of one floor will provide ample space for community and support facilities as well as a variety of living-learning spaces that can be allocated throughout each of the planned new residence halls.

Community centers and dedicated living-learning centers were also planned for each neighborhood. The amount of space for these facilities was also based on sample drawings and programs included in the Campus Student Housing Master Plan. The community centers house dining, social, recreational, administrative, and support spaces required for each neighborhood. The Southside and Westside neighborhoods include 35,000 square foot and 22,000 square foot community centers, respectively. The space allocation for the living learning centers was based on outline programs and drawings included in this plan. Space for living-learning centers is allocated to each neighborhood at 20,000 square feet each (40,000 square feet in the Westside, and 60,000 square feet in the Northside and Southside neighborhood). The living-learning center associated with the initial residence hall project is planned to be slightly larger at 24,800 square feet. The project costs associated with the construction of these community facilities is included with the cost of constructing the residence halls in each neighborhood. Therefore, the costs associated with the debt service and operations of the community facilities are supported by the revenues generated by the Residence Life system.
PLAN OVERVIEW: UNIVERSITY APARTMENTS

The current location of the University Apartments is a partially-developed, University-owned site across University Drive to the North of the main campus. The apartment buildings were constructed in four primary phases: Hensel Terrace in 1957, College View in 1967, College Avenue in 1974 and Avenue A in 1980. The four phases incorporate a range of construction types and overall building quality and most units have reached or are rapidly reaching the end of their useful life and will require replacement in the very near future.

Currently, the University Apartments are primarily occupied by single and married graduate students, and have rental rates that are at the low end of the local market. It is strategically important for the University to continue to offer such housing on campus. The plan for the University Apartments area incorporates the redevelopment of all 650 existing units with an equal number of units to be developed in four phases, as outlined in the “4 Phase Plan” presented to the TAMU Board of Regents. The proposed site plans for this planning area include several options for redevelopment that will allow for this proposed density. Depending on the final site plan for the area, significant amounts of space can be set aside for other University uses and still accommodate the proposed redevelopment.
Graeber, Simmons & Cowan conducted a site feasibility report for University Apartments in September, 2006 (this separate, stand-alone document is not included under cover of this report but is described below). Components of the study included both site due diligence and conceptual designs.

Site Due Diligence Findings

Due diligence was done on site improvements, flood plains and easements, utility services, existing vegetation and environmental issues, focusing on the existing site of the University Apartments. Although the Department of Residence Life recognizes that this property may be required for other University uses and may not be available for re-development of the University Apartments, the following conclusions were reached:

- Surface improvements that include Hensel Park, the Physical Plant Compound, Children’s Center, Horticulture Garden Center, Oil Well Site and Antenna, and Roadways and Access were taken into consideration.
- There are no “fatal flaws” such as flood plain or environmental problems that would prevent development of either of the sites were found.
- Water, storm sewer, natural gas, electric, television cable and fiber optics are deemed adequate to serve the new University Apartments. However, the study recommends that capacity issues for waste water be reviewed.
- GS&C also recommends that a tree survey be initiated as soon as possible for further planning.
- Should the site be developed, an in-depth environmental impact study is recommended.

Conceptual Design & Master Planning

GS&C established a conceptual design that would be responsive to the marketplace and a realistic estimated cost for each of the design approaches. The conceptual design study addresses building materials and systems, MEP systems, site materials and systems, and utility services. Architectural and structural components were covered under building materials and systems; BS mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire alarm and sprinkler systems were examined to ensure that all MEP systems as required were met. In addition, contact information for the following utilities were provided in the report: water, waste water, electrical, fiber optics/high speed Ethernet/wireless Internet, and television cable.

The study concluded that, without reducing the availability of buildable land, the flood plains provide excellent locations for sports fields, playgrounds, hike and bike trails and other functions that add to the quality of life for the residents of University Apartments.

Building Plans and Master Plans

3-Story and 4-Story apartment layouts were examined. Conceptual designs for apartment layouts and building layouts for both Option A – 3-Story and Option B – 4-Story concepts can be found in Exhibit F, on pages 61-67.
NEIGHBORHOOD OVERVIEW: CORPS OF CADETS RESIDENCE HALLS

The residential buildings associated with the Corps of Cadets are also in need of renovation and some expansion to include additional circulation and support spaces. The buildings, including Briggs and Spence Halls, will remain in their current locations and a program of renovation/expansion will be undertaken for this area incorporating two to four buildings at a time. Each building is expected to be off-line for two and a half years to accommodate the renovation and expansion. Unit types, overall bed counts, and occupancy rates are not projected to substantially change as a result of renovations.

DESIGN CONCEPTS

Residential Hall Conceptual Designs

As addressed in the Campus Master Plan, the conceptual design of the residence halls used the noted examples of buildings on the campus denoting the desired quality of architectural character to establish the proper design palette. Such historic buildings include the YMCA Building, the History Building, Francis Hall, Scoates Hall, the Animal Industries Annex and the Administration Building. These buildings illustrate massing, materials and design characteristics compatible with an academic community. These buildings use various stone materials, brick, exterior plaster, punched openings, details and other elements reminiscent of classical architecture. The roofs can be flat or sloped. If sloped, they should be covered with appropriate metal, clay tile, or other materials compatible with the period.

For academic buildings, the standards indicate that they should be no more than four to five levels. Considering the floor-to-floor heights of fourteen to eighteen feet, building heights should be in the range of 56 feet to 90 feet. For this study, and because of the quantity of living units required, the residence hall height is a maximum of five stories and not exceeding 75 feet for the primary building, not including elevator and mechanical penthouses.

It is suggested in the building standards of the Campus Master Plan that buildings should depict the main entrance and have a place of arrival upon entering the building. The residence hall designs reflect such main entrances and a sense of arrival upon entering the lobby/reception areas.

Concept for the Neighborhood Commons:

Meeting a fellow student for a latte, stopping by for cash on the way to a movie, having a selection of good food for dining out or for takeout close at hand, meeting a group of friends to study or discuss a student project, mailing a letter or picking up your mail, just an evening of music or watching a DVD with friends – all of these opportunities can be provided outside the residence hall and within easy walking distance. For the Campus Student Housing Master Plan, this concept has been expanded into a village center referred to as “The Commons”. As such, it has the character and flexibility of a mini-retail shopping center, combined with being the “living room” or an “academic center” for the neighborhood. It could have such retail establishments as coffeehouses, convenience grocery store, copy shop, bookstore, barber shop, dry cleaners, postal offices/mail center, video store, gift shop, kiosks and a wide variety of food venues from the local community, including but not limited to, a pizza shop, burger joint, Chinese food, barbeque, soup-&-salad bar, Mexican food, or whatever is in vogue at the time. Food places that cater to university students come and go, and the facilities should accommodate that concept.
For The Commons to be successful for its neighborhood, it is perceived that each village center be tailored to the specific neighborhood to which it belongs. It could be that the students have a great deal of input into what kinds of businesses they want in their village center. The spaces are designed for changing preferences with flexibility that allows them to be altered without major renovation. For example, if a Mexican restaurant isn’t catering to the tastes of the students, there must be twenty others in the local community that can replace it. For students, it has to be fast, good, cheap and stay open late. It might be that such a food business starts out selling breakfast tacos in a food kiosk, tests the market with chili, enchiladas, burritos, or whatever they sell. If they are successful, the students like the food and service and if they need more space, they move into a larger space and expand their business.

“The Commons” Conceptual Design:

There are two new Commons buildings proposed for this program: one is located in the Southside neighborhood and the second is in the Westside neighborhood. These two neighborhoods have neither dining service nor other village support elements in their immediate areas. The Northside neighborhood is directly across the street from Sbisa Hall, which provides dining service and other village services for the northern portion of the campus. The materials and architectural character of The Commons buildings in this master plan will be compatible with those described for the residence halls and in compliance with the Campus Master Plan standards. Each of The Commons is physically located in the center of its neighborhood, on the main neighborhood mall, and within easy, immediate walking distance from each residence hall.

Neighborhood Master Plans

There were three primary objectives in creating the neighborhood master plans:

- To create a sense of community within each of the residential neighborhoods
- To introduce the potential of incorporating mixed-uses either into the individual residence halls, or within separate structures within the neighborhoods, and
- To create a neighborhood that is a part of the academic community and enhances the student experience at Texas A&M University

There are three primary student residential neighborhoods on the main campus (see the following Master Plan for all neighborhoods):

- **Northside Neighborhood**: The Northside neighborhood is bounded by University Drive on the north, Wellborn Road on the west, Jones Street on the south and Houston Street on the east. This neighborhood contains eight residence halls (Buildings 1 – 8 and 10) surrounding a new east-west mall between Sbisa Dining Center on the east and the Dulie Bell Building on the west. There are two residence halls identified as Buildings 9 and 11 outside of the mall cluster across Houston Street, north of Sbisa Dining Center (currently Neeley Hall and Hobby Hall locations) and northeast of the YMCA Building and south of Ross Street (Leggett Hall’s current location).

- **Southside Neighborhood**: The Southside neighborhood is bounded on the north by Lubbock Street, on the west by the Corps of Cadets residence halls, on the south by George Bush Drive, and on the east by Bizzell Street. The Southside Neighborhood contains seven new residence halls, including a new residence hall replacing Hart Hall immediately north of Rudder Tower;
existing Spence and Briggs Halls: two Living & Learning facilities and the Southside Village Commons Building containing approximately 54,250 GSF.

- **Westside Neighborhood:** The Westside neighborhood is bounded on the north by Raymond Stotzer Parkway, Discovery Drive on the west, with Adriance Lab Road on the east. This neighborhood contains seven residence halls, two living & learning facilities and a Westside Village Commons Building of approximately 70,000 SF.

Enlarged versions of neighborhood maps are included in the addendum, on pages 53-58.

**Exterior Space Design**

The Campus Master Plan has identified a series of guidelines for new construction on the Texas A&M University campus and the Campus Housing Master Plan has utilized those guidelines in location and orientation of the residence halls. The following are primary criteria considered in this master planning effort:

- The alignments of facades are given by the build-to lines as indicated on the Regulating Plan in the Campus Master Plan.
- Buildings should align on the quadrangles, streets and courtyard of the campus.
- Every building should have at least one façade, which is the primary means by which the building fulfills its responsibility to the public realm.
- Buildings are to address campus spaces with facades, which in conjunction with neighboring buildings, define the volume of outdoor space, such as a quadrangle.
- Façades are to incorporate primary or symbolic building entrances.
- Buildings are to incorporate loggias, colonnades and porticoes to create a transition between the scale of the campus as a whole and the building interior.
- Loggias may be space-defining elements or pedestrian circulation routes.
- Where possible, buildings are to enclose courtyards and courtyards should be conceived as integral components of the building’s circulation system.
- Building facades should be used to form the boundaries of courtyards, quadrangles, malls and other spaces needing definition.
- The Council for the Built Environment (CBE) has determined that all buildings at Texas A&M will be designed and built to achieve a LEED Silver Certification.

**LEED Certification**

According to the US Green Building Council website, “The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System™ is the nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction, and operation of high performance green buildings. LEED promotes a whole-building approach to sustainability by recognizing performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor environmental quality. The LEED Rating System was created to transform the built environment to sustainability by providing the building industry with consistent, credible standards for what constitutes a green building.

A building project must earn certain prerequisites, and performance benchmarks (“credits”) within each category in order to earn LEED certification. Projects are awarded Certified, Silver, Gold, or Platinum certification depending on the number of credits they achieve.”

---

III. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

Utilizing a base financial model developed by B&D, the TAMU Office of Budget & Analytical Services developed a comprehensive financial analysis of projected revenues, expenses, and capital costs of the aggregate Department of Residence Life system, including all proposed new developments according to this Master Plan, over the next fifty-year period. The model is designed to test the financial viability of various housing development, renovation, and demolition/replacement phasing options and associated operational variables including rental rate structures, operating costs, financing assumptions, and unit size assumptions. Differing combinations of these variables and project phasing were tested for feasibility as measured by the ability of the Department of Residence Life to support the required debt and cover all of its operations through its revenues.

Methodology

The model includes a multi-year operating pro forma showing all operating revenues, operating expenses, and debt service based on specified financing assumptions. The model integrates all of these elements so that any change in assumptions automatically forces adjustments in corresponding components and assumptions of the model in order to maintain internal consistency. This approach allows the University to move forward with plan components understanding that detail-related decisions can be made within the established financial parameters without compromising the overall plan scope or quality.

The model’s structure includes a system-wide pro forma that is a summation of the pro forma tables for each individual building in the system. Any renovation, new construction or demolition impacts are quantified on the individual building pro forma which in turn affects the system-wide pro forma. The model was used to test the feasibility of a variety of development and sequencing options designed to alter the quantity of beds in various housing types on campus to better respond to the demands of the student market. The primary indicator of feasibility used in this analysis was the comparison of total annual Department debt service to the amount of debt that could be supported by the system’s net operating income under the given financing assumptions (outlined below). Project and sequencing options were determined to be feasible only if the total project costs in any given year were less than or equal to the system’s debt capacity for that year. The determination of the system’s debt capacity incorporates a minimum debt coverage ratio of 1.15 to 1 as well as an interest rate of 5.75% and a debt term of 25 years.

Key Project Assumptions

Revenue assumptions shown in the model are based on information provided by Texas A&M’s Department of Residence Life and the demand projections identified in the market analysis of the Campus Student Housing Master Plan. Based on B&D’s understanding of the projects and the University’s housing market, the assumptions shown in this model are intended to be realistic and achievable. The University should remain aware that meeting the identified occupancy projections will require not only the development of facilities that respond to student demands, but also appropriate marketing and department support of new and existing facilities.

Financing Assumptions

The project’s overall debt capacity generally depends on rental income, building size/GSF per bed (determinant of both initial capital and on-going operating costs), interest rate, debt term, and debt coverage ratio. The model assumes that the University will finance, develop, operate, and own all new housing developments included in this plan. The University enjoys a good credit rating and would be able to employ tax-exempt debt to finance any improvements. Therefore, the financial model assumes that projects are financed using 100% tax-exempt debt with an interest rate assumption of 5.75% and a term of 25 years. The required debt coverage ratio is assumed to be 1.15 to 1. In addition, these assumptions only apply to financing for residence halls, and may vary for University Apartments.

Development Assumptions

The model assumes that construction costs would be $206 per square foot for building new residence halls (including $200 per square foot for construction and $6 per square foot for furniture) and $80 per square foot for renovations to existing residence halls in FY2007 dollars. Demolition costs are assumed to be $12 per square foot, also in FY2007 dollars. Construction, renovation, and demolition costs are all inflated at 4.5% per year to reflect the
actual year of delivery within the pro forma. Construction, renovation, and demolition costs for each proposed project are also inflated by 22% to reflect total project costs, including site-related costs, utilities, furniture, and all project-related soft costs such as professional fees and related services.

Each proposed new construction project is linked within the financial model to the existing building(s) that will have to be demolished to provide a site for the new construction. To allow sufficient time for demolition and site preparation, existing buildings are taken off line two years prior to the beginning of new construction on their respective sites. Actual construction time for all new buildings is assumed to take two years (1.5 years for apartments), exclusive of any related planning and design time. At the start of each demolition project and the actual construction phase of each new development project, the total capital cost of the project is assessed to the system and the related debt service payments will begin at the completion of the project (either demolition or new construction).

For renovation projects, the model takes a building off line for the project duration. The model assumes a one and a half year duration for the actual construction related to all renovation projects, again exclusive of any related planning and design time. As with demolition and new construction projects, the debt service payments related to the total capital cost of the renovation will begin at the completion of the construction period. While the building is off-line, it generates no revenue and is assigned no operating costs. When it comes back on line, the rental and occupancy rates will change as described below and the per-square-foot variable operating expenses will be assessed at the system’s post-renovation rate.

### Revenue Assumptions

Room rates in non-renovated existing buildings are projected to remain stable and are inflated in the model at 4% per year. Room rates for new units are currently projected to be 10% higher than average rates in existing rooms of a similar unit type. Occupancy levels in existing buildings are assumed to be the same as average Fiscal Year 2007 occupancy levels. Renovated and newly constructed buildings are projected to have an occupancy rate of 95% (with the exception of Corps buildings which will have post-renovation occupancy rates identical to pre-renovation rates).

The individual building pro formas include a calculation of “other” revenues. These revenues include summer rentals, vending, laundry, and forfeited damage deposit revenues and are set for each existing building at that building’s 2007 rate on a per-bed basis.

All non-rental revenues are projected to increase at a rate of 4% per year.
Summer Conference Revenue Assumptions

B&D conducted research to determine the extent to which the current facilities are limiting the potential for summer conference revenue generation. This research included interviews with housing personnel at similar institutions to understand how and the amount of revenue generated by summer camp and conference rentals, and interviews with organizations that rent residence hall space for summer events in College Station. This research determined that the Department of Residence Life has the potential to generate several times as much as current levels for summer camps and conferences, but that certain conditions, including the limited window of time available to host summer conferences due to the time needed to prepare buildings for the fall semester, limited space availability due to renovations/maintenance/summer school use, and the competition offered by many of the newer off-campus facilities, limits the attractiveness of on-campus housing for summer event organizers. Although there is very strong potential to dramatically increase summer rental revenues, specific revenue increases were not included in the model to keep the assumptions as conservative as possible and also because increased summer revenues would only be applicable to new facilities and will require several new facilities to be operational to provide a "critical mass" of available new units.

Operating Expense Assumptions

The operating expenses assumed for this analysis are based on the Department of Residence Life’s current actual expense data. The operating expenses are allocated based on gross square footage and include all associated operating, administration and summer maintenance charges and are analyzed separately for residence halls, University apartments, and Corps of Cadets facilities. Specific line items for operating expenses include all salaries, wages and benefits, travel, supplies and materials, all utilities including cable and telephone, insurance, services, maintenance and repair, non-capital equipment, administration and finance charges, and depreciation. The existing expenses were separately analyzed for residence halls, Corps buildings, and University apartments. Existing expense rates per gross square foot were found to be $14.78 for residence halls, $3.99 for Corps buildings (which do not include expenses related to Department of Residence Life operations), and $6.75 for University apartments. These existing rates, including an inflation rate of 3% per year, are charged to each existing facility for each year of operation. Upon renovation, Corps buildings are charged $4.40 per gross square foot for their Department-related operating expenses. New residence halls are charged $14.00 per gross square foot and new University apartments are charged $6.00 per gross square foot. Possible reductions in variable operating expenses for new facilities (from more efficient building systems, less immediate need for major maintenance, etc.) are assumed to be offset by predicted long-term increases in utility costs. Operating costs for new and renovated facilities are also assumed to inflate at 3% annually.

Debt service is also incorporated in the financial model. Separate line items are provided for existing debt service, which is based on actual repayment schedules, and for new debt related to the development costs associated with the renovation/demolition of existing buildings and the construction of new buildings. New debt assumptions include a 5.75% interest rate and a 25 year term for each project. New debt is accounted for in the pro forma as each renovation/demolition/new construction project begins and is allocated as a flat repayment schedule over its term.

Replacement Reserve Assumptions

The University’s target for a replacement reserve fund is 115% of total debt service plus 3 month’s operating costs plus 1.5% of current year capital costs. This targeted minimum fund balance is expressed for each year of the pro forma based on the total of existing and proposed new debt service (including debt related to the project costs of demolition) and one-fourth of the year’s projected total operating costs.

PHASING STRATEGY

Description

Given the mix of unit types currently available on campus and the demand patterns of students surveyed as part of this study, as well as the age and overall condition of much of the University’s existing housing stock, B&D recommends a gradual phased replacement of nearly all of the University’s residential facilities. Replacing residential facilities will allow the University to provide a mix of unit types and a range of amenities that will better match student expectations and will also allow the University to incorporate a more extensive range of living-learning opportunities. B&D’s recommendations for redevelopment are based on the survey-measured demand and are intended to be conservative enough to allow the University to move forward without unnecessary occupancy risk. The demand for beds should, however, be periodically tested throughout the implementation of this long-term plan to account for unforeseen changes in enrollment, student characteristics, trends and tastes, as well as competition from the local private market and other colleges and universities.
This strategy not only responds to unit-type demand patterns, but also addresses the gaps identified in the Strategic Asset Value analysis conducted as part of the Market Analysis. The most significant gaps between current conditions and University aspirations with respect to campus housing were found to be in the areas of direct curriculum enhancement and in the use of housing as a competitive amenity. Comprehensive redevelopment of the University’s housing stock can be targeted to directly address these issues through the incorporation of a wide range of specialized and flexible living-learning facilities and in building and unit amenities designed to appeal to contemporary student tastes. Secondary gaps were identified in the areas of accommodating a continuum of appropriate housing options for students, the creation and reinforcement of distinct neighborhoods on campus, and supplementing the local market for housing graduate/non-traditional/family students. These gaps are directly addressed by this Master Plan by providing a wider range of unit types, including full suites and more apartments, within a well-defined plan that reinforces the existing North and South residential areas and the University Apartment neighborhood for graduate and family students as well as upperclassmen while developing a new upperclassmen/graduate neighborhood on the West side of campus.

The development plan summarized in the table on the following page was based on the results of the market analysis and assessment of existing facilities, using the financial model as a tool to determine and maintain financial feasibility. The plan, as outlined herein, would result in a supply of on-campus housing that closely matches the demands of the student population at Texas A&M University. It would also allow the campus to better realize the value of the strategic asset of on-campus housing and could be developed and supported by the revenues generated by the Department of Residence Life within the parameters of the University’s financing requirements.

In addition to the schedule outlined on the following page, renovations to each of the Corps of Cadets residence halls are also included in the pro forma. The twelve Corps residence halls, including Briggs and Spence (currently occupied by non-Corps students), are planned to be renovated beginning in 2014. As outlined in the above assumptions, the buildings would be taken off line during the one-and-a-half-year renovation period.
The redevelopment of the University Apartments is also accommodated in the financial model. The existing University Apartment buildings are all scheduled to be replaced with new apartment buildings on an adjacent site. Preliminary site plans for the redevelopment of the University apartments have reserved space on this site for additional new University-associated developments. The College Avenue apartment development, despite being the newest of the four separate existing apartment developments on the University Apartments site, will require replacement in the near term. The financial model assumes that the University apartment redevelopment effort will begin with proposed new apartments (Phase 1) to be located at the corner of Texas Avenue and Hensel Drive in FY2008. Additional phases of apartment redevelopment will follow in subsequent years.

The table below shows the order of construction and demolition for all neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Construction/Remodel</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Demolished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northside 10</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 3a</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 4a</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Apartments 1</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 1a</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 2a</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Apartments 2</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 1</td>
<td>2012 Crocker, Moore, and McInnis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Apartments 3</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainer</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 4</td>
<td>2015 Moses and Davis Gary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 2</td>
<td>2017 Schuhmacher and Walton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 3</td>
<td>2018 Moses and Davis Gary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 7</td>
<td>2019 Clements and FHK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside 4</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utay</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside 2</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 6</td>
<td>2024 Clements and FHK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 9</td>
<td>2025 Hobby and Neeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 8</td>
<td>2026 Lechner, Haas, and McFadden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 5</td>
<td>2027 Lechner and Haas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside 3</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacy</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside 5</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 6</td>
<td>2033 Mosher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiest</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 3</td>
<td>2034 Aston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 1</td>
<td>2035 Dunn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 2</td>
<td>2038 Krueger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 5</td>
<td>2038 Eppright, Wells, and Rudder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside 6</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 4</td>
<td>2040 Appelt and Underwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside 7</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside 7</td>
<td>2041 Hart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside 1</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside 11</td>
<td>2045 Legett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Apartments 4</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rental Rate Modeling

As outlined in the discussion of the model’s assumptions, room rental rates in existing buildings will continue with their existing rent structures and a 4% average annual increase in rental rates. Rent for new units will be based on rent for comparable existing unit types plus a 10% premium. A comparison of the rental rates in the proposed new buildings to the existing rental structure is given in the table below. These rental rates are designed to be responsive to the local off-campus housing market, room and board costs at the University’s peer and competitor institutions, and the experience and expectations of TAMU students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Style</th>
<th>Existing Room Rates (06-07)</th>
<th>Proposed Room Rates (2006 Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semester Rent (Base)</td>
<td>Semester Rent (w/ &quot;new&quot; premium*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Premium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Suite/Modular Style Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Suite Style Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular Double</td>
<td>$2,299</td>
<td>Semi-Suite Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons Double</td>
<td>$2,095</td>
<td>$2,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony Double</td>
<td>$1,802</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Double</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Double</td>
<td>$1,812</td>
<td>$1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular Single</td>
<td>$2,403</td>
<td>Semi-Suite Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons Single</td>
<td>$2,403</td>
<td>$3,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony Single</td>
<td>$2,403</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Single</td>
<td>$2,403</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Single</td>
<td>$2,403</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Style Rooms</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Double</td>
<td>$2,430</td>
<td>$2,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Family Apartments</td>
<td>Hawaiian Rent (per month)</td>
<td>$530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College View Rent (per month)</td>
<td>$470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Ave 1 BDR Rent (per month)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Ave 2 BDR Rent (per month)</td>
<td>$577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avenue A 2 BDR Rent (per month)</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Apartment Rent (per month)</td>
<td>$470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residence Halls Phasing

Southside Neighborhood

The Southside residential area, with the most recently constructed existing residence halls, would be the first neighborhood to begin redevelopment. The proposed phasing would have the first replacement project beginning concurrently with the first project at the University Apartment area in 2008 with construction continuing through 2043. At completion, the seven residence halls planned for this area would house nearly 3,400 students in suite style accommodations and would include a new commons facility and dedicated space for an extensive living-learning program. Ongoing construction of residential buildings in the Southside area would increase bed capacity, which would then enable the demolition and replacement of buildings in the Northside residential area.

Northside Neighborhood

The replacement process in the Northside neighborhood would begin in 2008. With additional projects beginning every few years, all existing Northside residence halls can be replaced by 2047. In addition to the ten residence halls planned for this area, the initial building is planned to include a substantial living-learning facility. Over 2,600 residents are planned to occupy the suite style units in this neighborhood. The existing Sbisa dining hall and associated community support facilities will remain to serve the Northside residential area.

Westside Neighborhood

Development of the new Westside neighborhood would progress during the development of the Southside and Northside neighborhoods. This neighborhood would consist of seven buildings and a community commons facility. A comprehensive living-learning center is also accommodated in the space planning and financial analysis of this area. Nearly 2,200 suite beds can be accommodated in a mix of four and five story residential buildings. Construction would begin in this neighborhood in 2020 with additional projects every few years through the completion of the last residence hall in 2043.
Corps of Cadets Residence Halls Phasing

The Corps of Cadets residence halls will be renovated and expanded beginning in 2014. With between one and three buildings being renovated at a time and a project duration of two-and-a-half years, the Corps facilities can be completed by the end of 2036.

University Apartment Phasing

The first phase of replacement apartments consisting of 252 units is planned for completion in 2010 with additional projects every few years until the existing inventory is replaced.

A total of 852 units of apartments will be replaced as outlined below:

Phase I: 252 units, target date 2008
Phase II: 144 units, target date 2010
Phase III: 288 units, target date 2010
Phase IV: 168 units, target date to be determined

Total 852 units

Financial Model

On the following page is the 25 year system-wide summary pro forma, including all of the proposed developments, based on the above assumptions and phasing schedule:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Beds - Residence Halls</td>
<td>7,176,000</td>
<td>6,983,000</td>
<td>6,983,000</td>
<td>6,983,000</td>
<td>6,983,000</td>
<td>6,983,000</td>
<td>6,428,000</td>
<td>6,428,000</td>
<td>6,428,000</td>
<td>6,136,000</td>
<td>5,943,000</td>
<td>5,517,000</td>
<td>4,944,000</td>
<td>4,944,000</td>
<td>4,944,000</td>
<td>4,944,000</td>
<td>4,944,000</td>
<td>4,478,000</td>
<td>4,041,000</td>
<td>3,824,000</td>
<td>3,824,000</td>
<td>3,824,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues - Residence Halls</td>
<td>$2,330,000</td>
<td>$2,358,000</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>$2,267,000</td>
<td>$2,358,000</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>$2,345,000</td>
<td>$2,442,000</td>
<td>$2,520,000</td>
<td>$2,592,000</td>
<td>$2,663,000</td>
<td>$2,772,000</td>
<td>$2,884,000</td>
<td>$2,713,000</td>
<td>$2,546,000</td>
<td>$2,505,000</td>
<td>$2,606,000</td>
<td>$2,712,000</td>
<td>$2,819,000</td>
<td>$2,931,000</td>
<td>$3,048,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues - Corps</td>
<td>$188,000</td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
<td>$188,000</td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$238,000</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$294,000</td>
<td>$303,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
<td>$316,000</td>
<td>$374,000</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
<td>$446,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Rental - New Developments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,568,000</td>
<td>$15,737,000</td>
<td>$18,777,000</td>
<td>$19,528,000</td>
<td>$28,267,000</td>
<td>$29,398,000</td>
<td>$51,292,000</td>
<td>$57,476,000</td>
<td>$59,773,000</td>
<td>$62,165,000</td>
<td>$69,526,000</td>
<td>$74,975,000</td>
<td>$82,753,000</td>
<td>$89,718,000</td>
<td>$99,121,000</td>
<td>$108,821,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Vacancy - Res. Halls</td>
<td>($2,559,000)</td>
<td>($2,583,000)</td>
<td>($2,681,000)</td>
<td>($2,481,000)</td>
<td>($2,583,000)</td>
<td>($2,681,000)</td>
<td>($2,623,000)</td>
<td>($2,681,000)</td>
<td>($2,820,000)</td>
<td>($2,931,000)</td>
<td>($3,051,000)</td>
<td>($3,173,000)</td>
<td>($3,302,000)</td>
<td>($3,441,000)</td>
<td>($3,580,000)</td>
<td>($3,719,000)</td>
<td>($3,858,000)</td>
<td>($4,097,000)</td>
<td>($4,336,000)</td>
<td>($4,575,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Vacancy - New Developments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($528,000)</td>
<td>($787,000)</td>
<td>($1,302,000)</td>
<td>($1,352,000)</td>
<td>($1,804,000)</td>
<td>($1,854,000)</td>
<td>($2,306,000)</td>
<td>($2,356,000)</td>
<td>($2,406,000)</td>
<td>($2,557,000)</td>
<td>($2,708,000)</td>
<td>($2,859,000)</td>
<td>($3,010,000)</td>
<td>($3,161,000)</td>
<td>($3,312,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>($31,459,000)</td>
<td>($31,523,000)</td>
<td>($32,471,000)</td>
<td>($30,602,000)</td>
<td>($31,523,000)</td>
<td>($32,471,000)</td>
<td>($36,744,000)</td>
<td>($38,092,000)</td>
<td>($40,440,000)</td>
<td>($42,788,000)</td>
<td>($45,137,000)</td>
<td>($47,487,000)</td>
<td>($50,837,000)</td>
<td>($54,187,000)</td>
<td>($57,537,000)</td>
<td>($60,887,000)</td>
<td>($64,237,000)</td>
<td>($67,587,000)</td>
<td>($71,937,000)</td>
<td>($76,287,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)</td>
<td>$7,567,000</td>
<td>$8,079,000</td>
<td>$8,731,000</td>
<td>$7,478,000</td>
<td>$8,079,000</td>
<td>$8,731,000</td>
<td>$13,617,000</td>
<td>$16,045,000</td>
<td>$18,393,000</td>
<td>$20,741,000</td>
<td>$23,089,000</td>
<td>$25,437,000</td>
<td>$27,785,000</td>
<td>$30,133,000</td>
<td>$32,481,000</td>
<td>$34,829,000</td>
<td>$37,177,000</td>
<td>$39,525,000</td>
<td>$41,873,000</td>
<td>$44,221,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Debt Service - Res. Halls</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($124,000)</td>
<td>($124,000)</td>
<td>($124,000)</td>
<td>($226,000)</td>
<td>($565,000)</td>
<td>($1,042,000)</td>
<td>($1,364,000)</td>
<td>($1,364,000)</td>
<td>($1,364,000)</td>
<td>($1,364,000)</td>
<td>($1,364,000)</td>
<td>($1,364,000)</td>
<td>($1,364,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Debt Service - Apts.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>&lt;1.15</td>
<td>&lt;1.14</td>
<td>&lt;1.15</td>
<td>&lt;1.14</td>
<td>&lt;1.15</td>
<td>&lt;1.14</td>
<td>&lt;1.15</td>
<td>&lt;1.14</td>
<td>&lt;1.15</td>
<td>&lt;1.14</td>
<td>&lt;1.15</td>
<td>&lt;1.14</td>
<td>&lt;1.15</td>
<td>&lt;1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Capital Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$113,536,000</td>
<td>$166,972,000</td>
<td>$191,465,000</td>
<td>$191,465,000</td>
<td>$256,628,000</td>
<td>$257,904,000</td>
<td>$323,068,000</td>
<td>$324,344,000</td>
<td>$380,508,000</td>
<td>$406,684,000</td>
<td>$432,860,000</td>
<td>$459,036,000</td>
<td>$485,212,000</td>
<td>$511,388,000</td>
<td>$537,564,000</td>
<td>$563,740,000</td>
<td>$590,916,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following chart illustrates the annual debt capacity of the system based on its net operating income and financing assumptions (5.75% interest rate, 25 year term, and 1.15:1 debt coverage ratio) compared to the annual capital costs of the proposed projects.

The following chart compares the total cumulative debt service related to the proposed projects to the total net operating income of the Department of Residence Life. All of these figures are based on the assumptions outlined above. The gap between the debt service amount and the net operating income represents the debt coverage ratio. The debt coverage ratio is at least 1.0 to 1 for all years of the pro forma, as illustrated, and averages 1.26 to 1 for the first 25 years of the pro forma.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>A “private market” style living unit, including two to four bedrooms, a living area, dining area, and full kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td>A traditional style of student housing, based on a series of typically shared bedrooms (double or triple) located along double-loaded corridors, served by large common bathrooms and lounges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>Gross Square Feet, a measure of area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED</td>
<td>Stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. A nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction and operation of high performance green buildings. The LEED Rating System was created to transform the built environment to sustainability by providing the building industry with consistent, credible standards for what constitutes a green building. LEED promotes a whole-building approach to sustainability by recognizing performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor environmental quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED Silver</td>
<td>A building project must earn certain prerequisites, and performance benchmarks (“credits”) within each category in order to earn LEED certification. Projects are awarded Certified, Silver, Gold, or Platinum certification depending on the number of credits they achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living-Learning</td>
<td>Any range of residence life facilities or programs structured around a specific approach to integrating the academic and living experiences for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>A clustering of residence life buildings, often sharing amenities such as dining and indoor or outdoor recreation facilities, designed for the purpose of building community within the larger university environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-suite</td>
<td>A hybrid style of living unit between “dormitory” style and “suite” style, in which a combination of bedrooms (usually two) share a bathroom between them but not with other rooms. Like a dormitory, semi-suite rooms are typically located along double-loaded corridors and may have large common lounge areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>A living unit in which a number of bedrooms, usually from two to eight, share a living area and bathroom, separate from those of other suites. Suites are distinguished from apartments in that suites typically do not include full kitchens but sometimes include a small kitchenette.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OVERVIEW**

During the Market Analysis phase of the Master Planning process, an assessment was conducted in 2003-2004 to determine the University’s strategic objectives for improving its residential facilities. The assessment was based on a “gap analysis” comparing the University’s current conditions to its aspirations relative to a number of specific outcomes in the areas of education, enrollment management, campus community, and financial performance. This “gap analysis,” termed by B&D the Strategic Asset Value Analysis, was based on information collected from interviews with a wide range of campus administrators and a review of all available materials related to the mission, goals, and long-range plans of the University. The analysis identified a number of areas in which the current conditions of the residential life facilities were falling short of the University’s expectations and aspirations. As the market analysis data was compiled to begin the process of creating a physical and operational master plan for campus housing, specific and deliberate strategies were established to close each of these significant gaps.

The results of this Strategic Asset Value Analysis are outlined below. This section of the report also outlines the strategies incorporated into the Master Plan to address the gaps identified in the Strategic Asset Value Analysis.

**STRATEGIC ASSET VALUE ANALYSIS**

**Objectives**

Nationwide, colleges and universities recognize the important role that campus housing facilities and services play in meeting institutional goals and enhancing campus life. B&D acknowledges the administration’s objectives to provide enhanced student housing facilities that will serve as a strategic asset, provide a valuable educational experience and foster community-building efforts among students. Although many factors impact the University’s ability to meet institutional goals, this strategic analysis provides evidence that carefully planned campus housing and other “quality of life” facilities are an important component of the overall strategy.

Accordingly, B&D worked with the project Steering Committee and other selected staff and administrators to identify Texas A&M University’s strategic goals, review the mission statements of the University and the Department of Residence Life, and critically examine the capacity of the existing residential life programs and facilities to contribute to the realization of these objectives.

**Methodology**

B&D uses a “Destination Value” approach to facility development to respond to the constant challenge of assuring that campus life improvements respond to the University’s strategic objectives. More specifically, B&D proceeded with the understanding that:

All of the project objectives must be expressed in specific terms that demonstrate their relevance to furthering the school’s mission, reinforcing campus values, responding to institutional commitments and responsibilities and improving the school’s competitive position in the market.

B&D’s approach required a working relationship with University administrators to develop a detailed understanding of the institution’s mission, the relevant stakeholders and customer groups, and the strategic project objectives which best serve that mission.

**Texas A&M University’s Strategic Goals**

The project objectives were determined by performing a “gap analysis” of the University’s strategic values as they relate to several key areas impacted by housing (the Strategic Asset Value analysis). This analysis identifies a range of values within several “outcomes,” including educational outcomes, enrollment management outcomes, campus community outcomes, and financial performance outcomes. For each value, two numbers between 0 and 10, with 0 being “low” and 10 being “high,” are assigned. One number, represented on the chart by an “X,” indicates the extent to which the University is currently able to reflect or realize the particular value based on current campus conditions and operations. A second number, represented by an “O,” indicates the extent to which the University would like to be able to reflect or realize that particular value, as expressed in published mission statements, strategic
goals, values, etc., as well as in information gleaned from administrator interviews. Significant gaps between the current campus conditions and campus aspirations — represented as significant gaps between “X’s” and “O’s” — are highlighted and became the areas of focus for this master plan.

The detailed Strategic Asset Value Analysis worksheet and commentary is provided in the following pages of this report. The following mission- and vision-related statements published by the University and the Department of Residence Life were used as background information for this analysis:

**Texas A&M University Core Values**

- **Loyalty** - Acceptance forever.
- **Integrity** - Character is destiny.
- **Excellence** - Set the bar.
- **Leadership** - Follow me.
- **Selfless Service** - How can I be of service?
- **Respect** - We are the Aggies, the Aggies are we.

**Texas A&M University’s Mission (as expressed in Vision 2020)**

The mission of Texas A&M University grows from a number of forces, but most important among these is adherence to our core values. These values serve to create and condition our mission. Texas A&M University is a modern, comprehensive public educational institution dedicated to serving society by:

- **Academic, Research, and Service Excellence**, by which we mean the achievement of national and international prominence through the scholarship and research of its faculty; development, dissemination, and use of the faculty’s knowledge; facilitation and support of interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary faculties and programs; strategic orientation toward fields of importance and unique competency; alignment of the interests of the faculty with the broader needs and mission of the university; and interaction and cooperation with other institutions and parties, both within and outside of the Texas A&M University System.

- **Teaching Excellence**, by which we mean the provision of an intellectual environment that encourages the development and expansion of the human mind and spirit; advances critical thinking and problem solving; significantly embraces global awareness; encourages life-long learning; develops in students the wisdom and skills needed to assume responsibility and leadership in a democratic society; and is committed to the success of its students once they are enrolled.

- **Leadership and Citizenship Development**, by which we mean the provision of a university environment that improves students’ understanding and use of their personal attributes and abilities; contributes to the students’ ability to work and live with others; promotes honesty, integrity, and morality; develops leadership, personal effectiveness, and a commitment to community and civic involvement on a national and global basis as well as on a state and local level.

- **Managerial and Service Excellence**, by which we mean the adherence to articulated core values and principles; the provision of an energetic, thoughtful, innovative, supportive, purposeful administrative structure led by individuals of character, effectiveness, insight, and accomplishment; and continuous reference to the best practices of our most admired peer institutions.

**Texas A&M University’s Core Values (as expressed in Vision 2020)**

A prerequisite to planning change is articulating the core values that will drive all our decision-making.

- First, we are absolutely and unequivocally dedicated to the search for truth, freedom of inquiry, and contribution to society.
Second, we recognize and hold the public trust sacred. We will conduct all of our activities with the highest standards of integrity, openness, and accountability. We will apply only the highest standards when making decisions on tenure, employment, and promotion. We will accept only the highest standards for the governance and leadership of the institution.

Third, we will seek excellence in everything we do. We will define excellence by a broad universe of national and global standards, and by objective standards of achievement and/or contribution. We will measure ourselves by those standards and we will reach out to colleagues in academia, government, and industry to understand how we can learn, benefit, and contribute.

Fourth, we will welcome all people and do our best to prepare them for purposeful and productive lives. We will attract a richly diverse student body, faculty, and staff. We will value and build character and leadership in our faculty, students, and graduates. We will treat all members of our community with respect and civility. We will foster an atmosphere of community among our faculty, students, staff, former students, and parents. We will increase opportunities for women and under-represented minorities on our faculty, staff, and administration.

Fifth, we will manage ourselves effectively and with wisdom and the understanding that human and intellectual capital are our greatest assets. We will make choices, allocations, and re-allocations to sustain excellence. And we will treat all generations equitably.

Texas A&M University’s Mission Statement

Texas A&M University is dedicated to the discovery, development, communication, and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings through research and creativity. It prepares students to assume roles in leadership, responsibility, and service to society. Texas A&M assumes as its historic trust the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and an intellectual environment nurturing the human mind and spirit. It welcomes and seeks to serve persons of all racial, ethnic, and geographic groups, women and men alike, as it addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse population and a global economy. In the twenty-first century, Texas A&M University seeks to assume a place of preeminence among public universities while respecting its history and traditions.

Texas A&M University’s Vision and Values

People are Texas A&M University’s most valuable asset. The University strives to maintain an environment which encourages all employees to achieve their personal and professional goals and aspirations as we work toward achieving the University’s mission. In this environment, each person’s individuality and contributions are respected. Texas A&M University recognizes that all people have rights at work, including the right to be treated with respect and dignity, the right to be recognized and rewarded fairly for performance, and the right to a work environment free from discrimination and harassment. The University is committed to these rights. All people at Texas A&M University are expected to treat each other in accordance with these rights.

Texas A&M University recognizes the importance of communication, and is committed to an environment which stresses open sharing of information and ideas, and values input from all people. Texas A&M University will strive for a work environment in which all people accept responsibility to contribute to the success of the University, and are empowered to do so. Finally, for this vision to become reality and endure, it must be continually communicated, supported and upheld.

Department of Residence Life Core Values

- **Integrity:** Unified adherence to ethical, truthful, and factual conduct.
- **Respect:** Recognize and honor the dignity, value, and individuality of each person.
- **Quality:** Provide excellence throughout a complete range of services, programs, and personnel.
- **Service:** Dedicated to being proactive, effective, reliable, and responsive.
- **Community:** Develop, promote, and preserve positive collaboration, understanding, and interaction.
- **Vision:** Valuing opportunities for learning, innovation, and positive change.

All of the strategic goals, core values, mission statement, and vision outlined above for both the University and the Department of Residence Life were given consideration in the Strategic Asset Value analysis.
Summary of Findings

Using the strategic goals, core values, mission statement and vision for the University and the Department of Residence Life, B&D conducted working sessions with the Project Steering Committee and other selected University staff and administrators to test these aspirations against the actual contributions of the current campus housing facilities and programs. The findings are detailed in chart form and narrative below.

Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend:</th>
<th>Targeted Strategic Value</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Current Conditions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Aspirations</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Educational Outcomes

a. Supervision Through Maturity

- Housing provided for competitive reasons, unit type reflect demand, minimal staffing and programming
- “Live-on” requirement, house significant proportion of students, average proportion of traditional rooms, high degree of staffing and programming

b. Proximity to Educational Resources

- Housing provided at campus perimeter, no associated academic support facilities
- Housing in major part of Master Plan, locations are close to academic core, “residential college” relationships, integrated academic support facilities

c. Personal Development

- No class distinctions made in room/building assignment, uniform rules/programming, minimum social/educational space
- Room/building assignment by class, support spaces/facilities provided, graduated programming and rules enforcement, academic tie-ins, live-in faculty

d. Direct Curriculum Enhancement

- No effort to assign rooms by major, more traditional programming/staffing, no faculty interaction
- Room/building assignment by major, “interest groups,” “residential colleges,” living/learning emphasis, academic support spaces provided, faculty in-residence/mentors

e. Development Continuum

- Unit type mix dictated by other factors (see above), younger students allowed in apartments, no differentiation in programming/supervision
- Full range of unit types available, differential programming/supervision (from parent to landlord), unit amenities responsive to market

Based on stated missions and values and current campus conditions, the University is close to achieving its objectives with respect to several important educational outcomes. These realized outcomes include providing appropriate supervision to younger students in their first years on campus, maintaining appropriate physical proximities between housing facilities and the educational resources of the campus, and fostering the personal development of residential students by providing an appropriate range of programming opportunities and activities for residential students. In two other key areas related to educational outcomes, however, the University is not realizing its aspirations. The largest gap between current conditions and aspirations with respect to educational outcomes is in the provision of opportunities for direct curriculum enhancement (such as living-learning, affinity housing, or residential college programs). The University currently does not offer the range of curriculum-based residential programs as would be expected given its stated mission and values. The University is also falling short of its aspirations with respect to providing a continuum of housing unit type options such that it is able to offer an appropriate level of privacy and supervision to students of all age groups and maturity levels.

Enrollment Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend:</th>
<th>Targeted Strategic Value</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Current Conditions:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Aspirations:</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Enrollment Management

a. Housing Market Supplement - Undergraduate Students

- Housing is intended to be provided by local market, no effort to expand recruiting radius, housing focused only on younger students
- Room/building assignment by major, “interest groups,” “residential colleges,” living/learning emphasis, academic support spaces provided, faculty in-residence/mentors

b. Housing Market Supplement - Graduate Students

- Housing is intended to be provided by local market, no effort to expand recruiting radius, housing focused only on younger students
- Room/building assignment by major, “interest groups,” “residential colleges,” living/learning emphasis, academic support spaces provided, faculty in-residence/mentors

c. Competitive Amenity

- Focus on the basics, large proportion of doubles for efficiency, minimal support facilities and amenities, housing not “shown off”
- Wide range of unit types available (e.g., apartments), amenities better than the private market at market or below-market rates, emphasis on recruiting

Housing facilities are especially important to campuses in communities that are not able to provide adequate, appropriate and/or affordable housing as an alternative to living on campus. It was determined that between the campus and the local private market, there was a sufficient amount of appropriate housing available for undergraduate students. The current situation is not as positive for graduate and non-traditional students and for students with families. It can
be very challenging to find safe, convenient, and affordable housing for a family in College Station, especially a family supported only on the income of a graduate student. In order for the University to realize its goal of increasing graduate student enrollments, and at the same time live up to its commitments to these students/employees, it must improve and expand its supply of graduate and family student housing.

Housing facilities are also an important tool for attracting and retaining students, especially those from out-of-state and those who are choosing between TAMU and other top universities in Texas and across the country. Given its age, unit type configurations, and general conditions, the University’s existing housing stock does not serve to attract potential students as much as it could and should, especially when compared to many of its comparable and competitive institutions.

**Campus Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Strategic Value</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Current Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Financial Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both campus housing and off-campus student/employee housing were evaluated relative to how well they helped to create and enhance a sense of campus community. The values considered included designation as a "residential campus," the nature and degree of out-of-classroom activity occurring on campus, the creation and reinforcement of campus neighborhoods, and integration with the campus quality-of-life system. The campus houses an appropriate proportion of its student population and has sufficient capacity to offer space to all who would like to live on campus. In terms of numbers of student organizations and events and activities, TAMU is doing an excellent job of providing "something for everyone," even relative to other large state institutions. The campus master plan has established very high expectations for the physical organization of the campus, including reinforcing the existing pattern of academic and residential neighborhoods. While residential facilities are generally organized into coherent zones, all future development must concentrate on strengthening these neighborhoods to comply with the master plan and with the desires of the administration and students. Related to the organization of campus neighborhoods is the physical distribution of "quality of life" facilities on campus. These facilities include student centers, recreation centers, athletic facilities, dining facilities, and other spaces that contribute to the out-of-classroom environment and the unique aspects of the "other education" that is so vital to the Aggie experience. While there is some room for improving the convenience and level of access to these types of campus facilities, students and administrators generally felt that the relationship between housing facilities and quality-of-life facilities on the Texas A&M campus was as good as could be expected for a campus of its size.

**Financial Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Strategic Value</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Current Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Financial Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the financial performance of the Residence Life Department was analyzed to determine how well revenues were being generated and expenses managed relative to campus expectations. It was felt that the campus had moderately high expectations relative to entrepreneurial revenue generation. Expenses were expected to be wisely managed, but not
to the point of extensive outsourcing or adversely affecting anything that would have any negative impacts on operations and student satisfaction. Current operations are very close to fully living up to both of these expectations. While there is some room for improvement, the gaps were not significant enough to be identified as high priority targets for this plan.

The values with the most significant gaps between current conditions and University aspirations are in providing direct curriculum enhancement (i.e. living-learning programs) and in the ability of the housing facilities and programs to serve as a competitive amenity for recruitment and retention goals. Secondary gaps were identified in the areas of providing an appropriate range of facilities to support a “development continuum,” supplementing the local market for graduate/non-traditional/family students, and in creating and reinforcing residential neighborhoods on campus.
Overall Goals

The Campus Student Housing Master Plan is intended to establish long-term development targets for the Department of Residence Life that appropriately respond to the needs of the targeted student market, the University’s academic and student life initiatives, the campus-wide Master Plan, and the development requirements of the Council on the Built Environment. To respond to specific issues raised by the Department of Residence Life, the Division of Student Affairs, and other campus constituencies involved in this planning process, as well as to close the gaps identified in the Strategic Asset Value analysis, a set of specific goals was developed for the Campus Student Housing Master Plan. These goals are as follows:

- To create a student housing system that will be considered to be among the best in the nation and the world.
- To provide a mix of unit types that will be responsive to contemporary student preferences.
- To develop facilities that will meet the high standards of the University’s Council on the Built Environment and will be in compliance with the Campus Master Plan.
- To form strong residential “neighborhoods” that will incorporate an appropriate hierarchy of support spaces including dining, social, recreational, and educational spaces.
- To foster the development of a range of living-learning opportunities by providing for the incorporation of an extensive array of academic support facilities within the residential buildings and neighborhoods. These facilities will enable the Department of Residence Life and academic departments to create a variety of programs that will enhance both the educational and residential experiences of Texas A&M students.

These goals were formulated to address the needs and concerns voiced during the Market Analysis phase of this planning process. (A detailed summary of the Market Analysis process and findings is included in the following section of this report.) The above goals are intended to meet the qualitative desires expressed by the students involved in the focus group and survey processes; to address the organizational, operational, and strategic needs of the wide range of University administrators interviewed; and to close the gaps identified in the Strategic Asset Value analysis. A summary of how each of the goals addresses the gaps in the Strategic Asset Value analysis is provided by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan Goals</th>
<th>Direct Curriculum Enhancement</th>
<th>Development Continuum</th>
<th>Housing Market Supplement - Goals</th>
<th>Competitive Amenity</th>
<th>Neighborhood Creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a housing system that will be considered to be among the best in the nation and the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a top housing system will offer “something for everyone”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a mix of unit types that will be responsive to contemporary student preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>responding to the preferences of all students will create an appropriate continuum of unit type options</td>
<td>offering improved options including apartments and suites, will assist in recruiting and retaining graduate students</td>
<td>a more contemporary mix of unit types will help to make the University more attractive to potential students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop facilities that will meet the high standards of the University’s Council on the Built Environment and will be in compliance with the Campus Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high quality buildings will remain attractive to students for many years</td>
<td></td>
<td>maintaining and supplementing residential neighborhoods reinforce the Campus Master Plan as well as the Housing Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form strong residential “neighborhoods” that will incorporate an appropriate hierarchy of support spaces including dining, social, recreational, and educational spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>educational spaces within neighborhoods can be resources for academic and co-curricular programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster the development of a range of living-learning opportunities by providing for the incorporation of an extensive array of academic support facilities within the residential buildings and neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as an operational option, neighborhoods could be developed to respond to the needs of specific class groupings</td>
<td>maintaining a distinct University Apartments neighborhood will allow the area to continue to focus on the needs of graduate students and their families</td>
<td>comprehensive neighborhoods can offset the potential negative of the system’s large scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a wide range of spaces can be provided as part of this Master Plan to accommodate living-learning programs ranging from ad hoc affinity housing to residential colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td>smaller, cohesive, and comprehensive residential neighborhoods can offset the potential negative of the system’s large scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Master Plan goals will each have a positive impact on multiple Strategic Asset Value analysis gaps and will address a variety of macro-level issues related to campus housing. In addition to these broad goals, a wide range of more specific quantitative and operational requirements are also included in the details of the phasing plan and financial analysis. Like the overall goals, the basis for these more specific requirements can be found in the market analysis.
EXHIBIT C: MARKET ANALYSIS RESULTS

The foundation for developing the Campus Student Housing Master Plan was a market analysis that was conducted during the 2003-2004 academic year. The market analysis was designed to determine the quantitative and qualitative nature of demand for housing among current Texas A&M students, project this demand to future student populations, and balance the student demand with the goals and objectives of the Department of Residence Life and the University’s student affairs and academic operations. This market analysis, along with an existing facilities assessment and a detailed system-wide financial analysis, formed the basis of the Campus Student Housing Master Plan. The complete market analysis is available as a separate document entitled Campus Student Housing Master Plan: Market Analysis Report, 30 August 2004. A summary of the qualitative and quantitative findings of the market analysis are included in Exhibit 2 of this report.

The market analysis was instrumental in determining both the qualitative and quantitative nature of the University’s housing needs. To gain a qualitative understanding of the unique nature of Texas A&M and the motivations, preferences and priorities of its students as they relate to housing and related issues, an extensive range of focus group interviews was conducted. Campus administrators were interviewed to determine how residential facilities could be leveraged to fulfill institutional goals and further the University’s mission and objectives. To develop a more quantitative understanding of A&M’s current situation and future needs, existing facilities were toured and assessed and operational, financial, and demographic information was reviewed. Off-campus housing alternatives were analyzed to develop a competitive context for housing improvements. A variety of potential unit types was developed in response to the qualitative input and tested via a broadly-distributed internet-based survey of current student populations to determine the levels of demand for each among current and projected future student populations.

The specific analyses conducted as part of the Campus Student Housing Master Plan included the following:

- Review of a wide range of documents and data provided by the University, including materials related to the University’s demographics, mission, strategic goals, and long-range master plans and Department of Residence Life policies, procedures, and operations;
- Interviews with key University administrators to determine project parameters and discuss background information;
- A determination of the Strategic Asset Value of the University’s housing program;
- A series of focus groups with students including residence hall residents, University Apartment residents, residence hall staff, student organization members, learning community residents, students in the Corps of Cadets, and commuter students to assess qualitative information regarding housing;
- A comparison of information regarding tuition and fees, demographics and enrollment, and housing facilities from a variety of comparison institutions selected by the University;
- A review of available information and reports concerning the local off-campus housing market to define and characterize private sector competition for student housing;
- A detailed electronic survey (distributed to 2,500 random students and completed by over 1,300 students) to quantitatively determine students’ housing selection criteria and assess a wide variety of factors relative to student housing preferences and demand; and
- A projection of the total demand for on-campus housing by student classification and unit type based on survey data.

Qualitative Findings

The market analysis found that the University has a very strong sense of history and tradition that was frequently cited by students as a major reason why they chose Texas A&M. This sense of tradition is maintained and reinforced in a wide range of campus activities that serve to make A&M a unique place, strengthen ties between students and the institution, make a large university feel more comfortable and personable, and in general create a sense of “school spirit” that is not surpassed by any other university.

Academically, Texas A&M is a statewide leader in engineering, architecture, agricultural sciences, and a variety of hard sciences, and has many programs of national and international renown. A&M is a top-choice university among students from all parts of Texas and draws a significant number of undergraduates, and especially graduate students, from all across the United States and throughout the world. While A&M recognizes its academic achievements, the institution is by no means resting on its laurels. The University leadership sets the highest possible targets for all of the institution’s endeavors from academic performance and research initiatives to the expectations and outcomes of student life programs and campus auxiliaries.
Texas A&M is one of a select few universities that has the resources and support to legitimately become the “best in the world” in almost any respect it so targets.

Quantitative Findings

Major quantitative findings of the market analysis illustrated that the University’s housing system has very stiff competition in the off-campus marketplace. Students who are more concerned with amenities than total costs can find apartment complexes that offer facilities and services ranging from those typical of contemporary student-oriented developments in many other college towns (including features such as individual leases, free parking, inclusion of all utilities, outdoor pools, weight and fitness centers, computer labs, and clubhouses) to newer developments that take the concept of student-oriented apartments to levels seen in very few markets around the country (offering roommate matching services, covered parking, theaters, student lounges, academic support services, on-premises meal plans, and residential life programming). Significantly for the University, many of the most competitive off-campus options are located within walking distance of campus.

From a financial standpoint, the Department of Residence Life currently has a strong operational base despite the strong off-campus competition. The financial situation of the Department of Residence Life will be improving significantly at the end of fiscal year 2010 as several bond issuances from the early 1990s will be paid off, eliminating over $6 million per year in debt service payments. The availability of additional debt capacity will come at a crucial period in the lifespan of many existing residence life facilities. While the proportion of freshmen who choose to live on campus is generally high for a large state university (at around 65% of all freshmen not in the Corps of Cadets) and the proportion of those freshmen residents who choose to remain on campus for their sophomore year is typical (about half of freshmen residents remain on campus as sophomores), the capture rates among sophomores and juniors is much lower than average (roughly 12% and 5% of juniors and seniors, respectively, live on campus). The qualitative analysis revealed that the reason few juniors and seniors remain on campus, and the reason that ever increasing numbers of freshmen never live on campus in the first place, is that the spartan and aging residence halls do not offer the unit types and level of amenities that can be found in the off-campus market. The campus must undertake a significant program of redevelopment of its residence life facilities if it is to better meet the challenges posed by the competition, both off campus within College Station and at other universities that have developed market-responsive housing facilities in an effort to recruit students. One of the main reasons that its rich history and traditions are such an integral part of student life at Texas A&M is that the University has long had a “residential” campus. To lose any more residents to the off-campus market would jeopardize the importance of this vital part of the “Aggie Experience.”

A detailed housing survey completed by over 1,300 A&M students revealed that the availability of on-campus housing was either “important” or “very important” to just under half of all respondents in their decision to attend Texas A&M. Survey respondents also indicated that living on campus plays an important role in helping adjust to college life and getting involved in the campus community. Privacy is very important to A&M students. Single bedrooms and more private bathrooms were listed as top amenities to be included in any new on-campus housing development. Additionally, students indicated that they move off campus primarily to find more privacy, including single bedrooms and more private bathrooms.

Several housing unit types were developed in response to student input from focus group interviews and these units were tested on the survey to project demand for each among the current student population. The units tested included “community style,” defined as a single or shared bedroom with a shared common bathroom; “suite,” defined as a group of single and/or shared bedrooms housing two to eight students and including a shared living space and/or bathroom(s) within the unit; and “apartment,” described as a one to four bedroom unit including a living space, kitchen, and bathroom(s). The survey included written descriptions of each unit type, a sample floor plan of each unit, and a relative price level for each. All survey respondents were asked to indicate where they would have chosen to live during the current academic year if each of the described unit types, in addition to existing off-campus options, were available to them. The responses to this question were weighted, analyzed and projected to the total current and projected future student population to determine the aggregate demand for various unit types.

The demand analysis revealed that the campus currently has an overall shortage of over 2,600 beds. When demand was compared to the existing supply of units, large surpluses of community-style double occupancy rooms and semi-suite style (defined as two single or double occupancy bedrooms sharing a bathroom) double occupancy rooms was found. Based on the survey demand projections, there are significant shortages of single occupancy rooms in semi-suite and suite configurations, as well as single and double occupancy student apartment rooms. In total, demand was found for approximately 1,200 community-style units, 2,500 semi-suite style units, and 4,800 suite style units. Demand among graduate and professional students for apartments was found to be approximately 1,500 units.
Methodologies and Results

Following are brief descriptions of the various components of the market analysis and the results and conclusions from each which support the Qualitative and Quantitative Findings described above:

A number of focus groups were conducted with A&M students to engage a variety of potential residents in dynamic conversations about their housing needs and preferences in order to gain an understanding of campus-specific issues, examine student perspectives of the on- and off-campus housing markets, and to develop project concepts for testing in a campus-wide survey. These focus groups found that many students chose to attend A&M because of its rich history and traditions. Students had high expectations with respect to campus activities and events and these expectations were met or exceeded for nearly all participants. Students have very strong ties to their residence halls and in general would not like to see them demolished, but most agree that improvements to the existing halls are needed. Most students would like to have more single rooms available, more private bathrooms, and more social and study spaces available in the residence halls.

A competitive context analysis was conducted to gather information from comparable universities (including Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of Michigan, the Ohio State University, the University of Texas, Iowa State University, and Oklahoma State University) to be used to evaluate the University’s competitive position against other institutions and to identify opportunities to improve the perceived quality of the University’s on-campus housing while staying within the financial confines of its competitive market. This analysis found that while A&M’s tuition costs were lower than the average of its peers (although it is higher than tuition at the University of Texas), its room rates for undergraduate housing are between 12% and 34% less than rates for similar unit types at peer institutions. A&M has 18% more commuter students and can house 4% fewer undergraduates than its peers. Relative to the selected peer institutions, A&M has significantly fewer apartments available for undergraduates and has no suite units.

An off-campus market analysis was conducted to provide a comparison of the on-campus and off-campus housing options available to students at TAMU and insight into the types of amenities and rental rates required to allow new on-campus development to be competitive with the market. Students who choose to live off-campus can find a variety of options close to campus. Prices vary depending on the quality of the building and amenities offered, but on average students can find off-campus housing in Bryan/College Station that is very close to the cost of living on campus. If students choose to share a bedroom off-campus, housing costs can be less than on-campus prices. Several “private dorms” have been developed within close proximity to campus that provide residents with amenities not offered on campus at higher prices than on-campus housing.

Separate student surveys were designed for on-campus students, off-campus students and students in the Corps of Cadets to collect reliable qualitative information about desirable housing facility characteristics, overall housing demand, and demand for specific housing and amenities. The survey was distributed via e-mail to random samples of 2,000 on-campus students, 2,000 off-campus students, and 500 members of the Corps of Cadets. Over 1,300 surveys were completed and returned for analysis, including 1,134 from non-Corps students and 186 from the Corps of Cadets. These response rates yielded a margin of error of +/- 2.9% at a 95% confidence level for the non-Corps survey and +/-7.2% at a 95% confidence level for the Corps survey. On-campus housing was found to be a vital tool for new students to adjust to the college lifestyle, meet new friends, and reinforce the strong community atmosphere on the TAMU campus. Students who choose to live off campus do so primarily to find more privacy. Among non-Corps students, single bedrooms, kitchens, and private bathrooms were important amenities to be provided in any new housing development.

B&D also conducted interviews with a total of 19 conference sponsors and produced a conference housing study in Exhibit D. The purpose of these interviews was to determine the strengths and weaknesses of on-campus conference housing and opportunities for improvements. The report revealed that the University’s main competitive advantage is convenience due to the competitive pricing of local hotels and private residence halls. In the case of youth and new student conferences, University housing provides a “first look” at the college experience, and is a great recruiting platform that encourages enrollment and on-campus living. Texas A&M currently has a few issues that are working in opposition to campus housing convenience including: a perception that the University requires too much lead-time for scheduling, expensive and inconvenient (i.e. not central to housing and conference venues), and a lack of elevators and parking. Review of aforementioned issues may reveal needed policy changes that could aid in the retention of many existing conferences. In addition, policy changes may require little or no construction or renovation.
Introduction

B&D conducted interviews with 12 conference sponsors that currently use Texas A&M University’s conference housing and seven (7) conference sponsors that formerly used Texas A&M’s conference housing. The purpose of these interviews was to determine the strengths and weaknesses of on-campus conference housing and opportunities for improvement. The following is a summary of participant responses.

Comments are presented exactly as they were in the interviews. They have not been edited for content, language, grammar, etc.

CURRENT USERS

1. Are you satisfied with TAMU conference housing?
   - I don’t have many complaints. TAMU housing is very accommodating and I’ll continue to use it.
   - I am satisfied with TAMU housing. Organization and cleanliness are good. The staff is very helpful. My only complaint is that housing is pretty far from the [football] practice facility.
   - I am perfectly satisfied. Most [high school] students have no objections to the facilities, however some are disappointed by the realities of college dorm life. The rooms are spartan [compare to home], but it’s ok because the students are only here four (4) days.
   - I’m generally satisfied, due to the price. However, sometimes the RA’s are hard to find and not helpful. On-campus parking is very expensive.
   - Most Southside halls are satisfactory and the staff is very helpful. However, the Corps dorms are not good recruitment tools.
   - I am highly satisfied. High school students love being on campus. University staff is always available. My only complaints are that the mattresses are uncomfortable and the rooms are cold.
   - TAMU housing is not very customer service oriented. TAMU housing is not a good value compared to local hotels, with regard to parking expenses and room rates.
   - My housing experience has been wonderful. Rick [Turnbough] is very good to work with.
   - I was pleased with on-campus housing, because it’s inexpensive, appropriate for students, and centrally located.
   - I was very pleased with campus housing because it was affordable and clean (compared to other universities). However, parking is expensive. I make sure to advise attendees to bring the following items to make their stay more pleasant: blanket to cover the mattress, extra blanket for warmth, clothes hangers, phone, and soap.

EXHIBIT D: CONFERENCE HOUSING STUDY

2. What improvements are needed?
   - Make sure rooms are cleaned before occupants get there.
   - I don’t think TAMU should change anything.
   - There is a need for meeting rooms that hold about 20 people.
   - Our conference participants are in there 40’s and 50’s and need to be on the ground floor to avoid carrying luggage up stairs, or elevators need to be installed. Older guests prefer a quiet facility, which means not being housed in the same facility with kids. The telephones need to be updated and internet access should be provided in each room.
   - I’d like something like the privatized dorms so we don’t have to house our participants in many different dorms. Generally the facilities need to be modernized [remodeled] and compliant with ADA requirements.
   - TAMU needs to provide more amenities like towels and fitted sheets. Elevators are also needed.
   - The University should provide daily linens and other amenities you find in a hotel.

3. Are you considering leaving on-campus housing? Why or why not?
   - Four interviewees stated they were considering housing off-campus next year.
     - It’s a possibility that our program may be off-campus next year because the facilities are nicer and a better recruiting tool. Transportation to campus will be the only negative.
     - Due to the cost of on-campus parking and the declining cost of hotels, it’s becoming more attractive for us to move off-campus.
     - I will consider off-campus housing next year because it’s a better value than on-campus housing.
     - I may use Motel 6 in the future, because they are competitively priced and provide more amenities (full-sized bed, phone).
   - We like to stay on-campus because Southside dorms are convenient to our conference venues, the MSC and dining. Being on-campus shows prospective students what it’s like to be on-campus.
I have used La Quinta Inn in the past but being on-campus is more convenient, due to are
participants' night labs. Groups tend to interact more when the stay on-campus.
Being on-campus is more convenient because you don’t have to coordinated transportation for
conference participants to get to campus. Participants can walk to meeting venues.
I have no plans to move off-campus. It is safer on-campus and you have the ability to enforce a
curfew.
Because our conference attendees are dispersed throughout campus and on different
schedules, coordinating off-campus transportation would be difficult.

**FORMER USERS**

1. **Why don’t you use Texas A&M conference housing?**

   • Our conference participants are adults and they complain that on-campus housing is not
     comfortable. We experienced repair and maintenance issues (i.e. water leaks). It’s hard to
     book a central location like the MSC; therefore on-campus housing is not always convenient to
     the conference venue. Some off-campus facilities have on-site conferencing facilities.
   • I want recruits to have a good experience and I felt off-campus facilities would leave them with a
     favorable impression.
   • Off-campus facilities are more modern, and provide more amenities.
   • On-campus parking requires paying for two permits, one near the residence hall and another at
     the conference venue.
   • A&M’s facilities have to be scheduled too far in advance. Adult participants do not like the lack
     of elevators.
   • Program was limited to a specified number of years, and is no longer offered.
   • Having to plan so far ahead makes on-campus housing harder to schedule than off-campus.
     Often you can find more cost-effective options off-campus.

2. **Which facility do you currently utilize? Why?**

   • I use Callaway House ($150 per week) and it’s a far better experience than on-campus housing.
     Accommodations are higher quality, more comfortable, and as good as a hotel. Amenities that
     are appreciated include a pool, on-site conference facility, quality food, convenient
     transportation to campus, on-site movies, and timely maintenance.
   • The Hilton provides nice rooms and dinner, including alcohol for adult participants. Parking is
     free and abundant. Finally, the price is comparable to on-campus housing.

   • I have used Traditions and currently use Callaway House ($16 per night), because they are
     good recruiting tools. Callaway House is actually very central to campus. Being on-campus
     is no advantage over Callaway, because the campus is so big that people have to drive.
   • I currently use Manor House Inn ($53 per night). They provide the occupant with the
     following: Refrigerator, microwave, television, clock, free transportation, continental
     breakfast, and pool.
   • The Hampton Inn ($35 per night) gives us a favorable rate, and provides a free shuttle to
     campus. It’s just a better value than on-campus housing.
   • I use Traditions because the facility is newer and feels more like an apartment. Often the
     cost is cheaper than TAMU housing. Traditions has sometimes given use free housing.

3. **What are the advantages of using TAMU conference housing?**

   • Using on-campus housing promotes campus by showing it off.
   • Students get a feel for campus, and are exposed to campus facilities and landmarks. [The
     campus helps sell itself.]
   • Due to late classes, on-campus housing would be more convenient. The MSC is a
     convenient conference venue, because it is central to housing and food service.
   • On-campus house is advantageous, because it gives students experience living on-campus
     and it’s closer to campus conference venues.

4. **What improvements does on-campus housing need? If improvements are made will
you use TAMU conference housing?**

   • On-campus housing needs the following:
     o Full-sized beds
     o In-room phone
     o In-room internet / email access
     o Convenient parking
     o Conveniently located meals
   • I would absolutely use campus housing if the above changes were made.
   • The University needs to rethink parking and make it more affordable and convenient.
   • There should be no shared bathrooms.
Competitor Institutions

- At an average of 165 groups annually, competitors (including Ohio State, Purdue, Michigan, and Penn State) housed over 100% more conferences than TAMU (78 conferences in fiscal year 01-02).
- The abovementioned groups resulted in an average of 116% more (over 24,000) annual guests and 216% more (over 103,000) annual bed nights than TAMU’s 11,110 and 32,730 guests and bed nights respectively.
- Annual conference housing revenues for the two competitors (Purdue and Michigan) that provided data averaged over $3 million compared to $660,715 at TAMU.
- Amenities not provided at TAMU that are provided by competitors include: recreational access, in-room computer access, and continental breakfast.
- Competitor schools stated that local hotels are not strong conference housing competitors, because their rates are not as affordable as on-campus rates. None of the four participating competitors mentioned private residence halls as formidable competition.
- Competitor rates are generally higher than at TAMU, with single room rates ranging from $18.50 to $66.00 and double rates in the range of $15.50 to $38.00. Michigan and Ohio State use predominately traditional-style halls for conference housing, while Penn State and Purdue provide a full range of housing that includes traditional, suite, and apartment options.

Conclusions

Due to the competitive pricing of local hotels and private residence halls, the University’s main competitive advantage is convenience. In the case of youth and new student conferences, University housing provides a “first look” at the college experience and is a great recruiting platform that encourages enrollment and on-campus living.

Currently TAMU has a few issues that are working in opposition to campus housing convenience including: a perception that the University requires too much lead-time for scheduling, expensive and inconvenient (i.e. not central to housing and conference venues) parking, and a lack of elevators. Review of the aforementioned issues may reveal needed policy changes that could aid in the retention of many existing conferences. In addition, policy changes may require little or no construction or renovation.

Conference attendees that desire the best value for their dollar are choosing off-campus facilities because they provide amenities/comforts for a price comparable to University housing. Amenities/comforts that were commonly mentioned were: a full-sized bed, clock radio, free parking and transportation to campus, in-room internet access, daily housekeeping, convenient food services, and fitness facility access. Competing with local hotels and private residence halls for conference attendees will not require immediate new construction of facilities. Renovations that refresh the physical environment and provide a good first impression, and the adoption of a more customer service-driven operating paradigm, could increase the University’s competitive position. As indicated by all conference sponsors who currently do not use University housing, University housing has the advantage of being more convenient to on-campus conference venues, and being on-campus has the appeal of a tourist attraction. Therefore, in the long-term, new construction and targeted renovations that increase the relative value (in comparison to off-campus options) of University conference housing will likely attract many conferences back to campus.
Objectives

In the summer and early fall of August, 2003, a physical survey was made of all residence hall types to determine the general condition of the facilities and evaluate their potential for renovation, expansion or conversion. This survey involved teams of architects, structural engineers, mechanical engineers, electrical engineers, landscape architects and accessibility consultants.

Methodology

Physical Plant and Residence Life staff provided existing maintenance and physical condition records of all residence facility types for review by the survey teams prior to actually inspecting the residence halls. Halff Associates and Venderweil Facility Advisors conducted the “Facilities Conditional Analysis” study in 1996. Because the university had accomplished a thorough survey previously, it was decided a sampling methodology would be used for determining current conditions. For each residence type, and using existing records, a sampling of those facilities representing the worst, the average and the best halls for each type would be inspected in-depth. Residences inspected included:

- Corps of Cadets Dormitories
- Ramp Residence Halls
- Balcony Residence Halls
- Corridor Residence Halls
- Commons Residence Halls
- Modular Residence Halls
- University Apartments
  - College Avenue Apartments
  - Hensel Terrace Apartments
  - College View Apartments
  - Avenue A Apartments

EXHIBIT E: EXISTING CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

For each residence hall and apartment building selected, the team inspected the structural condition of the building as a whole; inspected the exterior condition of the building; inspected condition of each room within the facility; inspected mechanical, electrical and communications systems and equipment components; reviewed accessibility for all levels and appropriately required rooms; and inspected the landscaping serving the building.

Corridor Dorms - Existing Conditions Summary:

Crocker
Moses
Spence

General

Graeber, Simmons and Cowan surveyed three (3) Corridor dorms (listed above). The following information provided in this summary and survey forms is based on data gathered from these buildings by Graeber, Simmons and Cowan staff and from information provided by TAMU staff regarding other dorms of the same type.

Exterior

The buildings are in good physical shape. Concrete walkways and porches need minor patch/repair work. The exterior brick has been well maintained over the years and needs only minor patch/repair work to mortar joints. Windows should be re-caulked and entrance doors need trim and weatherstripping replaced. There was no evidence of water damage from exterior windows.

Interior

The Corridor dorms have withstood a substantial amount of abuse. The plastic laminate on the built-ins has peeled back and broken and is unsightly. Stained, solid wood built-ins may be a better choice for future renovation work. The light fixtures, lavatories, faucets, mirrors, etc. should be replaced with new, more abuse-resistant fixtures. The gang toilets/showers need a complete renovation. Toilet partitions, plumbing fixtures and toilet accessories are broken, chipped, or pulled out of the walls. Shower flooring needs to be re-applied.
Recommendations

Upgrade and renovate
See Schemes A-E for the Corps Dorms

Modular Dorms - Existing Conditions Summary:

Rudder
Neeley
Underwood

General

Graeber, Simmons and Cowan surveyed three (3) Modular dorms (listed above). The following information provided in this summary and survey forms is based on data gathered from these buildings by Graeber, Simmons and Cowan staff and from information provided by TAMU staff regarding other dorms of the same type.

Exterior

The buildings are in good physical shape. Concrete walkways and porches need minor patch/repair work. The exterior brick has been well maintained over the years and needs only minor patch/repair work to mortar joints. Entrance doors need trim and weatherstripping replaced. There is evidence of serious water damage from exterior windows in several rooms (refer to Surveys for exact rooms). The concrete roofs over the entrances are in poor condition. The extent of the problems on the interior of these Modular dorms is evident by looking at the windows and seeing the moisture and fog on the inside.

Interior

The residents of the Modular dorms have had little effect on the overall poor condition of these buildings. If these buildings are to be saved, they need the mold problem addressed. The failures of the HVAC systems are evident by the oppressive humidity and musty smell throughout the corridors and in most resident rooms. The new carpet will only mask the problems temporarily. Many of the rooms had standing pools of water (condensate) directly under the above ceiling HVAC units. The HVAC issues have caused all metal door frames, lavatory trim, recessed light trim and ceiling grid to rust. Fresh paint only temporarily hides the rust. The shower enclosures are in poor condition throughout the Modular dorms. The furniture is in good condition, but the mattresses should all be replaced.

Recommendations

Upgrade and renovate
- See Modular Dorm Schemes.
- Replace the entire building HVAC with a new system. Use room units like in the Corps dorms instead of the above-ceiling units.
- Remove all interior finishes and replace with new.
- Eradicate the mold.
- Renovate the toilet rooms. Replace the sheet vinyl with ceramic tile. Replace the shower enclosures with tiled showers without doors. Students can personalize the shower with their own shower curtains. Add a wall-mounted light fixture to the toilet enclosure.
- Purchase all new mattresses.

Commons Dorms - Existing Conditions Summary:

Krueger
Mosher
Dunn

General

Graeber, Simmons and Cowan surveyed three (3) Commons dorms (listed above). The following information provided in this summary and survey forms is based on data gathered from these buildings by Graeber, Simmons and Cowan staff and from information provided by TAMU staff regarding other dorms of the same type.

Exterior

The buildings are in excellent physical shape. Concrete walkways and porches need minor patch/repair work. The exterior brick has been well maintained over the years and needs only minor patch/repair work to mortar joints. Entrance doors need trim and weatherstripping replaced. There was no evidence of water damage from exterior windows.

Interior

The Commons dorms have withstood a substantial amount of abuse. The painted metal closets have held up fairly well, but damaged doors could be restored and refinished by a professional contractor. The toilet room floors and walls are in good condition. The lavatories have not fared as well and should be replaced with a more abuse-resistant product. The
shower enclosures are in poor condition throughout the Commons dorms. The furniture is in poor condition, as are the mattresses.

**Recommendations**

Upgrade and renovate
- See Commons Dorms Schemes.
- Automotive paint may be a long-term solution to the metal finish on the closet doors.
- Renovate the toilet rooms. Replace the outdated floor tile (although in excellent condition) with a more modern color palette. Replace the shower enclosures with tiled showers without doors. Students can personalize the shower with their own shower curtains. Add a wall-mounted light fixture to the toilet enclosure.
- Apply a skim-coat of plaster to the masonry walls for a more residential look.
- Purchase all new furniture & mattresses.

**Corps Dorms - Existing Conditions Summary:**

Fountain
Gainer
Harrell

**General**

Graeber, Simmons and Cowan surveyed three (3) Corps dorms (listed above). The following information provided in this summary and survey forms is based on data gathered from these buildings by Graeber, Simmons and Cowan staff and from information provided by TAMU staff regarding other dorms of the same type.

**Exterior**

The buildings are in good physical shape. Concrete walkways and porches need minor patch/repair work. The exterior brick has been well maintained over the years and needs only minor patch/repair work to mortar joints. Windows should be re-caulked and entrance doors need trim and weatherstripping replaced. There is evidence of minor roof/water damage on the southeast corner of the 4th floor of Fountain. There was no evidence of water damage from exterior windows.

**Interior**

The Corps dorms have withstood a substantial amount of abuse. The plastic laminate on the built-ins has peeled back and broken and is unsightly. Stained, solid wood built-ins may be a better choice for future renovation work. The light fixtures, lavatories, faucets, mirrors, etc. should be replaced with new, more abuse-resistant fixtures. The gang toilets/showers need a complete renovation. Toilet partitions, plumbing fixtures and toilet accessories are broken, chipped, or pulled out of the walls. Shower flooring needs to be re-applied.

**Recommendations**

Upgrade and renovate
- See Schemes A-E for the Corps Dorms

**University Apartments - Existing Conditions Summary:**

Avenue A Apartments (#6, #11, and #8)
College Avenue Apartments (#3, #5, and #16)
College View Apartments (C100, 102, 104; F101, 103, 105; F207, 209, and 211)
Hensel Apartments (T-1, W-2, and X-2)

**General**

Graeber, Simmons and Cowan surveyed three (3) buildings in each of the four (4) University Apartment complexes (listed above). The following information provided in this summary and survey forms is based on data gathered from these buildings by Graeber, Simmons and Cowan staff and from information provided by TAMU staff regarding other apartments of the same type.

**Exterior**

The buildings are in relatively good shape for their age(s). The oldest buildings appear to be in better condition than the more recent buildings.

**Interior**

The interiors of the apartments are old, outdated, dirty and tired. Multiple coats of paint on the kitchen cabinets, vinyl asbestos floor tile, wood paneling and an outdated color palette make for an unappealing living space. Kitchens and bathrooms are scheduled to be renovated, according to TAMU staff.
Recommendations

Option 1 – Upgrade and renovate
   Asbestos abatement.
   Upgrade interior finishes (i.e., new flooring, add plaster to CMU walls, remove wood paneling).
   New kitchen cabinets and appliances.
   New light fixtures, interior and exterior.
   Patch/repair concrete walkways.
   Power wash concrete areas.
   Landscaping and equipment upgrades to playground, laundry, communal areas.
   Renovate bathrooms (i.e., all new tile, plumbing fixtures, shower enclosures).
   Upgrade electrical, data/comm, mechanical systems.

Option 2 - Phase out apartment buildings.
   Build new apartments on adjacent site and occupy as they come on line.
   Abandon old apartment buildings and begin demo work.
   Build additional apartment buildings on existing site.
College Avenue Apartments
226 Units

Hensel Terrace Apartments
252 Units

Avenue A Apartments
88 Units

College View Apartments
84 Units

Total Existing Apartments
650 Units
Campus Housing Master Plan
University Apartments Site
Texas A&M University
COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

Building 1
38,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
153,600 GSF

Building 2
30,000 GSF / Level
4 Levels
120,000 GSF

Building 3
34,200 GSF / Level
4 levels
136,800 GSF

Building 4
36,600 GSF / Level
4 Levels
146,400 GSF

Building 5
36,600 GSF / Level
4 Levels
146,400 GSF

Building 6
62,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
249,600 GSF

Building 7
32,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
129,600 GSF

Building 8
36,600 GSF / Level
4 Levels
146,400 GSF

Building 9
33,600 GSF / Level
4 Levels
134,400 GSF

Building 10
36,400 GSF / Level
4 levels
105,600 GSF

Building 11
26,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
105,600 GSF

Building 12
25,200 GSF / Level
4 Levels
100,800 GSF

Total Building Area
1,675,200 GSF
@ 800 GSF / Unit

Total 2,094 New Apartment Units

Total 226 Existing Apartment Units

Option A
All 4 Story Buildings
Master Plan

October 12 2005
Campus Housing Master Plan
University Apartments Site
Texas A&M University

Building 9
33,600 GSF / Level
4 Levels
134,400 GSF

Building 10
36,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
105,600 GSF

Building 11
26,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
105,600 GSF

Building 12
25,200 GSF / Level
4 Levels
100,800 GSF

Total Building Area
2,497,200 GSF
@ 800 GSF / Unit

Total 3,121 New Apartment Units

Total 226 Existing Apartment Units

Option A
4 – 10 Story Buildings
Master Plan

October 12 2005
Campus Housing Master Plan
University Apartments Site
Texas A&M University

Building 1
38,400 GSF / Level
5 Levels
192,000 GSF

Building 2
30,000 GSF / Level
7 Levels
210,000 GSF

Building 3
34,200 GSF / Level
9 Levels
307,800 GSF

Building 4
36,600 GSF / Level
11 Levels
402,600 GSF

Building 5
36,600 GSF / Level
13 Levels
475,800 GSF

Building 6
62,400 GSF / Level
11 Levels
686,400 GSF

Building 7
32,400 GSF / Level
9 Levels
291,600 GSF

Building 8
36,600 GSF / Level
7 Levels
256,200 GSF

Building 9
33,600 GSF / Level
5 Levels
168,000 GSF

Building 10
36,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
105,600 GSF

Building 11
26,400 GSF / Level
4 Levels
105,600 GSF

Building 12
25,200 GSF / Level
4 Levels
100,800 GSF

Total Building Area
3,303,000 GSF
@ 800 GSF / Unit

Total 4,128 New Apartment Units
Total 226 Existing Apartment Units

Option A
4 – 13 Story Buildings
Master Plan

Note: College Avenue Apartments are Scheduled for Demolition by 2008.
Proposed New Apartments

- Hensel Terrace Apartments: 60 Units
- Avenue A Apartments: 48 Units
- College View Apartments: 428 Units

Total 536 New Apartment Units
Total 650 Existing Apartment Units
Grand Total 1,186 Apartment Units

Option B Master Plan
Proposed New
Hensel Terrace
Apartments
60 Units

Proposed New
Avenue A
Apartments
48 Units

Proposed New
College View
Apartments
952 Units

Total 1,060 New
Apartment Units

Total 566 Existing
Apartment Units

Grand Total
1,626 Apartment Units

Option C
Master Plan

October 12 2005
3 LEVEL - GARDEN STYLE APARTMENTS

ONE BEDROOM
610 SF.

TWO BEDROOM
810 SF.
Garden Style Apartment Buildings

3 LEVEL - GARDEN STYLE APARTMENTS

8 UNITS/LEVEL
24 UNITS

4 UNITS/LEVEL
12 UNITS
University Apartments
Site Feasibility Report
Texas A&M University

COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

4 LEVEL - APARTMENT BUILDING

TWO BEDROOM
807 SF.

ONE BEDROOM
615 SF.

TWO BEDROOM
830 SF.

WASHER
DRYER

Four Level Apartment Units
4 LEVEL APARTMENT BUILDING

71 UNITS

7 2 BEDROOM
10 1 BEDROOM

74 TOTAL UNITS (4 LEVELS)
### Individual Building Pro Forma

#### Project: Hensel Terrace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Base Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Capital Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Total Beds (Rev Generating)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21 Traditional Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22 Traditional Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23 Semi-Suite Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24 Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Suite Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 Suite Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27 Apartments (Capacity)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Occupancy Level</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Occupied Beds</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Square Feet</td>
<td>133,560</td>
<td>133,560</td>
<td>133,560</td>
<td>133,560</td>
<td>133,560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Percent in Service</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pro Forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Single Rooms Rental</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Double Rooms Rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14 Other Revenues</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 Total Revenues</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Annuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 New Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Existing Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Description

#### Assumptions:
- **Capital Budget Assumptions**
  - Revenue Assumptions
    - Capital Improvement Cost (in Today's Dollars): $0
    - Single Room Rate: $0
    - Capital Cost Inflation Rate: 5%
    - Double Room Rate: $0
    - Semi-Suite Singles Rate: $0
    - Semi-Suite Doubles Rate: $0
    - Suite Singles Rate: $0
    - Suite Doubles Rate: $0
    - Apartments Rate: $0
- **Current Square Feet**: 133,560

#### Expense Assumptions:
- Operating Costs (
  - Post Completion Beds: 0
  - Current Alloc'd Exp. Rate / Sq. Ft. $7.24
- Financial Costs
  - Project Type (New & Existing, In & Out): Additional Financing
  - Financing Bank (New & Existing, In & Out): Additional Financing
  - Construction Loan: 2012
- Income/Expense Assumptions
  - Revenue Assumptions
    - Single Room Rate: $0
    - Double Room Rate: $0
    - Semi-Suite Singles Rate: $0
    - Semi-Suite Doubles Rate: $0
    - Suite Singles Rate: $0
    - Suite Doubles Rate: $0
  - Expenses Assumptions
    - Capital Expenditures: $0
    - Debt Service: $0
    - Vacancy (based on occupancy level): $0
    - Other Revenues: $0
    - Occupied Beds: 239
### Project: College View

#### Individual Building Pro Forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Capital Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Total Beds (Rev Generating)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21 Traditional Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22 Traditional Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23 Semi-Suite Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24 Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 Suite Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 Suite Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27 Apartments (Capacity)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Occupancy Level</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Occupied Beds</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Square Feet</td>
<td>72,408</td>
<td>72,408</td>
<td>72,408</td>
<td>72,408</td>
<td>72,408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Percent in Service</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Description

**Assumptions:**
- Capital Budget Assumptions
- Revenue Assumptions
- Expense Assumptions

**Base Parameters Details:**
- Capital Improvement Cost (in Today's Dollars)
- Single Room Rate
- Capital Cost Inflation Rate
- Double Room Rate
- Traditional Singles (Capacity)
- Traditional Doubles (Capacity)
- Semi-Suite Singles (Capacity)
- Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity)
- Suite Singles (Capacity)
- Suite Doubles (Capacity)
- Apartments (Capacity)
- Existing Square Feet
- Post Completion Beds
- Current Alloc'd Exp. Rate / Sq. Ft.

**Expense Assumptions:**
- Post Completion Beds
- Current Alloc'd Exp. Rate
- Traditional Singles (Capacity)
- Traditional Doubles (Capacity)
- Semi-Suite Singles (Capacity)
- Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity)
- Suite Singles (Capacity)
- Suite Doubles (Capacity)
- Apartments (Capacity)
- Total Debt Service
- Post Completion Total Beds (Capacity)

---

**Note:** The table is split into two sections: Base Parameters and Project Description. The Base Parameters section lists various financial metrics such as capital cost, total beds, and square feet, along with occupancy levels and square footage. The Project Description section includes assumptions for capital budget, revenue, and expense. Each section is further detailed with specific parameters and their respective values for each year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Total Apts (Rev Generating)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Traditional Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Traditional Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Semi-Suite Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Suite Singles (Capacity)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1 brm Apartments (Capacity)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2 brm Apartments (Capacity)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Occupancy Level</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Occupied Beds</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>153,369</td>
<td>153,369</td>
<td>153,369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Percent in Service</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Description

**Assumptions:**

- **Capital Budget Assumptions**
  - Revenue Assumptions
    - Capital Improvement Cost (in Today's Dollars): $0
    - Single Room Rate: $0
    - Capital Cost Inflation Rate: 5%
    - Double Room Rate: $0
    - Traditional Doubles (Capacity): 0
    - Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity): 0
    - Suite Doubles (Capacity): 0
    - 1 brm Apartments (Capacity): 58
    - 2 brm Apartments (Capacity): 136
- **Expense Assumptions**
  - Existing Square Feet: 153,369
  - Post Completion Beds: 0
  - Current Alloc’d Exp. Rate / Sq. Ft.: $7.24
  - New Proj Exp Rate / Sq. Ft.: $14.00
  - Post Completion Total Beds (Capacity) = 0

### Financial Summary

- **Other Revenues**: $119,000
- **Total Revenue**: $393,000
- **Expenses**: Operating Costs: $(1,111,000)
- **Net Operating Income (NOI)**: $(718,000)
- **Existing Debt Service**: $0
- **New Debt Service**: $0
- **Housing Contribution**: $(718,000)

**Notes:**

- (Fiscal Year)
## Avenue A

### Base Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Total Beds (Rev Generating)</th>
<th>Occupancy Level</th>
<th>Occupied Beds</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Percent in Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pro Forma

#### Revenues

- **Single Rooms Rental**: $0
- **Double Rooms (Shared) Rental**: $465,000
- **Double Rooms (Private) Rental**: $465,000
- **Single Rooms Rental**: $465,000
- **Double Rooms (Private) Rental**: $465,000
- **Other Revenues per Bed**: $616

#### Expenses

- **Operating Costs**: ($390,000)
- **Repairs and Maintenance**: $0

#### NET OPERATING INCOME

**TOTAL REVENUE**: $496,000
**OPERATING COSTS**: ($390,000)
**NET OPERATING INCOME**: $106,000

### Housing Contribution

- **Existing Debt Service**: $0
- **New Debt Service**: $0
- **Total Housing Contribution**: $106,000

### Assumptions

- **Revenue Assumptions**
  - Capital Improvement Cost (in Today’s Dollars): $0
  - Single Room Rate: $6,867
  - Capital Cost Inflation Rate: 5%
  - Double Room Rate: $7,248
  - Revenue Inflation Rate: 4%
  - Traditional Singles (Capacity): 0
  - Traditional Doubles (Capacity): 0
  - Semi-Suite Singles (Capacity): 0
  - Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity): 0
  - Suite Singles (Capacity): 0
  - Suite Doubles (Capacity): 0
  - Apartments (Capacity): 88

- **Expense Assumptions**
  - Post Completion Beds: 0
  - New Proj Exp Rate / Sq. Ft.: $14.00
  - Traditional Singles (Capacity): 0
  - Traditional Doubles (Capacity): 0
  - Semi-Suite Singles (Capacity): 0
  - Semi-Suite Doubles (Capacity): 0
  - Suite Singles (Capacity): 0
  - Suite Doubles (Capacity): 0
  - Apartments (Capacity): 0

### Project Description

- **Existing Square Feet**: 53,856
- **Post Completion Total Beds (Capacity)**: 72

---

**Project Summary**

- **Revenue Assumptions**
  - **Interest Assumptions**
    - **Interest Rate**: 5.75%
    - **Construction Date**: 2012
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000

- **Expense Assumptions**
  - **Interest Assumptions**
    - **Interest Rate**: 5.75%
    - **Construction Date**: 2012
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000
    - **Construction Loans (in today’s dollars)**: $2,500,000

---

**Brailsford & Dunlavey**