

Board of Regents - Campus Housing Updates (criteria for building new housing structures (resident halls, apartment buildings, etc); number of new housing structures requested (not approved) in latest budget round; examples of student rent costs for old-style dorms vs. new residences) (recommended time: 30 min.)

Master Plan

USD and SDSU are the only institutions in the system that have built new residence halls in the last twenty years. The Board requires a Master Plan (long-range plan) for housing facilities that addresses enrollment projections, an assessment of current facilities, student input, market analysis, rate structures, living preferences, proposed construction, peer institution review, site analysis, complimentary facilities requirements (food service and parking), and a financial plan. USD and SDSU completed Housing Master Plans in 2008 that look forward to 2018. The plan is provided to the Board and used as a roadmap for future planning.

Revenue System

The Board operates a housing “system” and looks at the system as a whole. Because revenues are cross-institutionally pledged to meet bond covenants, the entire system must be fiscally sound. The system, as well as each institution must meet a revenue/expense parity ratio of 120% (Net Revenues to Annual Debt Service). The Board monitors all the ratios on a regular basis and provides the information to rating and bond agencies.

Justification of New Housing Structures

To justify a new housing structure, whether it is a traditional resident hall, suite, or apartments, the various pieces of the Master Plan must be in place. The actual enrollment trends and projections must mirror the plan and the financials must pencil out at 90% occupancy. The type of hall often depends on what student body the institution is trying to address; freshman and sophomore housing tends to be traditional halls, learning communities or suites. Junior and senior students are not required to live on campus, but if they want living accommodations, the requests are often for single traditional resident hall accommodations, family, married or apartment style housing.

Replacement facilities would not necessarily require a Master Plan, but if capacity numbers are increasing, the Board will expect a complete planning document. The finances of the project of course have to meet the 120% parity ration at 90% occupancy.

Board Approval

The Board has two distinct phases that require Board approval before a project may proceed to the construction phase.

Preliminary Facility Statement

Requests to initiate the formal review of proposed capital improvement projects must be accompanied by a preliminary facility statement prepared by the institution that addresses the following:

- a. General programmatic needs to be addressed;
- b. Analysis of the student body or constituents to be served;
- c. Additional services to be offered;
- d. Compliance with master plan;
- e. Analysis of needs assessment based on the facilities utilization report;

- f. Location;
- g. Reallocation or demolition of old space, if any;
- h. Proposed funding source/sources; and
- i. Budget for development of a Facility Program Plan.

Facility Program Plan

If the Board authorizes the preliminary facility statement for a proposed capital improvement project, the institution shall prepare a Facility Program Plan. If an A/E firm will be involved in the development of the Program Plan, a Building Committee will need to be appointed to interview A/E firms for the purpose of developing the Facility Program Plan and for the Final Design stage (See BOR Policy 6:5). The program plan shall address the following:

- a. Programmatic justification for discrete spaces (classrooms, offices, etc.);
- b. Gross square footage;
- c. Site analysis;
- d. Description of key building features;
- e. Illustrative floor plans;
- f. Initial cost estimates and funding sources;
- g. Identification of fund sources and impact to campus maintenance and repair. Budget and sources for ongoing operational costs including janitorial, utilities, and other costs. The operational cost projections should identify the estimates of utilities, custodial and maintenance services, supplies, materials, equipment, etc

October Board Meeting

SDSU

The SDSU Master plan called for a second phase of construction for pod-style halls in 2012. The SDSU Preliminary Facility Statement request to the Board in October 2010 escalated the project timeline. SDSU proposed an additional 500 to 600 beds in two or three additional buildings at an estimated cost of \$29,400,000. SDSU's plan calls for changing Waneta and Hansen halls to single rooms which would mean a loss of 305 beds. In addition, SDSU has 138 students in day rooms (community space) this fall.

In addition to the residential facility, moving an additional 500 to 600 students to the east side of campus would require additional dining services to serve the students. SDSU was estimating \$8.5M for the dining facility, but needed to further investigate which the preliminary facility statement would have allowed.

BHSU

BHSU is in the process of updating its Housing Master Plan. The BHSU Preliminary Facility Statement request to the Board in October 2010 requested approval to plan for a 204 bed pod-style residence facility contained in 2 or 3 buildings at an estimated cost of \$12.1M. BHSU had not completed a Master Plan as of the October Board meeting. BHSU wanted to replace Pangburn Hall, a 78 bed traditional facility built in 1952, with virtually no updates since construction. In addition, BHSU fall housing needs exceeded availability by 45 beds.

Board Action

Both of the projects were tabled by the Board until a complete inventory of future projects is available for the system. The Board understood that several of the campuses were contemplating building new or replacement facilities; therefore, felt that a complete plan for the system was needed. The Board also wanted to look at housing occupancy at all schools for fall 2010 to make sure the 120% parity ratio was being met and could be sustained under varying enrollment scenarios.

Rates and Types of Housing

The key to student housing today is diversity and privacy. Students are demanding more amenities including semi-private bathrooms, air conditioning, individual bedrooms, laundry, and cooking facilities. Having a range of options for students to choose from allows the institutions to satisfy the needs of more potential students. Low cost is not the driving issue for most students, but very important for those who need affordable options.

Many of the traditional halls have been remodeled to date, including bathroom upgrades (including added privacy), furnishings, heating controls, lighting, flooring, and common space improvements. These upgrades do not satisfy the requirements of many students that want their own bedroom, semi-private bathroom, or air conditioning.

The various types of housing at each campus and the associated rental rates can be found on the following pages.

Black Hills State University

Fall 2010 Residence Hall Capacity and Rates

	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Triple Occupancy</u>	<u>Double Room As Single Occupancy</u>
<u>Traditional Residence Halls *</u>						
Thomas Hall	150	1966	\$1,368.85	\$1,787.55	NA	\$2,001.10
Heidepriem Hall	154	1965	\$1,368.85	\$1,787.55	NA	\$2,001.10
Wenona Cook Hall	141	1899	\$1,368.85	\$1,787.55	\$1,368.85	\$2,001.10
Pangburn Hall	78	1952	\$1,368.85	\$1,787.55	NA	\$2,001.10
Humbert Hall	85	1958	\$1,368.85	\$1,787.55	NA	\$2,001.10
*Lobbies are A/C but rooms are not.						
<u>Apartment with Full Kitchen and Private Bathrooms:</u>						
Campus Apartments/Suites	168	1993	\$1,727.45	\$2,262.10	NA	\$2,535.80

Note: Designed Capacity is the same as reported in Factbook - Current structural designed capacity and permanent changes including changing rooms to alternate uses and permanently making doubles into singles. Rates are per semester unless otherwise indicated.

Dakota State University

Fall 2010 Residence Hall Capacity and Rates

	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Apartment Semester</u>
<u>Traditional Residence Halls</u>					
Emry Hall	152	1968	\$1,337.85	\$1,756.40	
Higbie Hall	148	1965	\$1,337.85	\$1,756.40	
Richardson Hall	192	1971	\$1,337.85	\$1,756.40	
Zimmermann Hall	124	1964	\$1,337.85	\$1,756.40	
<u>Apartment style with Shared Living/Sleeping and Private Bath and Cooking Facilities</u>					
North Hall apartments (leased from the city)	72	2001			\$1,618.65

Note: Designed Capacity is the same as reported in Factbook - Current structural designed capacity and permanent changes including changing rooms to alternate uses and permanently making doubles into singles.

Rates are per semester unless otherwise indicated.

Northern State University

Fall 2010 Residence Hall Capacity and Rates

	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Triple Occupancy</u>	<u>Double Room Single Occupancy</u>
<u>Traditional Residence Halls</u>						
Jerde Hall	373	1967	\$1,305.50			
McArthur Welsh Hall	190	1966	\$1,305.50			\$1,660.75
Briscoe Hall	85	1958	\$1,305.50			\$1,660.75
J. C. Lindberg Hall	67	1954	\$1,305.50			\$1,660.75
<u>Suite with Shared Living/Sleeping and Private Bath(s) No</u>						
<u>Cooking Facilities</u>						
Kramer Hall	73	1962	\$1,754.30	\$2,220.15		
Steele Hall	65	1961	\$1,754.30	\$2,220.15		

Note: The designed capacity for Fall 2009 was 832 beds. For Fall 2010 community rooms were converted back to traditional rooms, an increase of 21 beds.

Note: Designed Capacity is the same as reported in Factbook - Current structural designed capacity and permanent changes including changing rooms to alternate uses and permanently making doubles into singles.

Rates are per semester unless otherwise indicated.

School of Mines and Technology

Fall 2010 Residence Hall Capacity and Rates

	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Double Occupancy Air Conditioned</u>	<u>Single Occupancy Air Conditioned</u>	<u>Quad* Air Conditioned</u>	<u>Deluxe/Study Quad * Air Conditioned</u>
<u>Traditional Residence Halls</u>						
Connolly Hall*	150	1948	\$1,497.15	\$1,675.55		
Palmerton Hall*	210	1969	\$1,497.15			
* Renovated in 2010						
<u>Suites with Private Baths, No cooking</u>						
Peterson Hall	297	2004	\$1,497.15		\$1,703.10	\$1,840.40

Note: Designed Capacity is the same as reported in Factbook - Current structural designed capacity and permanent changes including changing rooms to alternate uses and permanently making doubles into singles.
 Rates listed are semester rates unless otherwise indicated.

South Dakota State University

Fall 2010 Residence Hall Capacity and Rates

	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Apartment Single</u>	<u>Apartment Double</u>	<u>Apartment Quad</u>
<u>Traditional Residence Halls</u>							
Binnewies	488	1969	\$1,418.00	\$1,892.15			
Brown	382	1959	\$1,287.50	\$1,862.30			
Hansen	436	1967	\$1,287.50	\$1,862.30			
Mathews	350	1962	\$1,418.00	\$1,892.15			
Pierson	438	1965	\$1,418.00	\$1,892.15			
Waneta	264	1959	\$1,287.50	\$1,862.30			
Wecota Annex	52	1940	NA	\$1,632.40			
<u>Suite Shared Living/Sleeping Private Bath(s) No Cooking</u>							
Caldwell	294	2005	\$1,926.05	\$2,499.90			
<u>Apartment with Full Kitchen and Private Bathrooms</u>							
Bailey	160	1994					\$1,926.05
Berg		1994					\$1,926.05
State Court (monthly rate) (Married/Family)	47 units	1959			\$276.05		
State Village (monthly rate) (Married/Family)	39 units	1971			\$370.75	\$441.70	
<u>Pod Style with shared living and shared bathrooms</u>							
Jackrabbit Village	411	2010	\$1,957.00	\$2,153.00			

*This double rate has approval up to \$2,000, however the lower figure was assessed.

Fall 2010 Residence Hall Capacity and Rates

	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Triple Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Double Room Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Double Occupancy Air Conditioned</u>	<u>Quad Air Conditioned</u>
<u>Traditional Residence Halls</u>								
Beede Hall	279	1966	\$1,501.70	\$1,852.25	\$1,630.10	\$1,909.35		
Brookman Hall*	198	1963				\$1,793.85		
Burgess Hall	154	1960	\$1,501.70			\$1,906.35		
Julian Hall*	255	1950	\$1,398.90		\$1,518.55	\$1,793.85		
Mickelson Hall	285	1966	\$1,501.70	\$1,852.25	\$1,630.10	\$1,909.35		
Norton Hall	180	1963	\$1,501.70		\$1,630.10	\$1,909.35		
Olson Hall	285	1968	\$1,501.70	\$1,852.25	\$1,630.10	\$1,909.35		
Richardson Hall	279	1968	\$1,501.70	\$1,852.25	\$1,630.10	\$1,909.35		
* Lower rates since hall has not been renovated								
<u>Suite with Private Living/Sleeping and Private Bath(s) and Limited Cooking Facilities</u>								
Coyote Village 10 Month Contract - Monthly Rate	322	2010						
Coyote Village 12 Month Contract - Monthly Rate	92	2010					\$618.00	\$515.00
							\$541.00	\$453.00
<u>Apartment with Full Kitchen and Private Bathrooms</u>								
McFadden - Monthly Rate	100	1990						
Coyote Village 10 Month Contract - Monthly Rate	114	2010						\$2,199.45
Coyote Village 12 Month Contract - Monthly Rate	22	2010					\$658.00	\$545.00
							\$577.00	\$484.00

Note: Designed Capacity is the same as reported in Factbook - Current structural designed capacity and permanent changes including changing rooms to alternate uses and permanently making doubles into singles. All rates are semester unless otherwise indicated.