

**ATTACHMENT A: WSCU Facilities Master Plan Q&A**I. Planning Process

1. How does the Facilities Master Plan complement WSCU's most recent strategic plan?

*Response: WSCU's 2009-2014 Strategic Plan addresses the need to develop a new Facility Master Plan. An emphasis of the Strategic Plan is recruitment to engagement to improve retention rates and facilitate overall enrollment growth. Many of the projects identified in the Master Plan, such as building a recreation center/field house, improving student housing and creating contemporary library space, promotes student interaction and engagement and were derived through the direction of the Strategic Plan.*

2. How did WSCU get to an enrollment target of 2,800 by 2019? What factors were taken into account? Is 2,800 considered WSCU's full build-out capacity?

*Response: Paulien and Associates, WSCU's planning consultants, developed the enrollment target in large part based on a space needs analysis conducted as part of the Plan. The space needs analysis (page 20) shows a current overall deficit, based on 2009 actual headcount, of 6 percent, or 39,866 ASF. The analysis shows that in 2019, based on projected build-out and a headcount of 2,800, the deficit is 5 percent, or 39,649 ASF.*

*It is important to note, however, that there exists deficits in certain categories of space that, with enrollment growth, may need to be addressed through a repurposing of other space. This dynamic can ultimately affect the enrollment capacity of the University.*

*The University developed a marginal cost/enrollment model this past fall that looks both at the revenues and expenditures associated with enrollment growth as well as our current space capacity. Based on this model and under the current financial and space constraints, growth to 2,600 students would represent our capacity. Fall 2012 headcount was 2,259. The last time the University's enrollment was over 2,600 students was 1992. The last time the University's enrollment was over 2,800 was 1983.*

3. Did WSCU's planning process include input from students, faculty, staff or community members? If so, how were they involved and how was their input included in the master plan?

*Response: The University established an Executive Committee, composed of various campus constituents, including students, faculty and administrators, to guide the Master Plan process. Paulien held focus group sessions with various campus groups and met*

*with planners from the city of Gunnison. The Board of Trustees was provided periodic updates on the progress of the Plan development. Upon completion of the final draft, open sessions were held on campus to present findings and gather feedback and input.*

4. Has faculty input been received on the possibility of changing faculty housing from its university run to private partnerships? If so, what has the general response been?

*Response: Transitional housing for faculty and staff is an important recruitment tool for WSCU given our remote location. It is envisioned that, under any private partnership model, the University would manage the operation of the facility. Thus, discussions with staff and the WSCU Foundation have primarily focused on the style of housing and the diversity of housing options.*

## II. Facilities Needs

1. What new conditions have arisen to necessitate a new facilities strategic plan? Please speak specifically to the differing facility needs and land uses identified in this plan when compared with the 2002 amendment.

*Response: The development of a new Facilities Master Plan was necessitated primarily by two circumstances. First, CCHE policy requires that facility master plans are developed or reassessed every ten years. The 10 year clock was coming up on the 2002 amendment, and because the last plan was an amendment, the University felt there was value in going through a comprehensive facility master plan process since one had not been completed since the early 1990s. Secondly, with the exception of the renovation of Quigley Hall and the renovation and expansion of the Stadium Press Box, all other projects under the 2002 amendment had been completed or were in process of completion.*

2. Which, if any, projects in the plan have commenced since the master plan was approved by WSCU's Governing Board?

*Response: CIP-6 New Student Apartments (page 54) were completed in June of 2012. CIP-5 Field House/Student Recreation Center (page 53) broke ground in July of 2012. Both projects were also identified in the 2002 Facility Master Plan amendment.*

3. Do the building/renovation projects outlined in the master plan account for the \$1.3 million in deferred maintenance mentioned in the plan? Explain.

*Response: The FMP identifies approximately \$25 million in controlled maintenance backlog (page 34) as identified through our most recent facility condition audit. The recent remodel of Taylor Hall (state funds) along with the construction of the new student apartments and the recreation center/field house eliminated over \$12 million of this liability as numerous buildings were demolished to provide the footprint to construct these new facilities.*

*A component of the student approved facility fee (see response to section IV, question 2 below) is a dedicated controlled maintenance fund which, over time, will help us continue to address this backlog, particularly in the context of limited state funds.*

4. Was a strategy to increase classroom utilization beyond CCHE's use guidelines considered in the space needs assessment? If so, how? If not, why?

*Response: No. WSCU serves a traditional student population where the vast majority is between the ages of 18-25 and are full-time students capitalizing on the benefits of a residential University experience. Given the University's remote location and limited local population from which to draw students (over 90 percent of WSCU's students come from over 100 miles away), it is not likely that these demographics will switch to include a significant proportion of working adults or part-time students for which the application of different utilization rates may be more appropriate.*

### III. Land and Facilities Plan

1. Does WSCU envision any future property transactions? If so, where have opportunities for land acquisitions been identified?

*Response: The WSCU Foundation acquired approximately 17.5 acres immediately adjacent the easterly edge of campus that was part of the Gunnison Rising Annexation (page 65). While the property will remain owned by the WSCU Foundation, the Foundation will dedicate the use towards University initiatives such as faculty/staff housing, athletic/recreational field space, and additional academic space, if and when needed.*

2. Please describe the proposed "Gunnison Rising Annex" to the east of campus and how it would interface with the campus?

*Response: Gunnison Rising lies adjacent to the easterly boundary of the University along Hwy 50. Existing City infrastructure will pull through and past campus to connect into the development. There exists an MOU between the University, the WSCU Foundation,*

*the City of Gunnison and the developer outlining University/Foundation considerations that will minimize the development's traffic impacts on the campus (see question #3 below) and enhance campus vehicular and pedestrian circulation.*

3. How were vehicular circulation concerns addressed in the master plan? Is this a current concern or one that is anticipated in the future?

*Response: There currently exists little concern about vehicular circulation on campus. The University is framed by well-maintained Gunnison city streets and Escalante Drive, a University owned through-way that encloses the eastern and northern edges of campus. There are multiple access points off of these streets into parking lots that serve the inner core of campus.*

*The development of Gunnison Rising will potentially present problems. One of the major designated arteries to serve as access to the new development is Georgia Avenue. Georgia Avenue currently frames the southern border of campus and turns into Escalante Drive. When extended into the new development, the University is concerned that Georgia Avenue will provide residents and businesses of the new development ready access to Escalante Drive as a short-cut to get to the northern side of Gunnison and Colorado State Highway 135. To address this concern, the above referenced MOU was created that, in part, obligates the city and the developer to implement measures, including traffic calmers, that will deter this type of use.*

4. How has the issue of ADA accessibility been addressed in this facilities Master Plan?

*Response: The FMP (page 3) discusses the need for substantial ADA accessibility upgrades including curb cuts, ramping and parking lots and road maintenance throughout campus. In the late 1990s the University received significant controlled maintenance appropriations to upgrade sidewalks on the campus interior which included creating and marking routes that are ADA accessible. In recent years, old buildings have been brought into ADA compliance through renovation projects, and the University will continue, where applicable, to address ADA access through renovations identified in the 2011 Facility Master Plan.*

*This past summer the University partnered with the city of Gunnison to repave Escalante Drive. Not only did this address a much needed repair to the University's major vehicular circulation route, but the project was able to correct accessibility and drainage issues at The Mountaineer Stadium.*

#### IV. Funding

1. What plans are in place for capital construction if state funding does not return?

*Response: Since 2005 there has been over \$128 million invested into WSCU's physical plant, in both capital construction and controlled maintenance dollars. Of that amount, approximately \$98 million has come from institutional, private or other non-state sources. The University has no further debt capacity. Recognizing the constraints on borrowing and the limited resources available at the state level, the University is about to enter the silent phases of a capital campaign for the Mountaineer Bowl Press Box/Team Rooms, CIP-2 of the FMP (page 50) and an identified state-funded project. The other state-funded projects listed—Quigley Hall and Savage Library renovation and the Whipp Maintenance Building addition—are not the types of projects for which fund-raising is a strong option, and the University will have to wait for state resources to fund these projects.*

*The recently passed student facility fee includes a component for controlled/deferred maintenance. By FY2019-20 (see question #2 below), the controlled/deferred maintenance component will generate approximately \$370,000 annually. This component was added to the fee in recognition that state resources for controlled maintenance are likely to be limited for the indefinite future.*

2. Explain the existing student capital fee:
  - a) How is it structured?
  - b) What does it pay for?
  - c) Are rates projected to change?

*Response: In the spring of 2010, students at WSCU voted in favor of assessing themselves a facility fee that would help fund various capital construction and controlled maintenance projects. The fee has three major components: 1) a debt service component, 2) a financial aid component and 3) a deferred maintenance component. Other existing facility-related fees such as bond fees for past projects and fees supporting landscape renewal and maintenance were rolled into the new fee. Of the fee's new components, 70 percent of the revenue generated goes to service debt, 20 percent goes to financial aid and 10 percent goes to deferred maintenance. The fee will escalate on an approved scale until FY2019-20 when it caps out at \$2,915 (the net change in costs is \$2,689) per full-time student based on 30 credits per year. Of the \$4.2 million projected to be generated annually from the fee, approximately \$740,000 will be allocated towards need-based financial aid in order to ensure protection of low- and middle-income students.*

3. For those buildings with a poor Facilities Condition Index rating (below 55%), which if any are eligible for controlled maintenance? Has submitting them as controlled maintenance projects been considered? Why or why not?

*Response: Most of the remaining buildings on campus in need of rehabilitation contain substantial amounts of asbestos. Because of the existence of asbestos in most areas of these buildings, the University has limited ability to proceed on smaller, controlled maintenance projects within these spaces until the asbestos has been comprehensively abated. In many cases, to abate the asbestos would essentially require a complete rehabilitation of the building which typically moves the project from controlled maintenance to capital construction on a scope and funding scale.*

*WSCU staff works closely with the Office of the State Architect prior to submitting annual controlled maintenance requests in order to discuss unique needs and identify possible solutions.*