CONTENTS

› Study Overview
› Existing Conditions
› Outside the Unit Analysis
› Off-campus market
› Housing Survey
› Case for Investment
› Housing Master Plan
› Financial Plan
Study Overview
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ohio University holds as its central purpose the intellectual and personal development of its students. This is the focus of OHIO’s transformative residential experience which maintains a primary commitment to first- and second-year undergraduates and where:

- **intentional connections** are made between residential living and the University’s academic programs and goals,
- **inclusive communities** are cultivated, providing and nurturing opportunities for students to establish healthy relationships, uphold a level of responsibility for self and others, demonstrate leadership and advocacy, and respect differences,
- **educationally purposeful designs** are implemented into any construction or renovation, providing study space, classrooms, support services, safety and security, accessibility, technology, connectivity to campus, and public spaces that facilitate interaction and socializing with peers,
- **room and hall configurations** encourage interaction that are developmentally appropriate and allow for programming, resources and experiences that best support first- and second-year students with their transition, persistence and success,
- **accessible and responsive support, resources and services** are provided by a network of live-in professionals and paraprofessionals.

The outcomes of the OHIO residential experience are clear. Students who live on campus are more likely to feel connected to the University, faculty, and staff, engage in the life of the University (both inside and outside the classroom), perform better academically, and persist through graduation.

Physical facilities and space use are foundational to the residential experience and require ongoing investment in renovation and construction. Improvements to the existing residential portfolio are necessary to best meet the current and future needs of our students, to maintain market competitiveness and to be responsive to OHIO’s commitment to deliver a transformative living experience.
PLANNING TEAM

- Off-Campus Market Analysis
- Student Survey and Demand Analysis
- Competitive Context Analysis
- Budget Assessment / Operational Review
- Coordination
- Residence Life Programmatic Analysis
- Competitive Context Analysis
- Physical Planning for Future Improvements
- Collaboration with consultant planning team and coordination with stakeholders
- Facilitation:
  - Student Affairs
  - Housing and Residence Life
  - University Planning
- Stakeholders:
  - Students
  - Parents
  - University Leadership
  - Finance
  - Facilities
SCOPE AND PLANNING APPROACH

› Right-size housing inventory in the context of projected enrollment and student demand

› Develop recommendations for long-term capital reinvestment strategy

› Outline a sustainable financial plan that maintains affordability and provides value to students

› Balance student experience, facility quality, and amenities across residential facilities

› Engage with a variety of campus constituents and facilitate support for the plan
Five principles were developed to guide the Housing Master Plan

**Competitiveness**

Investments in OHIO’s residential facilities are necessary to meet the evolving expectations of students and their families and to maintain market competitiveness relative to the recruitment of new undergraduate students to the Athens campus.

**Capacity**

Capacity of the residential portfolio should be maintained at approximately 7500 with flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances. It should accommodate primarily 1st and 2nd year students with diversity in room types but focus on traditional-style units for 1st year and access to suite-style units for 2nd year.

**Proximity**

Proximity to the core campus is a key asset of the residential housing portfolio. The compact neighborhood feel and common architectural style of OHIO’s East, West and South Greens are cornerstones of the residential experience and should be maintained and enhanced.

**Affordability**

Investments in the residential housing portfolio must be considered in the context of affordability for students and the financial resources of the auxiliary and institution. Should be accomplished as efficiently as possible but with a common minimum standard across the portfolio.

**Wellbeing**

The student residential experience should nurture inclusivity, wellbeing and accessibility. Connectivity to outdoor spaces, culinary venues, recreational facilities and campus transportation is critical to fostering student engagement and belonging.
Existing Conditions
HOUSING PORTFOLIO
Current State

Ohio's existing campus housing inventory benefits from the university's close-knit and attractive campus environment. The buildings are in proximity to academic, student life, and recreation space contributing to a holistic residential experience. However, the inventory is marked by broad qualitative disparities, not only in facilities condition but also in adequacy of "outside the unit" space essential to support student success. In addition, the housing inventory has a high number of traditional units.

Currently the housing buildings are distributed across three of Ohio's campus greens.

› In terms of housing, East Green is where the university has its strongest sense of community and highest student satisfaction. East Green halls tend to be more up-to-date and better-aligned with contemporary student expectations. Jefferson Hall, for example, has benefitted from a recent comprehensive renovation providing best-practice amenity spaces and modern amenities, and scores near the top of the student satisfaction survey.

› West Green halls generally lag in student appeal, being more dated and lacking in community space. These realities are reflected in the fact that West Green halls are absent from the top third of student satisfaction rankings.

› South Green inventory falls in the middle, varying widely between newer and older inventory. The newer semi-suite style halls occupy the high end of the range and score well in terms of satisfaction. The five remaining Mod South halls are dark, dated, and unappealing, and largely occupy the bottom of the student satisfaction rankings. The Front Four buildings also have condition and community space deficiencies making them prime candidates for significant renovation.
HOUSING PORTFOLIO

By the Numbers

INVENTORY BY BED TYPE

- 64% TRADITIONAL
- 27% SEMI-SUITE
- 8% SUITE
- <1% APARTMENT

$236M - $255M TOTAL DEFERRED MAINTENANCE*

2.13M TOTAL INVENTORY GSF*

61% NON-RENOVATED HALLS
91% FULLY RENOVATED HALLS

7,230 BED CAPACITY (PROGRAM)

7% NON-RENOVATED HALLS
18% FULLY RENOVATED HALLS

STUDENT SATISFACTION

50% APPROX. OF HOUSING FACILITIES EXCEED THE RENOVATION AGE OF 50 YEARS

*NOTE: DM COST IS IN 2022 DOLLARS BASED ON AN ESCALATION RANGE OF 34-45% ABOVE 2016 COST DATA. NON-HOUSING SPACE IS EXCLUDED FROM DEFERRED MAINTENANCE AND GSF TOTALS.
HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Residential Greens

East Green
• 14 buildings
• 2,170 beds
• Deferred maintenance = $63.6M - $68.8M

West Green
• 8 buildings
• 2,259 beds
• Deferred maintenance = $69.6M - $75.3M

South Green
• 14 buildings
• 2,801 beds
• Deferred maintenance = $102.3M - $110.7M
### HOUSING PORTFOLIO

#### Unit Type Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Suite</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod-Style</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outside the Unit Analysis
“Outside the Unit” space refers to spaces that build community within each hall: lounges, study spaces, shared kitchens, laundry areas, multi-purpose rooms, residential support spaces, and staff apartments.

Many older halls suffer from inadequate outside the unit space, while others concentrate space in a one-size-fits-all lounge at the ground floor that is often over-scaled and under-utilized. A more impactful approach is to distribute a variety of spaces throughout the building that are scaled and tailored to different needs. Therefore, the Outside the Unit analysis studies the amount of space both overall as well as on a floor-by-floor basis. This ensures a holistic assessment of not only the total quantity of community space, but also the appropriate distribution.

At Ohio University the quantity, distribution, and quality of these spaces vary widely across buildings.
Outside the Unit space amounts are benchmarked to the Ayers Saint Gross housing database which reflects best practices. Space needs are further calibrated to the social maturation inherent to the undergraduate experience. Thus, residence halls designed for first-year students need more community space to nurture connections and strengthen campus community, while upper-division halls need less community space as social networks mature.
Floor plans and space program data form the basis of the analysis for each individual residence hall.

Every space in the building is analyzed and assigned to three essential categories:

- Net floor area common space
- Net floor area unit space
- Gross floor area (e.g., circulation, building support, etc)

The net floor areas are tallied, and community space expressed as a percentage of total net floor area.

This area is compared against the Ayers Saint Gross database that benchmarks appropriate quantities of community space.

Outside the Unit - Common spaces or amenities used by residents of the building

Unit - All spaces within individual units as well as communal baths used by residents

27%
The analysis evaluates the quantity of community space compared to the overall net floor area of each hall. The analysis compares each hall’s community space against best-practice benchmarks.

Based on the analysis, the team recommends that, when undertaking a major renovation, an appropriate amount of bed de-densification occur to achieve desired levels of community space. The bed counts are aggregated back into the overall inventory and phasing projections.
ANALYSIS SUMMARY

OHIO UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS - OVERALL

Note: Common spaces that are shared on a campus-wide basis and not dedicated to the hall community (e.g. dining) are counted separately and not included in these totals.
Off Campus Market
OFF CAMPUS MARKET SUMMARY

A review of off-campus market conditions found a highly competitive environment with many inexpensive student-focused complexes located close to the campus core. This analysis was informed by Co-Star data collected in spring 2022.

Vacancy Trends: In student-focused properties, vacancy rates have ranged between 8.6% and 14% over the past five years, indicating that the competition to attract upper-division students is high.

Rental Rate Trends: Over the same time, rental rate growth in Athens has been stagnant.

- Multi-Family Properties:
  - Rental rates have increased 2.2%
  - Vacancy rates have decreased
  - No new development or deliveries

- Student-Focused Properties
  - Rental rates have decreased 3.4%
  - Vacancy rates have decreased
  - No new development or deliveries

Competitive Position: Ohio University maintains higher average rates than the off-campus market, which is typical for most institutions, but is broadly competitive from an amenities standpoint.

Conclusion:

- Ohio University can compete with these off-campus complexes on an amenity standpoint / student-focused features, but not from an affordability standpoint.

- Given the two-year live on requirement and competitive off-campus market conditions, Ohio University should maintain its focus on maximizing the 1st and 2nd year live-on experience with the hope that the value added will help retain some of those students in on-campus housing when space allows.

- The value proposition of living on campus primarily derives from the student experience.

- Given high vacancy rates, the off-campus marketplace represents a “buyers market” where master leasing beds may be possible if Ohio University needs short-term capacity.

- OHIO should continue tracking the off-campus market conditions as vacancy & rent levels in the future will be highly dependent on student enrollment levels.
OFF-CAMPUS MARKET CONDITIONS

- “Buyer’s market” with stable rents and increasing vacancy levels
- On-campus rates competitive with off-campus
- Many options walking distance to campus
- No new development or deliveries in market-rate or student-focused development

Off-Campus Rent per Unit (Monthly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Multi-Family Rent</th>
<th>Student Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$928</td>
<td>$1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$938</td>
<td>$1,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$941</td>
<td>$1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$947</td>
<td>$1,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$948</td>
<td>$1,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Off-Campus Vacancy Trend

- 2018: 12.8%
- 2019: 14.9%
- 2020: 13.8%
- 2021: 8.6%
- 2022: 9.0%

How long is your typical one-way commute to campus?

- Less than 10 minutes
- 11-20 minutes
- 21-30 minutes
- 31-40 minutes
- More than 40 minutes
Peer Comparison
The planning team conducted a peer comparison of four major institutions -- Miami University, Kent State University, University of Cincinnati and Ohio State University (the “peer group”) -- with a focus on housing offerings and investment.

Overall level of investment: In terms of overall investment, all four institutions in the peer group have undergone major housing projects including new construction and renovation over the past five years. Investments have focused on improving the overall quality of their respective housing systems as well as the diversity of offerings by introducing semi-suite beds.

Major investments include Ohio State’s North Residential districts (3,200 beds; opened 2016), Miami University’s Withrow Hall (280 traditional beds; opened 2018) and the University of Cincinnati’s Calhoun Hall (825 semi-suite beds; opening 2023).

Capture Rate: Despite lower-than-average rates of investment, Ohio University has the highest capture rate compared to its peers. This could be attributed to two-year live-on requirement, strong on-campus experience, and relatively affordable housing options. Ohio University’s high capture rate is especially high given that other institutions in the peer group also apply a two-year live-on requirement.

Cost: OHIO provides the lowest total cost of housing relative to its peers and comes fourth in terms of total cost of attendance.

Unit Mix: Compared to the peer group, OHIO has more traditional units, denser housing, and fewer accessible common spaces and amenities than average.

Conclusion:
- Build on existing factors that have led to high satisfaction, while investing in unique value
- Need to invest to remain competitive
- More flexible unit type offerings would and accommodate current and future gaps in demand.
Undergraduate Capture Rates (Fall 2019)

- Cincinnati: 24%
- Kent St.: 29%
- Miami: 31%
- Ohio St.: 33%
- Ohio U.: 43%

Room & Board (Fall 2021)

- Ohio U.: $11,982
- Cincinnati: $12,288
- Kent St.: $12,412
- Ohio St.: $13,352
- Miami: $15,080

Share of Traditional Rooms (Fall 2021)

- Ohio University: 73%
- Miami: 94%
- Kent St: 86%
- Ohio State: 57%
- Cincinnati: 48%
- Average: 72%

Note: Room and Board based on standard double room rates and typical board rates.
### North Residential District (OSU)
- Opened in Aug 2016
- 3,200 beds (8 halls)
- $370 million investment

### Withrow Hall (Miami)
- Opened in Aug 2018
- 280 Traditional beds
- $37 million cost to build

### Calhoun Hall (UC)
- Opening Jan 2023
- 825 semi-suite beds
- $80 million investment

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Major Renovation</th>
<th>New Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ★★ Completed since 2016
- ★ In Progress
- ★ Planned
Housing Survey
The housing survey was intended to measure overall satisfaction with the housing experience by hall and green as well as identify key areas for future investment.

**Methodology:** The survey was hosted online and sent to students and parents between April 14th and April 24th, 2022.

- **Timeframe:** April 14th – April 24th
- **Total Respondents:** 2,489
  - Students: 1,595
  - On Campus: 1,152 (78%)
  - Off Campus: 285 (19%)
  - Commuter: 38 (3%)
  - Parents: 818
  - Other: 76

In addition to the survey, student focus groups were conducted to provide perspectives on the residential experience.

**Results:** Overall, the housing survey showed strong rates of satisfaction with Ohio University’s housing offerings overall, but satisfaction varied widely depending on hall.

- Most undergraduate students said that housing was important to their decision to attend Ohio University, with ratings ranging from 86% for first-year students, to 72% for fourth-year students.
  - In-state and out-of-state students rated housing as important at similar rates.
- In addition, 81% of parents said that the quality of housing was important or very important in their student’s decision to attend Ohio University.
  - By contrast, 29% of parents were unsatisfied with the quality of student housing at Ohio University compared to other institutions.
- Overall, 74% of on-campus students claimed high satisfaction with their living situation during the 2021-2022 academic year. 89% of off-campus students made the same claim.
  - However, overall satisfaction varied widely by hall, with the Back South and older, unrenovated halls ranking the lowest.
- Students rated private bedrooms, upgraded bathrooms, and on-site laundry as the most important features in their housing choice.

**Top Rated Building Amenities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Time Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded bathrooms</td>
<td>On-site laundry facilities</td>
<td>On-site laundry facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus facilities</td>
<td>Upgraded bathrooms</td>
<td>Upgraded bathrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (single) bedroom</td>
<td>In-unit kitchen</td>
<td>Private (single) bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community kitchen</td>
<td>Private (single) bedroom</td>
<td>In-unit kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining in or near building</td>
<td>Dining in or near building</td>
<td>Community kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-unit kitchen</td>
<td>Community kitchen</td>
<td>Dining in or near building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** Ohio University would be best served by continuing to invest in the on-campus housing experience and bringing the quality and condition of its halls to an overall higher standard across greens.

- Since both parents and students rank the quality of housing as an important factor in their choice of Ohio University, this investment is likely to support continued enrollment growth and stabilization.
- Ohio University is unlikely to be able to compete for upper-division students given the high satisfaction with off-campus options and competitive price profile.
- In the long-term, reducing the overall density of housing is likely to improve the overall competitive profile and flexibility of Ohio University’s housing system.
## SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING

### Inconsistent level of quality and experience by both hall & green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hall</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddle</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shively</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 University Terrace</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voigt</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffin</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamertsfelder</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hall</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convocation Center</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargent</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treudley</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryors</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hall</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowle</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luchs</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinnon</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wray</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inconsistent level of quality and experience by both hall & green
IMPORTANCE OF HOUSING

› On-campus housing an importance decision factor to both students and parents
› However, 29% of parents unsatisfied with quality of current housing offerings

### Importance of Housing in Decision to Attend OHIO (Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parent Survey Feedback

#### Importance of Quality Housing

- Very Important: 24%
- Important: 57%
- Unimportant: 18%
- Very Unimportant: 1%

#### Satisfaction with OHIO Housing

- Very Unsatisfied: 9%
- Unsatisfied: 9%
- Satisfied: 52%
- Very Satisfied: 8%
- Not Sure: 22%
Case For Investments
To maintain its competitive advantage, Ohio University must build upon its unique character and position and invest to offer a best-in-class residential experience for first- and second-year students.

**Existing Facilities**

Inventory has a high number of traditional units with a disparity of condition and space outside the unit.

**Student Satisfaction**

Survey found high satisfaction with good condition and well-designed halls and significantly lower satisfaction with poor condition halls.

**Peers Institutions**

Peers have invested significantly. OHIO lags in the level of investment and has more traditional units, and fewer common spaces and amenities than average.

**Capacity**

Need to maintain capacity to plan for steady state of 4,000 new students annually and a vibrant 1st and 2nd year student residential experience.

**Housing Financials**

In a strong position with a strong reserve balance and a highly competitive operating margin.
CAPACITY PROJECTION ASSUMPTIONS

Programmatic Capacity is based on the following planning assumptions:

› First-year students: assume steady state of 4,000 students and 95% capture rate in housing = 3,800

› Second-year students: 78% capture rate in housing = 2,964

› Upper class/ transfer students: 280 residents

› Student Staff: 265

› Non-degree seeking students: 60

› Includes buffer for enrollment elasticity, renovations, operational flexibility: 96

› Additionally, University may utilize community partner resources via master leasing for flexibility

› These numbers do not account for potential changes in retention and capture rates
CAPACITY PROJECTION ASSUMPTIONS

- **235** - right size, reprogram existing inventory
- **618** - remove Back South buildings
- **124** - repurpose beds during major renovations to increase outside of unit space

**Renovation Strategy:**
- Build new facilities
- Modify existing facilities to improve outside of the room space
- Major renovations
- Minor renovations
- Demolish facilities beyond their useful life and before major investment needed
BUILDING FLEXIBILITY INTO LONG-TERM PLANNING

- Fall 2022 Athens freshman enrollment: 4,441
  Freshmen living on campus: 4,224 (95%)

- Based on current understanding of anticipated market shifts, increased competition for students, and projected demographic changes, the long-term plan assumes annual enrollment of approximately 4,000 new first year students, with bed capacity for ~3,800 in residence.

- The proposed plan assumes ongoing alignment with University enrollment strategy and planning, with opportunities to review and modify housing capacity assumptions at least annually, as well as opportunity to adjust planned renovation or construction as necessary through the biennial capital improvement planning process.

- Examples of Levers for Flexibility:
  - Modify capacity assumptions
  - Delay renovations or demolition timelines
  - Accelerate new construction
  - Leverage off-campus housing providers (e.g., master lease agreements)

Source: Enrollment Management analysis of WICHE’s Knocking at the College Door, 10th edition, Ohio data.
Housing Master Plan
The Housing Master Plan is a multiprong and phased approach to improving OHIO’s residential experience. The existing housing facilities require varying levels of investment in renovation and new construction is required to raze buildings that are unsuitable and to meet future bed demand. These investments are necessary to meet student needs, strengthen market competitiveness and to be responsive to OHIO’s commitment to deliver a transformative living experience.

- **Minor Renovation:** Over the past five years Ohio University has taken a phased approach to renovating individual housing buildings. This has centered on addressing the most pressing issues individually, such as mechanical systems, bathrooms, exterior envelope, lobbies and room renovations. The master plan identified six buildings where minor renovations are required to complete outstanding condition issues.

- **Major Renovation:** The plan identified 10 buildings in poor condition. Most of the buildings suffer from aging infrastructure, dated finishes, and lack sufficient ‘outside the unit’ space to support community and student needs. For these buildings, the plan recommends comprehensive renovations that include targeted bed dedensification as a means of increase common space.

- **New construction:** The plan envisions two phases of new construction. Several sites were studied for new buildings. Phase 1 new construction will locate 600 beds on South Green. Two new buildings with unit type flexibility are proposed to define a new open space adjacent to the Front Four, extending a single level of parking beneath covered by an occupiable, landscaped roofscape. Broad steps open to a view of the Hocking River, and seat walls present opportunities to overlook proposed fields and courts that address campus recreation needs. A wide central pedestrian walk connects the proposed student housing to the Hockhocking Adena bikeway.

- **Buildings to Replace:** Over time, OHIO has incrementally razed a portion of the 15 mod-style residence halls constructed in 1970. Today, five of these buildings remain. These remaining buildings are in poor condition and lack spaces to support community. Furthermore, the raised network of catwalks elevated above inactive basement floors detract from the campus environment and are a barrier to connecting building interiors to campus green space. One of the drivers of new construction is to replace these obsolete buildings.
1. Boyd
2. Sargent
3. James
4. 4 University Terrace
5. Washington
6. Tiffin
6-year Capital Plan
1. Pickering
2. Brown
3. Mackinnon
4. Crawford

Future Projects
5. Perkins
6. Bryan
7. Voigt
8. Treudley
9. Ryors
10. Wilson
NEW CONSTRUCTION

Potential Future Phase: 400 beds
Potential Future Phase: 400 beds

5 - NEW CONSTRUCTION
4 - MAINTAIN
3 - MINOR RENOVATION
2 - MAJOR RENOVATION
1 - REPLACE

Phase 1: 600 beds

6-year Capital Plan
600 Beds on South Green

Future Projects
400 beds on a Future Site
SOUTH GREEN SITE – WITH BACK SOUTH

Total Building Area: 180,000 gross building area
Total Capacity: 600 beds
Parking Below Plinth – 35,000-40,000 gross building area
Parking Capacity - 100-125 spaces
SOUTH GREEN SITE – BACK SOUTH RAZED

Total Building Area: 180,000 gross building area
Total Capacity: 600 beds
Parking Below Plinth – 35,000-40,000 gross building area
Parking Capacity - 100-125 spaces
Review Capacity
Consider building additional replacement beds depending on financial and bed capacity needs

1. Hoover
2. Ewing
3. Wray
4. Dougan
5. True

-618 beds
Ohio University Facilities believes they can keep buildings operational as they have been for next five years.

- **Next Five Years**
  - $60K/building in O&M Labor
  - $300K water lines
  - $300K boiler
  - $150K generator
  - $200K cosmetic improvements to keep online

- **Elevator**
  - Are obsolete so could run into an issue if parts break down resulting in inability to bring elevator back online (accommodations or replace)
  - $500-600K/today’s dollars replacement per building
  - Domino of other systems

- **$43M Total Through FY26**
  - Mixture of modernization and Deferred Maintenance
Financial Plan
FINANCIAL PLAN SUMMARY

Methodology: The financial analysis tested various scenarios to accomplish planning goals. Scenarios were tested for impact on overall housing system capacity and ability to meet housing needs as well as impact on reserves and annual cash flow.

Goals: Three overall goals underpinned the scenarios tested.

▪ Create near-term capacity to perform major renovations of key halls as well as long-term capacity to take the Back South offline.
▪ Improve overall housing condition and expand offerings of a diverse residential portfolio.
▪ Maintain financial sustainability with a cap on debt at $75M and a reserve balance equating to a year of debt service.

Assumptions: To test these scenarios, the team relied on the following assumptions.

▪ HRL Budget: Baseline housing budget provided by Ohio University Housing and Residence Life, including current reserve balances, revenue and occupancy projections, and annual inflation.
▪ New Construction: 600-bed hall.
  ▪ Assumed all-in project cost of $450 per GSF.
▪ Additional site preparation and enabling projects of $16.5M
  ▪ Total project costs of $94.6M
  ▪ Debt financing at 5% of $75M of total project costs.
▪ Minor Renovations: $150 / GSF
▪ Major Renovations: $250 / GSF

Strategy:

▪ Near-term: Build approximately 600 beds of additional housing by Fall 2026.
  ▪ New beds will address acute enrollment-driven need for additional beds as well as create flexibility to pursue major renovations in the medium-term.
  ▪ Fund this new construction with a mix of internal bank funds, spending from margin, and reserve funds.
▪ Medium-term: Utilize new capacity to undertake major strategic renovations.
  ▪ Fund these major renovations with spending from margin and reserve funds.
  ▪ Where possible, also engage in minor renovations
▪ Long-term: When major renovations are complete, utilize surplus beds to take Back South halls offline, pending future enrollment.
  ▪ If enrollment continues to grow, further new construction may be required to take the Back South halls offline.
  ▪ If enrollment slows or declines, Back South may be taken offline without further new construction
▪ Reserve Balance: Maintain reserves to cover at least one year of total debt service ($15M).

Results:

▪ Preliminary financial modelling suggests the housing system can support the proposed capital improvement plan and maintain a healthy operating margin.
▪ Student affordability levels are maintained as the plan assumes consistent escalation of rates but no major restructuring of rent.
▪ The housing system continues to support significant institutional overhead & transfers. B&D’s analysis of OHIO’s housing system versus other comparable institutions shows that the current levels of institutional support are overburdening the system. However, these assumptions are maintained given the importance of the housing systems contribution to support campus enrollment initiatives.
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW: PRINCIPLES

› Committing to replacement beds and plan creates flexibility for future changes.
  – Every biennium, OHIO updates its capital plan and will align capacity assumptions to plan for future needs.

› Use of Back South will be reassessed during each future capital planning biennium, with target for replacement approach by 2024.
  – During that time, we leverage off campus market.
  – Mod South halls are expected to need $2M+/- investment by year 2027.

› Reserve Balance: Maintain reserves to cover at least one year of total debt service ($15M).

› Replacement Beds: Build approximately 600 beds of additional housing by Fall 2026.
  – New beds will address acute enrollment-driven need for additional beds as well as create flexibility to pursue major renovations in the medium-term.
  – Contributes to room type diversity goals and addresses future deferred maintenance offset.
  – Addresses replacement bed need for Back South.

› Renovations: Utilize new capacity to undertake major strategic renovations.
  – Where possible, also engage in minor renovations.
  – Goal of residential portfolio to hit 100% renovated.
Financial Overview

PHASING STRATEGY

- In the near-term, adding approximately 600 beds of new housing will meet the current shortfall, meet bed type capacity goals, and create capacity to pursue major strategic renovations.
With current planned enrollment assumptions and renovation strategies, we anticipate additional new bed needs to maintain housing need with Back South demolition.

- **7,465** Anticipated Housing Need
- **7,881** System Capacity with New Housing Project
- **7,465** Anticipated Housing Need
- **7,500** System Capacity with Renovations and Mod South Demolition
- **Add 600 beds in '26**
- **New Housing Project**
- **Major Renovations enabled by surplus**
- **Pickering**
- **MacKinnon**
- **Brown**
- **Crawford**
- **Back South Demolition**
- **Evaluate Second Phase of Replacement Housing**
- **Dip below current planned capacity needs**

**Capital improvement priority review**
Financial Overview
FY23 BUDGET SUBMISSION

› In addition to $37M in reserves, Ohio University Housing and Residence Life expects an operating margin between $11M and $20M through 2030.

In FY23...
$54.9M Gross Revenues
- $5.8M Funding Transfers
- $7.2M Compensation
- $5.6M Supplies, Services and Capital Costs
- $10.7M Debt Service

$25.5M Results of Operation before Contribution Margin and Financial Aid
- $6.9M Contribution Margin
- $7.9M Financial Aid

$10.7M Available for Reinvestment

Budget Projection: FY23-30*

*Source: FY23-26 – Housing and Residence Life; FY29-30 extrapolated based on FY23-26 Averages
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW
NEW HOUSING PROJECT

› To support the new housing project, which enables further major renovations, we anticipate supplementing margin and reserves with internal bank spending.
› The anticipated allocation for the new construction project includes enabling and utility projects, plus a buffered construction cost to anticipate future inflation.

› **Scale:** ~600 Beds; 180K GSF
› Construction in 2024/2025
› Opening by Fall 2026
› **Construction Allocation:** $450/GSF all-in
› **Other Costs:**
  - $6.6M Enabling Projects (Garage, Plinth, Site Prep)
  - $7.0M University utility and chiller capacity costs
› **Total New/Replacement Capacity:** $94.6M

New Housing Project
Anticipated Funding Sources ($MM)

- $75M Internal Bank
- $19.6M Margin, Reserves
Financial Overview

ANTICIPATED CAPITAL SPENDING

- Excluding minor renovations, total investment through FY30 is anticipated to be $192M

Capital Spending by Year ($MM)

- In Progress Projects
- New Construction
- Major Renovations/Demolition
NEXT STEPS
HOUSING MASTER PLAN

• Integrate capital improvement plan priorities into broader University Six Year CIP process

• Bring prepared projects to Board of Trustees for approval at future dates

• Continue diligence in review of capacity assumptions and timing of next projects