

Strategic Housing Planning Analysis

Prepared For:

Portland State University

Portland, Oregon

Prepared by:



December 21, 2006

Table of Contents		Page Number
Section 1	Introduction and Executive Summary	1
Section 2	Operations Review	4
Section 3	Facility Assessment	15
Section 4	Student Housing Programming	29
Section 5	Student Housing Financial Analysis	35
Addendum	A. Housing Offerings at Peer Institutions B. Rental Market Analysis C. Area Graduate Programs	38

Section 1: Introduction and Executive Summary

The Scion Group LLC has prepared the following report for Portland State University (“PSU”) in support of the University’s long-term strategy for transitioning its existing on-campus housing inventory to self-operation and addressing the need to meet the housing demands of current and future students.

Scion was requested to: recommend strategies to capitalize on operating efficiencies; review existing housing facilities and recommend a plan for their renewal; develop an overall program for on-campus student housing; and create initial financial and operational models. To understand the market in which these strategies would be implemented, Scion was also asked to review the *Student Housing Study* completed in 2005, consider market conditions in Portland and Vancouver, and the overall preferences of the PSU population.

In preparing this report, Scion specifically considered the following questions and issues:

- How can PSU most effectively position its on-campus student housing operation? What types of housing should be built or renovated? How should existing third-party operator policies be adopted or revised?
- Can housing be built, renovated and operated in a cash flow-neutral or positive manner?
- What are the current market conditions for students? How have those conditions changed over time and what do they project in the future? What types of programs and initiatives would best promote student retention?

Scion has analyzed its research to create a comprehensive, strategic long-term plan for PSU to address housing for students. Our research included conducting two on-campus student focus group sessions, conversations with numerous PSU administrators, tours of existing student housing options (on-campus and off-campus), analysis of market data for Portland and a review of housing options at peer institutions. Based on this research, Scion has the following recommendations:

1. Based on student focus group feedback and enrollment data provided by PSU, Scion believes that the demand for 3,401 beds of student housing contemplated by the *Student Housing Study* can be expressed as 1,339 semi-suite style residence hall beds (with semi-private bathrooms) and 2,062 apartment style beds.
2. Based on designed capacity, PSU’s current unmet demand of 2,010 beds includes a shortfall of 1,070 semi-suite residence hall beds and 940 apartment-style beds. This is derived from total designed capacity of 1,391 beds (269 semi-suite residence hall beds and 1,122 apartment beds). These figures also assume that single-as-double and University Place overflow spaces are not used.
3. Scion has assumed for this study that PSU will reach its enrollment targets, with benchmarks in the 2011-12 and 2017-18 academic years. Regardless of enrollment trends, however, PSU must address the need to improve, renovate and demolish several of its existing student housing facilities. Scion has completed a review of existing facilities and recommends the following:
 - a. Demolition of Parkway and Stratford
 - b. Re-purposing of Montgomery Court to a non-housing use
 - c. Conversion of studio and “sleeper” units in Blackstone to one-bedroom apartments
 - d. Inclusion of academic space where possible

4. In addition, Scion has made recommendations to increase capacity in existing facilities by converting several single occupancy units to double occupancy. This will both address increased student demand and capitalize on operating efficiencies to generate greater revenue in the existing housing facilities. Many of these initiatives are currently being undertaken by PSU, and include conversion from single to double occupancy as follows:
 - a. Six floors of Broadway
 - b. All Epler and West Hall units
 - c. All semi-suite (“sleeper”) units in Ondine

5. Should PSU accept Scion’s facility and capacity recommendations, it will be necessary to add 1,158 semi-suite residence hall units and 502 apartment units to address demand. Scion believes these additional beds should be added in two phases; first a 650 bed state-of-the-art living/learning residence, consisting of semi-suites, to be opened by no later than fall 2011. This should be followed by a 510 bed residence hall (semi-suite or suite style) and a 500 bed apartment facility by 2017. Due to the near-term need to generate a stabilized positive cash flow, Scion does not recommend building all three facilities concurrently.

6. The 650 bed residence hall (2011 benchmark) should be built as semi-suite rooms. Semi-suite rooms are defined as one or two bedrooms with a semi- private bathroom and no in-unit kitchen or living room (currently defined by PSU as “sleepers”). In Scion’s experience, first year students have welcomed semi-suite style housing, as it provides the community atmosphere generally sought by traditional-aged first year students, without the need for community bathrooms. There should be options for both single- and double-occupancy bedrooms in the semi-suite units, which will satisfy some demand for privacy among upper-division students. The single occupancy bedrooms would probably be the least expensive option for students to live on-campus with privacy, and therefore will attract some returning students. A mix of some upper-division students in predominant freshmen communities provides a chance for healthy modeling. Further, semi-suite style units will be the most attractive to a variety of summer conference groups. Scion recommends this facility be constructed near the Broadway and Ondine facilities, in the Broadway/Jackson area.

7. The 500 apartment style units (2017 benchmark) should consist of entirely private bedrooms in four-bedroom quad-occupancy and two-bedroom double-occupancy units. PSU students indicate a strong preference for private bedrooms through the *Student Housing Study* and, moreover, lower cost shared-bedroom units will already exist in Broadway, Epler, Ondine and West Hall. Each apartment should have one compartmentalized bathroom, although there is some demand for two bathrooms in the four-bedroom units. Scion recommends that this facility be located on the existing University Place site.

8. The 510 residence hall beds (2017 benchmark) do not necessarily have to be built as semi-suite units. While Scion believes that semi-suite units are best suited for the 2011-12 benchmark, these units may not be as attractive to students in 2017. Still, Scion does not believe that this needs to be built as apartment units, and recommends a careful examination of both semi-suite and suite-style units at the time this project reaches the preliminary planning stages. Suite style units include one to eight bedrooms sharing a

- bathroom(s) and living room with no kitchen facility. Suite-style units may provide sophomore and junior students with an increased level of privacy and space they desire while continuing to remain on a meal plan as an interim step between semi-suite and apartment. Additionally, suite-style units may be offered to students less expensively than apartments. Scion recommends this facility be located near West and Epler halls, in the Market/Twelfth area.
9. Current housing operations are actually very efficient on a *per square foot basis*, with operating costs of approximately \$7.17. This is actually less than Scion's national urban benchmark of \$7.88. Conversely, the percentage of single-occupancy apartments, which is among the highest that Scion has ever observed, causes *per bed* operating expenses to be far beyond industry averages, at approximately \$4,014 versus the benchmark of \$3,152. Increasing density in current properties and adding higher-density properties as part of any expansion will help improve efficiencies. The current utilization (gross square foot per bed) of approximately 660 SF will be immediately reduced to 466 by implementing Scion's density and demolition recommendations and will be reduced to approximately 414 by 2011 and 390 by 2017 by following the growth projections that Scion has set forth.
 10. Without knowing current debt service obligations, it is not possible for Scion to know whether or not operating income (after servicing new debt related to expansion and renovations) will be sufficient. Recognizing PSU's desire to keep rates affordable to students, and therefore keeping long-term escalations minimal, Scion calculates 2011 net operating income of all housing (2,391 beds) to be \$4,221,000, or \$1,025,000 net of new debt to service approximately \$52 million of expansion and renovation costs. 2017 net operating income of all housing (3,401 beds) would be \$10,739,000, or \$2,519,000 net of new debt to service approximately \$134 million of expansion and renovation costs. Scion believes that some upward pricing elasticity exists, and should PSU require additional income to be generated, this, along with a higher frequency of 12-month contracts and the addition of summer conferencing revenue should add to the bottom line.
 11. Dining capacity and overall program should also be evaluated, since Scion recommends all traditional-aged freshmen residents and all residents who live on-campus but without in-unit kitchens should be required to participate in a meal plan. A new dining facility may need to be part of the planning process and possibly incorporated into the next new housing facility.

Scion appreciates the opportunity to have prepared this report and looks forward to continuing to assist PSU in achieving its important objectives in connection with its housing strategies.

Section 2: Operations Review

Scion has reviewed numerous aspects of operations for PSU on-campus housing, including product type and unit mix, residence life, financial strategies, occupancy management and general safety.

General Observations and Recommendations

Overall, Scion found the facilities, programs, policies and services to be in quality condition and efficiently managed, particularly as to routine repairs and operating costs based on a per-square-foot basis. An especially positive component of the existing housing inventory is the general prevalence (80%) of studio and one-bedroom apartment-style accommodations, providing a level of privacy and independence not typically found in such abundance among the product type owned and offered at many other schools.

One reason institutional housing systems generally do not provide a high percentage of smaller (lower occupancy) apartments is the relatively higher operational cost of including them in the unit mix – particularly when evaluated on a per-bed basis. Having a wide range of housing product, however, is advantageous to attract a broader market of students, including freshmen through seniors, graduate students, and students with dependents.

The current inventory seems to heavily favor those preferences typically preferred by juniors, seniors, graduate students and families. Because smaller apartments are the most expensive to deliver, and those are already largely in place, the University has an opportunity to provide accommodations that are not only appropriate to the specific growing campus population of traditional-aged freshmen, but also – if properly programmed – an opportunity to enhance revenue flow to the campus system.

Scion therefore recommends developing more intentional first-year (with some second-year) student communities. These communities should be of higher density and include more common space, as well as additional staffing. The facilities should offer only community access to one or more kitchens, rather than providing this amenity within every unit, assuming campus dining continues to improve and can be expanded to accommodate more participants.

The current campus master planning that Scion has reviewed appears to incorporate sound principles – most notably, the wise massing of housing communities and East-West pedestrian connecting corridors. The most logical place for additional new housing for first- and second-year students is in the central corridor area. When comparing housing in this location to other options – including location, contract terms, neighbors and other intangibles – the central corridor location will provide the best opportunity for new students to become connected to the campus.

Financial Strategies

Ideally, University housing should provide a balance between financial and educational enhancements to the institution. Educationally, there is a reasonable expectation that housing should enhance the campus learning environment and the experience for residents. Indeed, there is much evidence that, especially when there is collaboration between student and academic affairs in living-learning communities, such environments are more likely to yield student persistence and success.

The University should also expect its housing to deliver financial enhancements, such that the housing system can flourish to the benefit of the institution as well as its residents. Scion has reviewed policies and practices with the view that housing must at least be self-supporting in the

sense that non-resident students should not financially support campus housing. Scion endorses the generally accepted campus housing financial objectives that:

- a) Expenses should be recovered only by those residents who take advantage of campus housing options (although, there is often debate regarding whether certain overhead categories should be included in expenses); and
- b) Attractive housing should increase the University's ability to compete in the marketplace and support enrollment management objectives.

Specific marketing comments and recommendations are included *infra*. Generally speaking, however, certain policies and practices can influence financial operations, as follows:

Revenue

The two most significant accomplishments toward improving revenues are increased density and increased occupancy. Both are easier goals to proclaim than to achieve, particularly in a climate where for years student have been provided with a level of privacy that is virtually non-existent on peer campuses. There will undoubtedly be resistance to change in this regard, especially if it results in a reduction in options, flexibility and/or privacy. It may be necessary to implement desired changes in phases over a period of time; it is almost always helpful to articulate clearly the anticipated benefits for the system and to the majority of students, to openly address questions and to be receptive to additional suggestions that may prove attractive.

Vacancy currently averages about 10%. Any change in policy that decreases vacancy by only 1% will add approximately \$120,000 in annual revenue. Based on this dramatic effect, all reasonable policies that could enhance occupancy, including those contained in this report, should be carefully weighed against the cost of implementation.

To increase student utilization of residential space, Scion recommends migrating toward contracting with students individually, instead of by-the-apartment – the only exception being in the case of student families or where a phased-in approach in some buildings might be warranted.

In a per-person (or “per-bed”) environment rather than per-unit, furniture is typically provided that takes best advantage of available space while attempting to serve student comfort and convenience. Therefore, such a policy may require capital expenditures to provide desirable furniture. In addition to furnishings, additional expense may be needed for locks (perhaps separate, locking wardrobes), building upgrades to accommodate additional occupants and other improvements. In a per-bed environment, residents are financially responsible only for their own space, and not those of other occupants in the unit, except as to damages to unit common areas. Individual contracts provide significant benefits for students and are worthwhile to market specifically, highlighting these advantages as compared with the common “joint and several” leases students will encounter in nearly all off-campus arrangements.

Other policy changes that can improve revenue include:

- *Year-round revenue base*

Scion understands that in some locations, students are offered only an academic-year (approximately 9.5 month) contract, while in other locations an annual (12-month) contract is an option; for others still, a month-to-month option may be available. Unless space can be utilized efficiently during summer months by summer conferences

(which is a growing business), academic-year contracts will tend to require an increase in average annual vacancy allowances in the operating budget. Additionally, any space that becomes vacant due to a cancellation or termination – particularly after the Fall term has begun – is likely to remain vacant for some time and will adversely affect occupancy and revenues.

Scion recommends that only an annual contract be offered for returning students in the unit types and buildings enjoying the greatest demand, especially in non-traditional (“near campus”) apartment housing, which may temporarily continue to be contracted on a per-unit basis during a phased approach to a per-person contract policy. The duration of an annual contract should actually provide 50 weeks of access, so that there is a reasonable opportunity to properly prepare the space for the next occupants. If a resident renews an annual contract for the same space, that resident should be permitted to remain present during the interim (two-week) period at no additional charge.

Academic-term contracts should be offered only in buildings required to be available for summer conference housing. Summer conference housing appears to provide a strong return to supplement overall housing operations, and also appears to be increasing in demand.

In remaining areas where both academic and annual contract options are available, Scion recommends a financial incentive for residents to select an annual instead of academic contract term. If the monthly rate of an academic-term contract were only 5-10% lower than an annual contract and this option were properly marketed, it is likely that occupancy and overall revenue could be increased. The current policy, however, actually provides a financial incentive for students to reside on a month-to-month basis, as there is no extra cost and this choice virtually eliminates any financial obligation on their part beyond 30 days.

- *Early termination fees*

Presently at Broadway, a student may reserve a space for their exclusive use for up to a year, several months in advance of taking occupancy, representing a commitment of up to \$10,547 for a single apartment, including a meal plan. That student, however, may cancel the contract for any or no reason up to 15 days prior to scheduled occupancy without penalty. Within 15 days, there is an early termination fee of just \$150. Even after the scheduled start date, a resident may petition for early termination for a fee of \$100; if approved, the resident is charged \$9 per day remaining on his or her contract. Using First Year Experience residents in Broadway as an example, this represents less than 25% of their original financial commitment. Moreover, it is estimated that more than 90% of all returning students are in a month-to-month contract, resulting in no cancellation fee whatsoever simply by providing 30 days notice.

The above policies are so lenient that they are unquestionably reducing overall revenue. While colleges and universities generally offer more flexible cancellation policies than one might expect to find off-campus, the above policies are among the most generous Scion has encountered for individual students; they certainly bear no resemblance to what students will encounter later in life or even if attending another institution. While these policies are surely favorable to each individual student taking advantage of them, they are not necessarily in the best interest of students remaining in

the housing, because the higher vacancy unavoidably encouraged by lenient cancellation means higher vacancy costs must be borne by those that remain: higher vacancy means some combination of higher rates and/or reduced services.

Scion recommends that a significant fee – perhaps 50% of the entire remaining housing charges under the contract – be implemented for termination of the contract once it is signed. A reduced fee equivalent to two to four months of housing charges would be appropriate for early termination due to graduation, study abroad (through PSU), student teaching, international internships or similar academically-related program requirements, but only if PSU is notified in writing at least 60 days in advance. Because of the extreme difficulty in replacing terminated residents after approximately May 1 of each year, termination occurring after that time should require payment of full housing charges through the end of the contract term. Conversely, students terminating their meal plans should receive a somewhat more significant credit against the contract price of those plans given the imputed marginal savings in raw food costs for such a termination.

- *Billing and collections*

Scion supports the planned transition to PSU student accounts for the billing and collections of housing and food costs. However, residents should pay all room and board charges for each academic term prior to or near the beginning of each academic term, with sensitivity to the timing of financial aid credits for those affected. Again, this is common practice at most institutionally-owned and -operated housing; doing so simplifies accounting, reduces expenses and improves collections. Obviously, adjustments will need to be made to a student's account during the course of the term to reflect housing or dining changes that impact rates. A monthly billing option could be retained, but an additional service fee should apply.

Expenses

Scion has also reviewed expenses by comparing PSU data to industry standards, area operating costs as reported by the Institute of Real Estate Management and Scion's own experience. The chart on the following page indicates operating expenses of \$7.17 on a per-square-foot (PSF) basis. This figure is very close to what Scion would expect to see in a very efficient operation, especially when compared to other urban schools with similar number of students housed, where PSF costs have been as high as \$16.

Notably, however, the cost to operate on a per-resident basis is nearly 30% higher than what Scion recommends as a standard. This result clearly reflects the inordinate amount of space provided, on average, to each resident. The vast majority of this space is not located in common areas, which are relatively sparse. Rather, it is located inside residential units that often could accommodate more students to meet demand and improve efficiencies. In Scion's opinion, this inefficient use of space for student housing will continue to detract from the financial performance of the system.

All PSU Units FY2006

Contracts Sqft.

1641 918,872

Annual Operating Expenses	Suggested Per Bed*	Suggested PSF	Current Per Bed	Current Total	Current PSF
1. Utilities					
Electricity	\$ 140.00	\$ 0.35	\$ 189.56	\$ 311,062	\$ 0.34
Heating Fuel / Gas	\$ 160.00	\$ 0.40	\$ 227.71	\$ 373,673	\$ 0.41
Water / Sewer	\$ 140.00	\$ 0.35	\$ 209.31	\$ 343,480	\$ 0.37
Cable Television / Phone / Internet	\$ 240.00	\$ 0.60	\$ 207.18	\$ 339,981	\$ 0.37
Garbage/Recycling	\$ 60.00	\$ 0.15	\$ 44.22	\$ 72,558	\$ 0.08
Total	\$ 740.00	\$ 1.85	\$ 877.97	\$ 1,440,754	\$ 1.57
2. Maintenance Expenses					
Building and Grounds Maintenance	\$ 480.00	\$ 1.20	\$ 738.96	\$ 1,212,630	\$ 1.32
Custodial, Cleaning and Turnover	\$ 200.00	\$ 0.50	\$ 225.69	\$ 370,352	\$ 0.40
Custodial Supplies	\$ 8.00	\$ 0.02	\$ 12.88	\$ 21,138	\$ 0.02
Miscellaneous Rentals and Leases	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.32	\$ 518	\$ 0.00
Info Technology Eq., Data Processing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.15	\$ 11,726	\$ 0.01
Other Expenses / Misc.	\$ 80.00	\$ 0.20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 768.00	\$ 1.92	\$ 984.99	\$ 1,616,364	\$ 1.76
3. Residence Life Expenses					
Residence Life Program Costs	\$ 200.00	\$ 0.50	\$ 325.03	\$ 533,377	\$ 0.58
Admin Labor Assessment	\$ 100.00	\$ 0.25	\$ 133.92	\$ 219,758	\$ 0.24
Admin and Support Unit Labor Distributions**	\$ 160.00	\$ 0.40	\$ 393.00	\$ 644,910	\$ 0.70
Miscellaneous Admin Supplies	\$ 4.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 3.96	\$ 6,503	\$ 0.01
Furniture, Linen and Bedding	\$ 60.00	\$ 0.15	\$ 83.83	\$ 137,570	\$ 0.15
Postage and Freight	\$ 4.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 6.52	\$ 10,695	\$ 0.01
State and Institutional Assessments/Fees**	\$ 172.00	\$ 0.43	\$ 240.51	\$ 394,676	\$ 0.43
Marketing	\$ 20.00	\$ 0.05	\$ 9.47	\$ 15,541	\$ 0.02
Credit Processing	\$ 40.00	\$ 0.10	\$ 60.81	\$ 99,785	\$ 0.11
Miscellaneous Admin Service Expenses/Meal Plans**	\$ 348.00	\$ 0.87	\$ 485.93	\$ 797,405	\$ 0.87
Total	\$ 1,108.00	\$ 2.77	\$ 1,742.97	\$ 2,860,220	\$ 3.11
4. Mgmt. Fee, Insurance and Reserve Expenses					
Management Fee	\$ 256.00	\$ 0.64	\$ 360.25	\$ 591,177	\$ 0.64
Insurance	\$ 160.00	\$ 0.40	\$ 48.14	\$ 78,993	\$ 0.09
Reserves	\$ 120.00	\$ 0.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 536.00	\$ 1.34	\$ 408.39	\$ 670,170	\$ 0.73
Aggregate Operating Expenses	\$ 3,152.00	\$ 7.88	\$ 4,014.33	\$ 6,587,509	\$ 7.17

**Assuming 400 GSF per bed*

***Scion suggested is identical to PSU Actual*

PSU versus "Scion standard" on PSF basis is less by 9%
 PSU versus "Scion standard" on per bed basis is exceeded by 27%

Residence Life

There are many factors that might be used to determine the success of a housing operation, including the perceived value by residents, occupancy rates, return rates and GPA of residents versus non-residents. Many schools across the country – including PSU in 2005 – participate in a housing satisfaction survey prepared and analyzed by Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI). That survey is a sophisticated instrument that asks respondents to rate their overall satisfaction with their housing experience, as well as a number of other questions to determine which factors are likely to accurately predict overall satisfaction on each participating campus. EBI then compares institutional results with six other institutional benchmarks identified by each participating school.

Participation in the 2005 survey by PSU on-campus residents was relatively low (29%), so caution is advised when considering the results. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy, at least, to identify some trends revealed by the survey. There were no predictors of overall program effectiveness with a “high” or “extreme” impact, perhaps because of the low response rate, but of the top five predictors (all with “moderate” impact) on the survey, three of these fell within the general area of responsibilities of residence life professionals.

Residence Life at the University has a dotted-line responsibility to the associate director of auxiliaries, who serves as the chief housing officer. The Director of Residence Life reports directly to the Dean of Students, within the division of Student Affairs. While Auxiliaries focuses on the fiscal, facility, marketing, conferencing, occupancy and dining functions, Residence Life focuses more directly on developing a sense of community within each building, enhancing the educational experience for residents as well as processing violations of the housing contract and/or student behavioral standards. Both areas, however, are understandably concerned with elements of service, retention, safety, providing a generally positive experience for residents and ensuring enough of an income stream to support operations and further enhance the programs, services and facilities.

Of the top five PSU survey predictors of overall program effectiveness, the three that the Residence Life team likely influences the most are as follows:

- *Satisfaction with Staff and Policies* (Residence Life staff is the “face” of the University for residential students)
- *Satisfaction with Personal Growth Areas* (which relates to “the extent to which apartment living enhances your ability to” meet others, study more effectively, manage time efficiently, adopt a healthy lifestyle and appreciate different cultures)
- *Satisfaction with Ability to Sleep & Study* (“without interruption”)

Notably, PSU’s performance on the first two predictors, as defined by EBI and based on respondents, is “good.” Performance on the third predictor above (Ability to Sleep & Study) is “fair” and ranks last when compared with the six other institutions selected by PSU as benchmark participants.

Thus, of the top five predictors, the ability to “sleep and study” seems to provide the greatest opportunity for improvement in something that matters in resident satisfaction. While the ability to sleep uninterrupted may be influenced by construction of buildings, the urban environment, and other factors, it is probably most influenced by the behavior of fellow residents and their guests. Scion’s experience is that the resident assistant (RA) staff can provide a significant impact in educating the community, communicating reasonable standards and holding residents accountable to community standards.

Generally, to improve the ability of the RA staff to succeed, the following ingredients are essential components:

- The RA position must be attractive to interest the most reliable, mature and respected students on campus.
- The RA-to-resident ratio should be reflective of the scope of work and population served.
- Training and mentoring (supervision) are critical, so the supervisor-to-RA ratio should also be considered.

Resident staffing levels

Quite often, students with the same class standing tend to congregate in the same housing areas on many campuses. This may be encouraged intentionally by the school, but it also happens through natural self-selection. The types of accommodations that may be of interest and available to first- and second-year students and those attractive to upper-division students are different. Preferences also generally differ among graduate students and again for students with dependents. As diversity of unit mix increases, these differences may become more evident, especially with the existence of specific freshmen living-learning communities. While individual preferences will of course vary, the full range of demographic preferences appears to exist at PSU.

Therefore, based on the importance of staffing ratios and the particular conditions at PSU, Scion recommends the following RA staffing levels as a general guideline for balancing system-wide (excluding special staffing for learning communities):

- Up to 1:35 for first-year student areas
- Up to 1:40 in a mixed, first- and second-year area
- Up to 1:45 for second-year student areas
- Up to 1:60 for junior and senior areas
- Up to 1:90 for areas predominately for graduate students
- Up to 1:200 for areas predominately for students with dependents

Because of the importance of mentoring and providing support for RA staff, as well as potential exposure, Scion does not recommend RA supervision by other undergraduate students, no matter how mature or responsible. Cost effective and valuable supervision can be provided, however, by graduate students serving in an assigned graduate assistantship (GA) or like role. A GA as a hall director will sometimes have the time and interest to devote up to 30 hours per week to fulfilling the responsibilities of the position, particularly if enrolled in a related program. Some two-year master-level programs require an internship during the second year, returning to campus at scheduled intervals depending on the program.

Scion recommends that for a good experience for the University, the GA and the RA, the GA role should include direct supervision of about eight RAs, rotating campus duty and back-up duty scheduling, and at least one system-wide coordinating responsibility. Scion has researched schools within a day's drive of campus that offer programs with students who may be interested in this experience for the compensation and/or to fulfill program requirements. Compensation typically includes a private apartment, a meal package and a stipend that varies in part on whether the home school is willing to provide a tuition waiver as part of this

experience. Without a tuition waiver, Scion has seen stipends range from \$500 to \$1500 per month, generally without a benefits package.

Supervision of the GA staff should be fulfilled by full-time professionals (such as Area Coordinators) who should also reside on-campus in apartments with a meal plan, and provide campus crisis response on a rotating basis. Because the focus is residence life, community development and crisis intervention (rather than facility management), a graduate degree in counseling, college student personnel or higher education administration would be highly desirable, in addition to previous successful resident staff experience. Scion recommends up to four GAs within an area supervised by one AC, in addition to managing a system-wide responsibility.

Living-Learning Communities (LLC)

The First Year Experience (FYE) program at PSU is exciting, as it often is rewarding to participants and aligned with institutional mission. Successful LLCs have the potential for improving satisfaction with campus living, which also results in increased retention and financial performance. Additionally, they bring increased recognition to the residence life program and the University. Still, to reap the greatest rewards of an LLC requires commitment on the part of residence life staff beyond “normal” residence life programming efforts, investment and collaboration by academic affairs and facilities designed to help such learning communities flourish.

In the past, the FYE director has spent an inordinate amount of time (estimated at 440 hours annually) on housing assignments, rather than on strengthening the programmatic elements of the program. Future coordination of assignments should probably be managed centrally using the anticipated new technology, with assistance from the FYE director. Additionally, new part-time resident positions have been added within the FYE communities to focus on programs that connect with faculty and academic pursuits. Scion supports this additional staffing level for LLC above and beyond the recommended RA-to-student ratios stated above.

Student Affairs, Academic Affairs and Auxiliary operations should work collaboratively to explore additional programs and options for freshmen, but also for sophomores and possibly others. Learning communities on other campuses that might be appropriate for PSU include women in science and engineering, the performing arts, staying fit and healthy, and community service.

The best LLC programs appear to be those with more structure, rather than less. Participation may involve specific eligibility criteria, a separate application and addendum to the housing contract specifying special privileges and participation requirements, even academic credit or notation on transcripts. The role of faculty mentorship, because of the impact on undergraduate education, may be as valuable to the University as research or publishing and therefore should be acknowledged and supported.

Future campus housing should be designed with the physical space to support LLCs, such as classrooms, faculty offices, small group meeting spaces, resource rooms, etc. Student Affairs should explore partnerships with academic departments to provide priority scheduling for classroom and office space, as a perk, for those who co-sponsor an LLC.

Occupancy Management

There does not appear to be enough capacity to meet current demand among students, and certainly not enough to meet enrollment management objectives of additional, traditional-aged students. Every space is needed to accommodate students, at least until additional inventory can be provided. Scion recommends eliminating the University's guarantee to provide housing for freshmen and the out-of-state and international student populations until sufficient space exists or, at minimum, to move the deadline for guaranteed housing to a date earlier in the year.

Eligibility standards

Presently, except for students in the FYE program, campus housing is generally assigned per unit/apartment to an individual student on a month-to-month basis, who may designate any other occupant as a roommate (including non-students) for an additional \$50/month. Though well intended, this policy generally does not create a sound business model nor position the school to offer the best combination of programs, services and facilities for future generations of students.

Scion recommends eliminating the option for residents to select another roommate for an additional \$50 per month. As noted above, housing should be available to students on an individual, per-person basis. As appropriate, this could be a "grandfathered" policy for current residents who are utilizing this option for one additional year. If allowed, this exception should not only be on a limited, temporary basis, but also should be restricted to only certain buildings. Still, all residents (including grandfathered roommates with the \$50/month extra fee), should be required to have PSU affiliation. Having people live in the building who are not affiliated with the school, unless they are documented dependents of those that are, raises questions regarding security as well as the housing's tax-exempt status.

Elimination of the month-to-month option is also recommended. Occupancy planning, especially when a policy of guaranteed housing exists, becomes very difficult in a month-to-month environment. Meeting the needs of the entering class can therefore result in additional expenses (the need for unanticipated temporary housing) or lost enrollment altogether (applicants choosing to enroll elsewhere where campus housing is provided). Housing applicants should certify (in the contract) that they intend to remain a student (which requires definition) during the entire duration of the contract. The resident should be required to inform the housing office of any change in student eligibility status. The agreements should clearly explain the method and charges associated with early termination, so that applicants apply with the intent of remaining for the full term of the contract and understand that early termination charges will apply even if student status ends.

Specific areas restricted to students with families should be established to accommodate some of that market, either on-campus or through an affiliation with other providers. Units designated for this population should be assigned per apartment, and not per person, but should not be inter-mixed within the same campus building. The definition of "family," (especially extended family), should be clearly communicated along with maximum occupancy limits.

Marketing

Current information refers to PSU housing options as "On-Campus, Near Campus Buildings and Overflow Housing." To more clearly identify the new organization and for

marketing purposes, the website and collateral material should be revised. In doing so, Scion recommends identification of options as follows:

1. “Campus Housing” (the 11 PSU-managed on-campus buildings), including “Temporary Housing” (PSU-managed overflow housing at University Place and possibly other facilities)
2. “Affiliated Housing” (off-campus housing with information/application material promoted through the PSU website and/or collateral material if agreements are reached with NWH or others)
3. “Off-campus Housing” (simply a listing of links/resources for other off-campus housing options for members of the PSU community)

It is important to clearly distinguish between those properties that are managed and/or billed through the University and those that are not. It is not clear what is currently meant by “near campus housing,” as there are geographically close residential units that are not included in the current “near campus” category. Also, it is recommended that the reference to “low income residents” be dropped from the Communities tab on the web site (<http://www.housingnorthwest.org/psu/>), because no reference to income of applicants, whether students or not, is made at any of the building links that follow

The campus housing office should be a stop on all tours for prospective students, and someone from the marketing team should be available for a brief presentation and to field questions. There is no need for security deposits if all residents are affiliated with PSU (or are dependents of University affiliates), now that the University will handle collections. This is also a benefit for students and will provide a market advantage for the University. However, Scion recommends a pre-payment to reserve a space for all new students, refundable only if they do not matriculate at PSU and notify the housing office by May 1 of the application year. After May 1 and whenever a returning student (no pre-payment necessary) submits a contract to reserve a space, there should be no cancellation permitted without significant fees and/or extraordinary circumstances.

The current marketing process results in an inordinate amount of time to track all current vacancies and show only those units, whenever contacted by a prospective resident. Not only is this time-consuming, but it likely contributes to the ten percent vacancy currently experienced. Although this approach is customary in off-campus multi-family residential communities and may be necessary at PSU in a month-to-month environment, it is certainly not ideal. An academic or annual required contract term will be easier to administer, fits the schedules for the vast majority of full-time students and is more closely aligned with student recruitment and enrollment cycles. In marketing and contracting on a per-person basis, the student typically enters into an agreement for a specific type of housing (single or double space in a residence hall or apartment, for example), and at a specified rate. However, the specific assignment by the University is not often confirmed until a 60 day window prior to move-in, which makes touring all unit types much less critical than if students contract for a specific unit.

Temporary housing

Arranging for temporary housing for some students is a necessary process in high-demand markets, including PSU. Doing so provides campus housing to a higher percent of students who apply than would otherwise be possible. If a student request for campus housing cannot

be confirmed – especially a new student – this sometimes results in losing the student to another institution ready to commit to campus housing.

To prevent this from occurring, several suggestions have been noted previously, including requiring students to pay significant fees who reserve a space but then cancel, increasing density where that can be accomplished reasonably to provide more opportunities for campus housing, and eliminating month-to-month terms. A key element in the process is managing “no-shows.” Because there will always be some would-be residents that fail to identify themselves as having changed their plans until the very last minute – or perhaps not until the housing staff visually confirms no-show status – Scion recommends over-booking and utilizing temporary housing for these students until all the no-show spaces are identified.

This “over-booking” process is accomplished by determining the number of residents that could be temporarily accommodated in reasonable accommodations, including University Place and by an extra roommate in some residence hall rooms, as well as the number of no-shows that have occurred in each of the last several years. Scion recommends a limit of temporary assignments (over-booking) that equals the number of reasonable accommodations identified, but capped at no more than 50% of the average number of no-shows actually experienced during recent years, unless the University is prepared to maintain “temporary” placements all year. Of course, the number of no-shows each year will fluctuate in part as policies change to improve access and occupancy. Also, because of public relations issues, managing this process fairly and carefully is crucial and should include significant communication in advance and appropriate discounts for students affected by temporary housing.

Safety/Security

Some safety and security items are addressed in the operations review above and facility assessment below. Primary recommendations on this topic are summarized as follows:

- Install fully functional cameras to record activity at building entrances and perimeter alleys, as well as interior areas of added risk including laundry rooms, bike storage rooms and possibly some stairwells.
- Improve lighting and trim back exterior landscaping in some locations near walks and building entrances.
- Do not allow residents to invite an unrelated person to move in and share campus accommodations.

Section 3: Facility Assessment

Introduction

Scion conducted a series of building condition surveys to determine the status and condition of each of the residence halls located on the PSU campus, including Blackstone Residence Hall, King Albert Residence Hall, The Montgomery, The Parkway, Saint Helens Residence Hall, Ondine, Stratford, Broadway, Stephen Epler Hall and West Residence Hall.

The visual survey of each residence hall was conducted to provide a cursory overview of each building, but did not include an in-depth investigation of the facilities or testing of building components. Supplemental information utilized during the survey that was provided by the PSU Auxiliary Services Group included basic architectural information and building data. The information provided was used as a guideline to review and confirm the accuracy of current conditions of each building.

As part of the building evaluation and condition surveys, Scion conducted interviews and meetings with key personnel from the physical plant, facilities management, IT, parking, public safety and outside contractors. The discussions were conducted to provide a first-hand opinion of the existing conditions from the people who are responsible for the maintenance, security and safety of the buildings and its residents. In addition to the building surveys, Scion conducted a visual observation of the areas surrounding the residence halls to evaluate the condition of the exterior grounds surrounding the buildings as related to general pedestrian traffic patterns, vehicular traffic patterns, illumination during nighttime hours and other potential public concerns.

In general, the range of issues observed reflects what would appear to be continued general routine maintenance of the facilities and the grounds surrounding the buildings, but without defined capital improvement planning and program implementation. All issues observed can be corrected by establishing a comprehensive multi-year strategic master plan of buildings and grounds designed to meet the objectives of the University with regards to current and future student housing demands and financial requirements.

Summary of Observations

Daytime visual observations to the exterior and interiors of the buildings and surrounding areas were conducted on August 28-31, 2006 between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. each day.

Daytime observations to the exterior of each building were performed to view the condition of building walls/components, exterior of the windows, entry/exits, walkways, driveways/vehicular traffic flow, pedestrian traffic patterns, landscape and more. Roofs, gutters and downspout systems were also viewed from ground level with binoculars.

Scion also performed daytime visual observation to the interior of the buildings, which provided evaluation of various areas including student rooms, mechanical areas, electrical rooms, storage areas, washroom facilities, laundry areas, window conditions, ceiling systems and flooring conditions. The type, quality and adequacy of various building components and materials were viewed at from a visual evaluation perspective of condition only, and were not thoroughly investigated or tested for any other purposes.

Existing design conditions and floor layout at each student residence hall were visually observed in regard to daily and routine activities by students and staff, with focus on flow and function between entries/exits, security devices, elevators, washrooms, student rooms, student

lounge areas, study areas and more. Emergency egress patterns and fire exiting stairwells were reviewed as well.

Nighttime visual observations to the exterior of the residence halls and the grounds surrounding the buildings were conducted between August 28th and August 31st, 2006 at approximately 9:00 p.m. each day.

Nighttime visual observations to the exterior areas surrounding the student residence halls provided opportunity to evaluate the illumination of the general area of each building at exit/entry locations. Also nighttime visual observations of the landscaping around each building were conducted to evaluate safety issues.

General Evaluation Comments

With respect to the various documents and information compiled and provided by the PSU Auxiliary Services Group, in most cases the information provided for each residence hall was found to be fairly accurate. However, information is outdated for some major building components. Further, while most building systems were found to have been extremely well maintained, many continue to deteriorate due to the lack of availability of some parts. This seems to have impacted specific components such as boilers, heating systems, life safety lighting and electrical systems.

After visiting all properties, reviewing the information and discussing the observations with others, Scion recommends a complete and concise study of each building be performed in order to fully evaluate the need for either a comprehensive multi-year phased capital improvement program to rehabilitate the existing properties, or a plan to demolish certain buildings. Ideas regarding planning for new buildings to meet student housing needs for the University are also presented below.

Areas of concern due to the relative age of several buildings include asbestos and ADA compliance. The probability of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) is high. This is a rather costly task to address, which includes identification and containment or removal. Scion recommends a study of each building to determine the various types and locations of the ACM. This procedure will be required whether buildings are demolished or renovated. Further, many facilities do not adequately address the ADA guidelines; this too should be considered when determining whether to renovate an existing building.

While visiting the various residence halls Scion concluded that the current facilities for physical activities are either limited or not conveniently located. Several residents shared comments regarding the location of current “work-out” facilities, the distance and route of travel, as well as access to the equipment. Scion learned of plans for new facilities planned to enhance opportunities for physical fitness, but consideration for placing various types of exercise equipment in underutilized areas of existing or in newly planned buildings would be worthwhile. A small or limited “work-out” facility located within a reasonable distance of the student residence halls would be most desirable.

Generally, the range of problems viewed reflects the need for a clear and concise facilities capital improvement plan. Existing concerns include potential mechanical systems failures due to age, inadequate electrical power systems and devices, insufficient lighting systems, insufficient Internet access systems and inadequate ventilation systems within washroom and laundry facilities. Additionally, landscaping around some buildings require attention, although recent efforts have resulted in noticeable cosmetic improvements. In some cases current conditions may jeopardize safety.

Recommendations

A comprehensive three- to five-year phased master renovation plan for most buildings should be initiated while discussions for an overall master re-development plan continue. Within this master plan for the renovation of the individual buildings, major components should include interior redesign, exterior surroundings, life-safety issues, ADA compliance, common area improvements to encourage community development and enhancing the overall ambiance of the buildings and campus. The end result must be that of a fully functional building with exterior perimeter areas designed to meet concerns such that residents, parents and the University will feel comfortable.

Newer Residence Buildings (Broadway, West Hall, Epler Hall, Ondine*)

As these particular buildings are of newer construction, Scion has little to recommend for them at this time. However, a re-visit to these buildings should occur once the determination has been made as to opportunities to enhance underutilization of space. In general, wherever increased density of residents can comfortably occur, it is recommended. Opportunities to do so in these buildings exist, but further study is recommended to include the impact of increased density on the following:

- Elevator usage
- Electrical distribution/usage
- Domestic water supply systems
- Plumbing systems, waste and vent lines
- Heating and ventilation systems
- Life safety issues
- Resident traffic within stairwells, hallways and/or corridors
- Additional needs for security systems
- Toilet exhaust systems
- Enhancing common-area space

In general, the buildings listed above were found to be in good repair, well maintained and aesthetically pleasing.

* Ondine, as Scion was informed, has undergone several improvement projects. While the building was found to be in good condition, Scion recommends that the general areas of the residence floors be reviewed the following:

- Lighting levels in resident rooms and common areas
- Upgrades to ceilings, walls and flooring systems
- Life safety upgrades, including emergency lighting
- Apartment access systems (locksets, card access systems, etc.)

Other Properties (Stratford, Parkway, Blackstone, St. Helens, King Albert, Montgomery)

The Stratford Building and the Parkway Building are each over 70 years old and in need of many upgrades of major building components. Clearly, it would be very expensive to renovate and upgrade these properties. Therefore, replacement by a new multi-use building to serve both

housing and academic needs should be considered. Scion believes that these properties, due to their location with other parcels of adjacent property owned by the University, would be an ideal setting for a new student residential development.

Montgomery Court should be considered for historic renovation, but the capacity it would provide to the housing inventory would not justify the expense to the housing system, especially given that the current design of community bathrooms is not generally attractive to students. Therefore, Scion recommends that the building be restored to a functional multi-use building of offices and classrooms.

The remaining buildings, including Blackstone, St. Helens and King Albert, are generally contiguous to campus and add to architectural integrity. Some detailed use planning for these properties with respect to occupancy management is suggested, but the buildings enhance the beauty of the PSU campus and have been well maintained.

Indeed, all buildings have been generally maintained well. Therefore, this information should be considered as recommendations for enhancement. A detailed budget for renovations, upgrades and repairs for each building follows.

Portland State University

The Blackstone Residence Hall

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Totals
Roof System											
Annual roof inspections and annual roof repairs	Inspection \$ 500.00	Replacement \$125,000.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	\$ 129,000.00
Façade											
Masonry façade inspections and general maintenance (Power wash building to remove moss build up)	Maintenance \$ 15,000.00		Inspec. Maint. \$ 1,500.00		Inspec. Maint. \$ 2,000.00		Inspec. Maint. \$ 2,500.00			Inspec. Maint. \$ 3,000.00	\$ 24,000.00
Window Replacement											
Replacement of all windows	\$ 300,000.00										\$ 300,000.00
Lighting											
Interior hallway/corridor general lighting	\$ 35,000.00										\$ 35,000.00
Exterior building lighting for safety purposes	\$ 10,000.00										\$ 10,000.00
EM & Exit lighting											
Interior hallway/corridor emergency battery back-up lighting and exit signage	\$ 25,000.00										\$ 25,000.00
Water Heater											
Domestic water heater maintenance, repairs and replacement		Replacement \$ 18,000.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 800.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 800.00	\$ 20,600.00
Boiler											
Boiler, maintenance, repair and replacement (Annual maintenance program)	Gen. Maint. \$ 1,500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Replacement \$ 125,000.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	\$ 130,500.00
Electrical Distribution System											
Miscellaneous electrical upgrades	\$ 25,000.00										\$ 25,000.00
Apartment Revisions											
Eliminate the existing "sleeper units" and studio apartments and convert to one bedroom apartments (all trades)	\$ 300,000.00										
										Sub-Total	\$ 699,100.00

Portland State University

The King Albert Residence Hall

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Totals
Roof System											
Annual roof inspections and annual roof repairs	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Inspection \$ 500.00	Replacement \$ 110,000.00	\$ 114,500.00
Façade											
Masonry façade inspections and general maintenance		Inspection \$ 500.00		Inspection \$ 500.00		Inspection \$ 500.00		Inspection \$ 500.00		Inspection \$ 500.00	\$ 2,500.00
Fire Escape											
Fire escape to be inspected by a licensed structural engineer. General maintenance as required.	Inspection \$ 1,500.00			Inspection \$ 1,800.00			Inspection \$ 2,000.00			Inspection \$ 2,250.00	\$ 7,550.00
	Maintenance \$ 1,200.00			Maintenance \$ 1,250.00			Maintenance \$ 1,400.00			Maintenance \$ 1,500.00	\$ 5,350.00
Lighting											
Interior hallway/corridor general lighting	\$ 25,000.00										\$ 25,000.00
EM & Exit lighting											
Interior hallway/corridor emergency battery back-up lighting and exit signage	\$ 25,000.00										\$ 25,000.00
Water Heater											
Domestic water heater maintenance, repairs and replacement		Replacement \$ 12,000.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 800.00		Gen. Maint. \$ 800.00	\$ 14,600.00
Boiler											
Boiler, maintenance, repair and replacement (Annual maintenance program)	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Gen. Maint. \$ 500.00	Replacement \$ 65,000.00	\$ 69,000.00
Electrical Distribution System											
New electrical service upgrade	\$ 65,000.00										\$ 65,000.00
New electrical distribution system upgrades with new wiring, additional power outlets and devices	\$ 115,000.00										\$ 115,000.00
										Sub-Total	\$ 443,500.00

Portland State University

Montgomery Court

As the Montgomery Court Building has served many purposes in the past, and continues to do so with it's rich history, it is recommended that this building be considered for historic renovation. This is especially true of the main level of the building. It could prove to be one of the many architectural and aesthetic focal points on the campus. With the recommendation to upgrade and increase occupancy at other residence halls it is unlikely that this building would be needed for residents.

We believe that this building should undergo a complete renovation and restore it to a full and functional multi-use building to include staff offices, faculty offices and department and facilities related offices. Other purposes could include classrooms, meeting rooms for both small and large groups and several multi purpose conference or presentation rooms.

Considering that this would be a major renovation project that would most likely take several years of work, we are suggesting a multi-year project budget as noted below. Please note that our original evaluation included a budget of approximately \$35.00/SF for repairs, replacements and upgrades and did not reflect a renovation project of this nature.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Totals
Soft Costs/Design Fees	\$ 100,000.00										\$ 100,000.00
Roof System		\$ 125,000.00									\$ 125,000.00
Façade		\$ 25,000.00									\$ 25,000.00
Window Replacement Program		\$ 300,000.00									\$ 300,000.00
Electrical Power Distribution System		\$ 150,000.00									\$ 150,000.00
Boiler System		\$ 115,000.00									\$ 115,000.00
EM lighting & Exit Signage			\$ 75,000.00								\$ 75,000.00
General lighting Systems			\$ 85,000.00								\$ 85,000.00
Life Safety/Fire Protection Systems			\$ 85,000.00								\$ 85,000.00
Plumbing Systems			\$ 125,000.00								\$ 125,000.00
Internet/Data/Cable Systems			\$ 75,000.00								\$ 75,000.00
Academic Space			\$ 400,000.00								\$ 400,000.00
Office Space			\$ 400,000.00								\$ 400,000.00
Landscape Revisions			\$ 25,000.00								\$ 25,000.00
FF &E			\$ 150,000.00								\$ 150,000.00
Contingency			\$ 100,000.00								\$ 100,000.00
	Building Sq. Ftg. 43,320 Cost per sq. ft. = \$ 48.71										Total \$ 2,110,000.00

Section 4: Student Housing Programming

Scion has reviewed the *Student Housing Study* completed by Anderson Strickler, LLC in 2005 to calculate target capacity of 3,401 total beds of on-campus student housing (a combination of the 1,535 students in on-campus housing and 1,866 additional students who could be captured). Based on enrollment data provided by PSU’s Office of Institutional Research, the Committee Approved Facilities Planning Target Enrollment and Scion’s own research, Scion believes this target can be accomplished. For the purposes of this report, Scion has used the 2006-07, 2011-12 and 2017-18 academic years as benchmark dates (coinciding with the dates contemplated by Committee Approved Facilities Planning Target Enrollment). Reviewing the data provided by PSU, Scion assumes total enrollment to be as follows in the benchmark years:

Academic Year	Total Enrollment
2006-07	26,049
2011-12	29,716
2017-18	35,000

Further, Scion assumes that approximately one-third of campus beds will be occupied by freshman students and two-thirds among all other students (continuing students, new transfers, graduate students, etc). This is based on the results of the *Student Housing Study*, in which Scion calculates total demand to be distributed among classes as follows:

Class	Occupancy	% of Total Demand
Freshman	1,110	32.6%
Sophomore	403	11.8%
Junior	601	17.7%
Senior	670	19.7%
Graduate	340	10.0%
Other	277	8.1%
TOTAL	3,401	100%

Based on the existing on-campus housing inventory of predominately private bedroom apartment units and the institutional priority to transition first-time freshmen to more traditional on-campus housing, Scion has projected a unit type interest that contemplates 100% semi-suite style units for freshmen and a 10%-90% split of semi-suite and apartment units among all other students. Semi-suite units consist of one or two bedrooms and a bathroom, with no living room or cooking facilities (defined by PSU as “sleeper”). The 10%-90% split of semi-suite to apartment interest for non-freshman students is based on Scion’s experience and feedback from PSU student focus group participants.

Based on projected demand and unit type interest, Scion projects unit type demand for on-campus housing to be 1,683 semi-suite style beds and 1,718 apartment beds, calculated as follows:

Student Cohort	Total Demand	Unit Type Interest		Unit Type Demand	
		Semi-Suite	Apartment	Semi-suite	Apartment
First-Year Freshmen	1,110	100%	0%	1,110	0
Continuing & Transfer Students	2,291	10%	90%	229	2,062
TOTAL	3,401	-	-	1,339	2,062

PSU's current unmet demand of 2,010 beds includes a shortfall of 1,070 semi-suite beds and 940 apartment-style beds. These figures are based on total designed capacity of 1,391 beds as expressed by 269 semi-suite beds and 1,122 apartment beds, and also assume that no private bedrooms are converted to double occupancy.

A graphical summary of this methodology follows:

Unit Type	Unit Type Demand	Existing Beds	Current Unmet Demand
Semi-Suite	1,339	269	1,070
Apartment	2,062	1,122	940
TOTAL	3,401	1,391	2,010

Unit Mix & Housing Inventory

Regardless of enrollment trends, PSU must address the need to improve and/or renovate several of its existing student housing facilities. Considerations of demand coupled with Scion's review of facilities have resulted in the following program recommendations toward the 2011-12 benchmark:

Facility	Scion Recommendation
Blackstone	Convert semi-suite and studio units to one-bedroom apts
Broadway	Convert to double bedroom occupancy on six floors
Epler	Convert rooms to double occupancy
King Albert	Maintain
Montgomery	Re-purpose for non-housing use
Ondine	Convert to double occupancy in all semi-suite units
Parkway	Demolish
St. Helen's	Maintain
Stratford	Demolish
West Hall	Convert rooms to double occupancy

Should PSU adopt Scion's recommendations, and assuming some rooms in Broadway, Epler, Ondine and West Hall are lost to the addition of common areas (mainly floor lounges), its housing inventory would be 1,741 total beds, including 181 semi-suite beds and 1,560 apartment style beds.

Taking into account current demand, this would leave an unmet demand of 1,660 total beds – 1,158 semi-suite and 502 apartment style. The following is a summary of this methodology:

Facility	Current Beds	Recommended Beds (2011-12)	Beds Gained/Lost	Remaining Semi-Suite Beds	Remaining Apartment Beds
Blackstone	56	41	-15	0	41
Broadway	383	624	+241	-	624
Epler	130	250	+120	-	250
King Albert	64	64	0	-	64
Montgomery	144	0	-144	0	0
Ondine	289	373	+84	180	193
Parkway	54	0	-54	0	0
St. Helen's	51	51	0	1	50
Stratford	31	0	-31	-	0
West Hall	189	338	+ 149	-	338
TOTAL	1,391	1,741	+350	181	1,560
			Current Demand	1,339	2,062
			UNMET DEMAND	1,158	502

Taking into account all of the previous factors, including the projected unmet demand resulting from Scion's facility recommendations for 2011-12, Scion recommends that PSU proceed with the new construction of 650 semi-suite style residence hall beds to open by 2011-12. Along with the increased density of Broadway, Epler, Ondine and West Hall units, these new beds will provide a traditional community living experience for primarily first-time freshman students.

Due to the near-term priority being placed on maximizing revenue and capitalizing on efficiency such that student housing is cash-flow positive, Scion does not recommend concurrent construction to address total student demand by the 2011-12 benchmark. However, once revenue and occupancy are stabilized following the opening of the new facility, Scion recommends the new construction of 510 residence hall beds and 500 apartment-style beds.

The resulting capacity at each benchmark appears on the follows page.

Facility	Current Beds (2006-07)		Recommended Beds (2011-12)		Recommended Beds (2017-18)	
	Semi-Suite	Apartment	Semi-Suite	Apartment	Semi-Suite	Apartment
Blackstone	16	40	0	41	0	41
Broadway	-	383	-	624	-	624
Epler	-	130	-	250	-	250
King Albert	-	64	-	64	-	64
Montgomery	143	1	0	0	0	0
Ondine	96	193	180	193	180	193
Parkway	13	41	0	0	0	0
St. Helen's	1	50	1	50	1	50
Stratford	-	31	-	0	-	0
West Hall	-	189	-	338	-	338
New Residence Hall 2011	-	-	650	-	650	-
New Residence Hall 2017	-	-	-	-	510	-
New Apartments	-	-	-	-	-	500
Total Bed Type	269	1,122	831	1,560	1,341	2,060
Total Beds in Inventory	1,391		2,391		3,401	

Facility and Program Design

In general, a mix of units and options will appeal to the broadest possible market for the longest period of time. Semi-private bathrooms are a necessity in new construction, with no more than four students to a compartmentalized bathroom. Additionally, more community space for first- and second-year communities and more privacy in bedrooms for juniors and seniors are both desirable. Scion has found, and PSU focus group participants confirm, that older students will gladly sacrifice space for privacy if they are unable to afford both.

For the 2011-12 benchmark, the 650 new residence hall beds contemplated by Scion should be built as semi-suite rooms. Semi-suite rooms are defined as one or two bedrooms sharing a bathroom with no kitchen (currently defined by PSU as “sleepers”). There should be options for both single- and double-occupancy bedrooms in the semi-suite units, which will satisfy the demand for privacy among upper-division students, providing a community that includes non-freshman students as role models. Further, semi-suite style units will be the most attractive to a variety of summer conference groups. Scion recommends this facility be constructed near the Broadway and Ondine facilities, in the Broadway/Jackson area. This will allow for the higher density facilities, which will attract younger students, to be located near one another, and for greater proximity to the existing student dining facility. Dining capacity needs should be assessed as well, in conjunction with construction of additional semi-suite beds (which will require a mandatory dining plan).

For the 2017-18 benchmark, the 500 apartment style units should consist of entirely private bedrooms in four-bedroom quad-occupancy units and two-bedroom double-occupancy units. PSU students indicate a strong preference for private bedrooms through the *Student Housing Study* and, moreover, lower cost shared-bedroom units will exist in Broadway, Epler, Ondine and West Hall. Each apartment should have one compartmentalized bathroom, although there is some demand for

two bathrooms in the four-bedroom units. Scion recommends that this facility be located on the existing University Place site. This would be attractive to older students, who value freedom and a feeling that they are not living directly on the campus.

The 510 residence hall beds for the 2017-18 benchmark do not necessarily have to be built as semi-suite units. While Scion believes that semi-suite units are best suited for the 2011-12 benchmark, these units may not be as attractive to students in 2017. Still, Scion does not believe that this needs to be built as apartment units, and recommends a careful examination of both semi-suite and suite-style units at the time this project reaches the preliminary planning stages. Suite style units include one to eight bedrooms sharing a bathroom(s) and living room with no kitchen facility. Suite-style units may provide sophomore and junior students with an increased level of privacy and space they desire while continuing to remain on a meal plan as an interim step between semi-suite and apartment. Scion recommends this facility be located near West and Epler halls, in the Market/Twelfth area. Additionally, semi-suite space can be offered less expensively to students than apartment space.

Specific recommendations for the program and design of new facilities include:

- Dedicate space for all first-time freshman students to live on campus. Once sufficient capacity exists, on-campus housing for these students should be guaranteed, provided they apply by a reasonable date.
- Continue to provide academic space in new residential facilities, and also establish greater academic-residential connections by providing some high-tech wired classrooms/seminar rooms in new residence facilities that are dedicated to academic departments wishing to partner with living/learning program initiatives. Most should be able to accommodate 25 to 40 students, but one conference room for about twelve and a lecture hall, if needed on campus, of about 300, all with wireless Internet connectivity, should also be considered.
- If possible, provide offices for student affairs and academic support staff to coordinate programs and provide one-on-one guidance and advising.
- Consider the elimination of land-line telephone access in student bedrooms to save cost. With so many students using mobile phones it is possible that the installation of voice access in each bedroom is not worth the cost. Further, PSU should consider the implementation voice over Internet protocol (VoIP) technology in new facilities.
- If financially feasible, incorporate some parking spaces into new facilities. There is currently no pronounced need for on-campus parking among residential students; however, the inclusion of short-term loading and overnight guest parking can be an attractive feature of any housing facility. Further, the creation of additional parking can help to absorb any increased parking demand that occurs as a result of increased enrollment.
- Ideally, residents need access to a large multipurpose or community room for various types of programs, activities, training sessions, socials and meetings. Such spaces should be included in any new construction. This is particularly important for the facilities designed to attract first-time freshman students.
- Use abuse resistant (AR) drywall in living and common areas of the new facilities. Further, carefully select a sound attenuation strategy for wall assembly for the room-demising walls. Sound transmission is a common complaint among students in new construction residential facilities.
- Consider offering twelve-month (50-week) contracts on a reduced rent basis. This is particularly true for apartments. Apartments are less attractive to summer conference

groups, but they do attract older students (junior and above) during the academic year. Scion has found on several campuses that many older students would chose to live on-campus through the summer if a 5-10% discount were applied to their monthly rent.

- Consider the creation of designated communities for students over the age of 21. Such a community would appeal to those older students seeking an environment away from students they view as less mature. This is particularly important as the University continues to attract an increasing number of traditional college-age students.
- Foster a “campus community” concept for student housing facilities, where residents may bring non-residents into the building so they may study, eat, attend programs and classes, meet with academic support staff and use computing resources. This openness increases student interaction and involvement and also helps deter individual hall isolation, group-think and related behavior.
- Continue to construct “green buildings.” With the Oregon University System favoring the construction of facilities that are environmentally friendly, building to LEED-certified standards is a requirement. Further, the opportunity exists to create a “sustainable living” learning community within a green building.

Section 5: Student Housing Financial Analysis

The following analysis demonstrates likely financial performance of PSU housing in Fall 2011 and 2017, should Scion's recommended expansion, renovation and demolition all be undertaken.

The first two spreadsheets that immediately follow this page show both the current and recommended 2011 programs. The recommended program reflects adjusted pricing to most closely match demand and market conditions (expressed in Fall 2011 figures), as well as adjusted occupancy based on likely demand for the various buildings and unit types.

On the recommended program spreadsheet, Scion has made the following assumptions:

- Total capacity reflects Scion's recommendations:
 - Density is increased in Broadway, Epler, Ondine and West Hall (with some rooms lost due to addition of common areas)
 - Demolition of Stratford and Parkway
 - Montgomery Court is re-purposed for non-housing use
 - A new 650-bed semi-suite residence hall

The third spreadsheet combines the costs to implement Scion's recommendations for increased density (primarily furniture costs) and facility renewal with the cost to construct a new residence hall. Additionally, Scion has assumed \$60,000 per bed to build an institutional quality LEED-certified facility housing 650 new residence hall style beds. The result is a total budget of \$47,250,000, adjusted to \$52,132,000 to assume construction costs at the mid-point of 2006 and 2011.

The fourth spreadsheet compares suggested long-term operating expense targets with those of the current overall housing system. Scion has outlined benchmark operating expenses for a housing system of similar capacity, unit type, age and geographic location, totaling \$7.88 per square foot in operating expenses.

The final spreadsheet demonstrates five-year cash flows (2011 – 2015) on the recommended program, assuming that all recommendations are undertaken and amortized for 30 years at 4.57%. This pro-forma does not take into consideration any revenue from food service revenue sharing; ancillary uses (laundry, vending, etc.), nor does it take into consideration summer conferencing revenue. Scion has recommended an initial combination of 50% academic term contracts and 50% calendar year contracts. However, PSU's assessment of the demand for conferencing revenue may impact this assumption. Assuming that rental rates escalate 4% per year, net operating income in year 1 is \$4,222,000. This amount is sufficient to service the \$3,196,000 per year amortization of the \$52 million of improvements and leaves \$1,025,000 for other obligations, including existing debt service.

The next spreadsheets show the same analysis, using Fall 2017 as the basis. It is assumed that further renovations occur and that a new 510-bed residence hall and 500-bed apartment building are constructed. Total renovation/expansion costs are \$66 million in 2006 dollars, adjusted to \$82 million to assume work occurring at the mid-point of 2006 and 2017. Assuming that rental rates escalate 4% per year, net operating income in year 1 is \$10,739,000. This amount is sufficient to service the \$3,196,000 per year amortization of the \$52 million of improvements (2011) and the new \$5,024,000 to service debt on the \$82 million, and leaves \$2,519,000 for other obligations, including existing debt service. Again, food service, ancillary and summer conferencing revenues are not included.

2011 Analysis

Portland State University - Current Housing

	Unit Type	Approx SF	Single Beds	Double Beds	Single Rate	Double Rate	Current Occup.	Revenue
1. Student Housing								
Blackstone	Apartments	40,655						\$ -
Blackstone	Semi-suites	-						\$ -
Broadway	Apartments	220,399						\$ -
Epler	Apartments	61,174						\$ -
King Albert	Apartments	31,950	Due to current leasing policies it is not possible to accurately					\$ -
Montgomery	Semi-suites	43,320	report this information					\$ -
Ondine	Apartments	225,744						\$ -
Ondine	Semi-suites	-						\$ -
Parkway	Apartments	40,500						\$ -
Parkway	Semi-suites	-						\$ -
St. Helen's	Apartments	36,280						\$ -
St. Helen's	Semi-suites	-						\$ -
Stratford	Traditional	22,950						\$ -
West	Apartments	195,900						\$ -
Total		918,872	-	-	\$ -	-	0.0%	\$ -

Total Beds	-
Average Occupancy	-
Revenue / Bed	-

Copyright 2006, The Scion Group LLC

Portland State University - Recommended Housing Plan

	Unit Type	Approx SF	Single Beds	Double Beds	Single Rate	Double Rate	Expected Occup	Revenue
1. Student Housing								
Blackstone	Apartments	40,655	41	-	\$ 912		95.0%	\$ 373,185
Broadway	Apartments	220,399	96	528	\$ 791	\$ 547	95.0%	\$ 3,640,834
Epler	Apartments	61,174	-	250		\$ 547	95.0%	\$ 1,365,313
King Albert	Apartments	31,950	64	-	\$ 706		95.0%	\$ 450,493
Montgomery	RE-PURPOSED	-	-	-			95.0%	\$ -
Ondine	Apartments	225,744	193	-	\$ 681		95.0%	\$ 1,311,671
Ondine	Semi-suites	-	-	180		\$ 487	95.0%	\$ 873,800
Parkway	DEMOLISHED	-	-	-			95.0%	\$ -
St. Helen's	Apartments	36,280	50		\$ 681		95.0%	\$ 339,811
St. Helen's	Semi-suites	-	1		\$ 578		95.0%	\$ 5,765
Stratford	DEMOLISHED	-	-	-			95.0%	\$ -
West	Apartments	195,900		338		\$ 493	95.0%	\$ 1,661,312
New Res. Hall	Semi-suites	177,500	150	500	\$ 639	\$ 547	95.0%	\$ 3,686,344
Total		989,602	595	1,796				\$ 13,708,528

Total Beds	2,391
Average Occupancy	95.0%

Assumes 4% annual escalations between 2006 and 2011
Assumes 50% 9-Month Terms and 50% 12-Month Terms

Copyright 2006, The Scion Group LLC

Portland State University

Housing Renewal Budget	<u>Cost - 2006 Dollars</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Blackstone		
Roof System	\$ 127,000	
Façade	\$ 18,500	
Window Replacement	\$ 300,000	
Lighting	\$ 45,000	
EM & Exit Lighting	\$ 25,000	
Water Heater	\$ 18,500	
Boiler	\$ 3,500	
Electrical Distribution System	\$ 25,000	
Apartment Revisions	\$ 300,000	
Apartment Upgrades	\$ 182,500	
Academic Space	\$ 250,000	
Landscape Improvements	\$ 10,000	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 1,355,000	
Broadway		
New Furniture	\$ 289,200	\$1,200 per additional bed
Sub-Total	\$ 289,200	
Epler		
New Furniture	\$ 144,000	\$1,200 per additional bed
Sub-Total	\$ 144,000	
King Albert		
Roof System	\$ 4,500	
Façade	\$ 1,000	
Fire Escape	\$ 5,750	
Lighting	\$ 25,000	
EM & Exit Lighting	\$ 25,000	
Water Heater	\$ 12,500	
Boiler	\$ 2,500	
Electrical Distribution System	\$ 180,000	
Apartment Upgrades	\$ 92,500	
Academic Space	\$ 150,000	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 548,750	
Montgomery Court		
Contingency until re-purposing project	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 50,000	
Ondine		
Roof System	\$ 200,000	
Electrical Power Upgrades	\$ 130,000	
Internet/Data/Cable Systems	\$ 75,000	
Water Heating Systems	\$ 115,000	
EM Lighting & Exit Signage	\$ 75,000	
Lighting	\$ 150,000	
Life Safety / Fire Protection Systems	\$ 85,000	
Plumbing Systems	\$ 125,000	
Finishes Upgrades	\$ 100,000	
Ceiling Systems	\$ 80,000	
Apartment Access Systems	\$ 200,000	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
New Furniture	\$ 100,800	\$1,200 per additional bed
Sub-Total	\$ 1,485,800	
Parkway		
Demolition	\$ 75,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 75,000	
St. Helen's		
Roof System	\$ 127,500	
Façade	\$ 1,000	
Window Replacement	\$ 350,000	
Lighting	\$ 35,000	
EM & Exit Lighting	\$ 25,000	
Water Heater	\$ 1,000	
Boiler	\$ 112,000	
Electrical Distribution System	\$ 25,000	
Plumbing Systems Upgrades	\$ 175,000	
Apartment Upgrades	\$ 5,500	
Landscape Revisions	\$ 20,000	
Academic Space	\$ 200,000	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 1,127,000	
Stratford		
Demolition	\$ 75,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 75,000	
West Hall		
New Furniture	\$ 178,800	\$1,200 per additional bed
Sub-Total	\$ 178,800	
New Residence Hall		
650 beds x \$60,000/Bed	\$ 39,000,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 39,000,000	
Soft Costs, Contingency, Cost of Borrowing (7.5%)	\$ 2,925,000	
Total Budget	\$ 47,253,550	
Total Budget, 4% Annual Esc.to mid-point of 2006 and 2011	\$ 52,131,628	

All PSU Units FY2006

Contracts Sqft.

1641 918,872

Annual Operating Expenses	Suggested Per Bed*	Suggested PSF	Current Per Bed	Current Total	Current PSF
1. Utilities					
Electricity	\$ 140.00	\$ 0.35	\$ 189.56	\$ 311,062	\$ 0.34
Heating Fuel / Gas	\$ 160.00	\$ 0.40	\$ 227.71	\$ 373,673	\$ 0.41
Water / Sewer	\$ 140.00	\$ 0.35	\$ 209.31	\$ 343,480	\$ 0.37
Cable Television / Phone / Internet	\$ 240.00	\$ 0.60	\$ 207.18	\$ 339,981	\$ 0.37
Garbage/Recycling	\$ 60.00	\$ 0.15	\$ 44.22	\$ 72,558	\$ 0.08
Total	\$ 740.00	\$ 1.85	\$ 877.97	\$ 1,440,754	\$ 1.57
2. Maintenance Expenses					
Building and Grounds Maintenance	\$ 480.00	\$ 1.20	\$ 738.96	\$ 1,212,630	\$ 1.32
Custodial, Cleaning and Turnover	\$ 200.00	\$ 0.50	\$ 225.69	\$ 370,352	\$ 0.40
Custodial Supplies	\$ 8.00	\$ 0.02	\$ 12.88	\$ 21,138	\$ 0.02
Miscellaneous Rentals and Leases	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.32	\$ 518	\$ 0.00
Info Technology Eq., Data Processing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.15	\$ 11,726	\$ 0.01
Other Expenses / Misc.	\$ 80.00	\$ 0.20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 768.00	\$ 1.92	\$ 984.99	\$ 1,616,364	\$ 1.76
3. Residence Life Expenses					
Residence Life Program Costs	\$ 200.00	\$ 0.50	\$ 325.03	\$ 533,377	\$ 0.58
Admin Labor Assessment	\$ 100.00	\$ 0.25	\$ 133.92	\$ 219,758	\$ 0.24
Admin and Support Unit Labor Distributions**	\$ 160.00	\$ 0.40	\$ 393.00	\$ 644,910	\$ 0.70
Miscellaneous Admin Supplies	\$ 4.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 3.96	\$ 6,503	\$ 0.01
Furniture, Linen and Bedding	\$ 60.00	\$ 0.15	\$ 83.83	\$ 137,570	\$ 0.15
Postage and Freight	\$ 4.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 6.52	\$ 10,695	\$ 0.01
State and Institutional Assessments/Fees**	\$ 172.00	\$ 0.43	\$ 240.51	\$ 394,676	\$ 0.43
Marketing	\$ 20.00	\$ 0.05	\$ 9.47	\$ 15,541	\$ 0.02
Credit Processing	\$ 40.00	\$ 0.10	\$ 60.81	\$ 99,785	\$ 0.11
Miscellaneous Admin Service Expenses/Meal Plans**	\$ 348.00	\$ 0.87	\$ 485.93	\$ 797,405	\$ 0.87
Total	\$ 1,108.00	\$ 2.77	\$ 1,742.97	\$ 2,860,220	\$ 3.11
4. Mgmt. Fee, Insurance and Reserve Expenses					
Management Fee	\$ 256.00	\$ 0.64	\$ 360.25	\$ 591,177	\$ 0.64
Insurance	\$ 160.00	\$ 0.40	\$ 48.14	\$ 78,993	\$ 0.09
Reserves	\$ 120.00	\$ 0.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 536.00	\$ 1.34	\$ 408.39	\$ 670,170	\$ 0.73
Aggregate Operating Expenses	\$ 3,152.00	\$ 7.88	\$ 4,014.33	\$ 6,587,509	\$ 7.17

***Assuming 400 GSF per bed**

****Scion suggested is identical to PSU Actual**

PSU versus "Scion standard" on PSF basis is less by 9%
 PSU versus "Scion standard" on per bed basis is exceeded by 27%

Portland State University
Projected Financial Performance

Academic Year, Beginning Fall:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<i>Annual Escalation</i>	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
REVENUE					
Housing Revenue	\$ 13,708,528	\$ 14,256,869	\$ 14,827,144	\$ 15,420,230	\$ 16,037,039
Projected Total Revenue	\$ 13,708,528	\$ 14,256,869	\$ 14,827,144	\$ 15,420,230	\$ 16,037,039
OPERATING EXPENSES					
Utilities	\$ 2,227,404	\$ 2,316,500	\$ 2,409,160	\$ 2,505,527	\$ 2,605,748
Maintenance	\$ 2,311,684	\$ 2,404,151	\$ 2,500,318	\$ 2,600,330	\$ 2,704,343
Residence Life Expenses	\$ 3,335,086	\$ 3,468,489	\$ 3,607,229	\$ 3,751,518	\$ 3,901,579
Mgmt, Insurance and Reserves	\$ 1,613,363	\$ 1,677,897	\$ 1,745,013	\$ 1,814,814	\$ 1,887,406
Projected Total Operating Expenses	\$ 9,487,537	\$ 9,867,038	\$ 10,261,720	\$ 10,672,189	\$ 11,099,076
NET OPERATING INCOME	\$ 4,220,991	\$ 4,389,831	\$ 4,565,424	\$ 4,748,041	\$ 4,937,963
Debt Service (30 Year Amortization at 4.57%)	\$ 3,195,792	\$ 3,195,792	\$ 3,195,792	\$ 3,195,792	\$ 3,195,792
Debt Coverage	1.32	1.37	1.43	1.49	1.55
Net Cash Flow**	\$ 1,025,199	\$ 1,194,039	\$ 1,369,632	\$ 1,552,249	\$ 1,742,171

***Prior to servicing any other debt on student housing properties*

Copyright 2006, The Scion Group LLC

2017 Analysis

Portland State University - Recommended Housing Plan

	Unit Type	Approx SF	Single Beds	Double Beds	Single Rate	Double Rate	Expected Occup.	Revenue
1. Student Housing								
Blackstone	Apartments	40,655	41	-	\$ 1,153		95.0%	\$ 471,569
Broadway	Apartments	220,399	96	528	\$ 1,001	\$ 693	95.0%	\$ 4,606,816
Epler	Apartments	61,174	-	250		\$ 693	95.0%	\$ 1,727,556
King Albert	Apartments	31,950	64	-	\$ 893		95.0%	\$ 570,017
Montgomery	RE-PURPOSED	-	-	-			95.0%	\$ -
Ondine	Apartments	225,744	193		\$ 862		95.0%	\$ 1,659,682
Ondine	Semi-suites	-	-	180		\$ 616	95.0%	\$ 1,105,636
Parkway	DEMOLISHED	-	-	-			95.0%	\$ -
St. Helen's	Apartments	36,280	50		\$ 862		95.0%	\$ 429,970
St. Helen's	Semi-suites	-	1		\$ 731		95.0%	\$ 7,294
Stratford	DEMOLISHED	-	-	-			95.0%	\$ -
West	Apartments	195,900		338		\$ 623	95.0%	\$ 2,102,090
New Res Hall 2011	Semi-suites	177,500	150	500	\$ 808	\$ 693	95.0%	\$ 4,664,401
New Res Hall 2017	Semi-suites	162,500	350	160	\$ 808	\$ 693	95.0%	\$ 3,927,311
New Apartments	Apartments	175,000	500		\$ 1,116		95.0%	\$ 5,566,570
Total		1,327,102	1,445	1,956				\$ 26,838,912

Total Beds	3,401
Average Occupancy	95.0%

Assumes 4% annual escalations between 2006 and 2017
Assumes 50% 9-Month Terms and 50% 12-Month Terms

Copyright 2006, The Scion Group LLC

Portland State University

Housing Renewal Budget	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Blackstone		
Roof System	\$ 2,500	
Façade	\$ 5,500	
Water Heater	\$ 2,100	
Boiler	\$ 127,000	
Apartment Upgrades	\$ 500	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 187,600	
Broadway		
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 50,000	
Epler		
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 50,000	
King Albert		
Roof System	\$ 112,000	
Façade	\$ 1,500	
Fire Escape	\$ 7,150	
Water Heater	\$ 2,100	
Boiler	\$ 66,500	
Apartment Upgrades	\$ 1,500	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 240,750	
Montgomery Court		
Off-Line as housing	\$ -	
Sub-Total	\$ -	
Ondine		
Boilers	\$ 125,000	
EM Lighting & Exit Signage	\$ 75,000	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 250,000	
Parkway		
Demolished	\$ -	
Sub-Total	\$ -	
St. Helen's		
Roof System	\$ 2,500	
Façade	\$ 1,500	
Water Heater	\$ 13,000	
Boiler	\$ 2,500	
Apartment Upgrades	\$ 1,000	
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 70,500	
Stratford		
Demolished	\$ -	
Sub-Total	\$ -	
West Hall		
Contingency	\$ 50,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 50,000	
New Residence Hall		
510 beds x \$60,000/Bed	\$ 30,600,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 30,600,000	
New Apartments		
500 beds x \$60,000/Bed	\$ 30,000,000	
Sub-Total	\$ 30,000,000	
Soft Costs, Contingency, Cost of Borrowing (7.5%)	\$ 4,545,000	
Total Budget	\$ 66,043,850	
Total Budget, 4% Annual Esc.to mid-point of 2006 and 2017	\$ 81,959,491	

Portland State University
Projected Financial Performance

Academic Year, Beginning Fall:	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
<i>Annual Escalation</i>	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
REVENUE					
Housing Revenue	\$ 26,838,912	\$ 27,912,469	\$ 29,028,968	\$ 30,190,126	\$ 31,397,731
Projected Total Revenue	\$ 26,838,912	\$ 27,912,469	\$ 29,028,968	\$ 30,190,126	\$ 31,397,731
OPERATING EXPENSES					
Utilities	\$ 3,779,686	\$ 3,930,873	\$ 4,088,108	\$ 4,251,633	\$ 4,421,698
Maintenance	\$ 3,922,701	\$ 4,079,609	\$ 4,242,794	\$ 4,412,505	\$ 4,589,006
Residence Life Expenses	\$ 5,659,314	\$ 5,885,686	\$ 6,121,114	\$ 6,365,958	\$ 6,620,597
Mgmt, Insurance and Reserves	\$ 2,737,719	\$ 2,847,227	\$ 2,961,116	\$ 3,079,561	\$ 3,202,743
Projected Total Operating Expenses	\$ 16,099,419	\$ 16,743,396	\$ 17,413,132	\$ 18,109,657	\$ 18,834,044
NET OPERATING INCOME	\$ 10,739,493	\$ 11,169,073	\$ 11,615,836	\$ 12,080,469	\$ 12,563,688
Debt Service (30 Year Amortization at 4.57%)	\$ 8,220,103	\$ 8,220,103	\$ 8,220,103	\$ 8,220,103	\$ 8,220,103
Debt Coverage	1.31	1.36	1.41	1.47	1.53
Net Cash Flow**	\$ 2,519,390	\$ 2,948,970	\$ 3,395,733	\$ 3,860,366	\$ 4,343,585

***Prior to servicing any other debt on student housing properties*

Copyright 2006, The Scion Group LLC

Appendix A: Housing Offerings at Peer Institutions

Scion has studied housing offerings at the following institutions identified by Portland State University as being competitors for student recruitment:

- **Oregon State University:** There are 13 residence halls, four cooperative houses, one privately managed apartment complex and one family housing apartment complex at Oregon State University. The residence halls offer programs focused on specific interests such as the Austin Entrepreneurship Program, First Year Experience Community, Community Service Learning, Honors College Program, International Experience, Engineering Emphasis, Transfer and Upper-class Experience, ROTC wings, Female Only and Male Only Wings, and Quiet Floors. The Austin Entrepreneurship Program includes seminars, guest speakers, and facilitated programming. In addition to room and meal costs, there is a \$250 per term fee to help cover part of these program costs. The First Year Experience Community is dedicated to helping new students transition to college life through the OSU Odyssey and FOOTsteps programs. OSU Odyssey students meet regularly with about 20 other first year students and a faculty member or student leader and FOOTsteps takes students within their Odyssey class on backpacking, canoeing, or rock climbing trips. All of the residence halls are made up of traditional triple, double and single rooms except for Bloss Hall, aimed specifically for transfer and upper-class students, which is made up of semi-suite rooms where two rooms share a bathroom. The Cooperative Houses are all single-sex and house between 40 to 60 students. Typically, two to three students are assigned to a room with a desk and closet space for each student. Shared sleeping rooms with bunk beds, called sleeping porches, are separate from the study rooms. All of the residence halls and co-op houses include two washing and two drying laundry loads per week in the price of the room. The privately managed apartment complex, through College Housing Northwest, hosts juniors, seniors and graduate students. These are apartment-style studios, lofts, one-bedroom and multi-bedroom apartments. All apartments come with a kitchen and private bathroom; electricity is not included. The apartment complex also offers a business center, fitness center, café, laundry facility, community lounges, game room and yoga area. Finally, OSU offers affordable family housing in a 107-unit apartment complex, in which 65% of the student families are currently from outside the United States and more than 70% of the residents are graduate students.
- **University of Oregon:** The eight residence halls at the University of Oregon offer many different types of double and single room configurations. Within the double room category, UO offers a traditional double room, enhanced double, double with a sink, enhanced double with a sink, deluxe double, enhanced deluxe double. The enhanced rooms offer slightly more living space, while the deluxe rooms each have a private bathroom (also referred to as a semi-suite). However, the residence hall that offers semi-suite rooms is located five blocks west of campus. There are many different options for students who want to participate in a residential freshman interest group called a FIG, which consists of 25 first-year students who take two general education courses together during the fall term and live close enough together in the same housing complex so that they can form study groups. All residence halls also have a theme. Students can pick up to three themes when applying for housing, including Civic Engagement/Leadership, Collegiate, Creative Arts, Cyber, Honors, International, Multicultural, Music, Wellness and Substance-Free, Quiet, Upper-class/Transfer/Graduate. UO also offers family housing and university apartments, which house students with children, graduate students and undergraduate students at least

21 years old in configurations ranging from studios to five-bedroom apartments. All full-time students are eligible to apply for the apartments; however, priority is given to the students listed above. Water/sewer and trash pickup are included at the apartments, but all other utilities are extra.

- Western Oregon:** At Western Oregon, first-year students are required to live on-campus if they are within one year of high school graduation. WOU therefore provides two residence halls specifically for freshman, which offer three different room choices – a traditional double room, a traditional single room and, if space is available, single occupancy in a traditional double room. The freshman residence halls are coeducational; however, they are divided into different communities with about 20 to 30 students of the same gender living in each community. WOU offers about 450 living spaces for upper-class students split between three residence halls and an apartment complex. The residence halls include semi-suite rooms where two rooms share a bathroom. Usually this room type is occupied by three to four students; however, if space is available, it may be possible for only one or two students to have an entire suite to themselves. The campus also offers Butler Kitchenette rooms which has a private bathroom and an efficiency kitchen. All students are allowed to stay in the residence halls during winter break for an extra fee of \$363 and during spring break for an extra fee of \$100. The apartment complex is made up of units with private bedrooms, private bathrooms and kitchens. Family housing is also available for students who are married or have dependents as well as faculty who are transitioning to WOU. Family housing consists of apartment units and townhouse-style living with all utilities included.
- University of Portland:** There are eight residence halls housing about 1,343 students at the University of Portland. Six of these halls offer traditional single, double, and triple rooms. Where space is available, single occupancy in a double room may occur. Only upper-class or graduate students are allowed to live in a single room or obtain single occupancy in a double room. Two of the residence halls are for upper-class and graduate students only and offer “townhouse-style” units, housing about 200 students. Each such unit accommodates between four and 17 students and has private bathrooms, private laundry facilities and kitchenette facilities. One of these halls is female-only and almost every hall has its own attached chapel. All students living on campus must purchase a meal plan (because all room rates come with a meal plan included, Scion used off-campus meal plan rates to determine on-campus student meal plan rates which could then be subtracted from room and board; from two different meal plan possibilities, an average was calculated and then removed from room and board to calculate with the rental rates stated below). The school also has approximately 24 rental houses that are occupied by one to six students; this is the only housing available to married students.

Unit Mix

Representing 64% to 85% of all beds on each campus, the vast majority of on-campus student beds at these schools are in traditional residence hall units. Traditional residence hall units are defined as a private or shared bedroom with no kitchen or living room and a shared community bathroom down the hall. On the opposite end of the student housing spectrum, only 13% to 17% of the beds on these campuses are in apartment style units or houses.

The following chart details housing inventory mix by total beds in each unit type at each peer institution:

Total Number of Beds by Unit Type (Pct. of Beds in each Type out of Total Beds)				
	Oregon State University	University of Oregon	University of Portland	Western Oregon University
Traditional	2,635 (76%)	3,487 (78%)	1,143 (85%)	791 (64%)
Semi Suite	280 (8%)	400 (9%)	-	160 (13%)
Suite	-	-	-	80 (6%)
Apartment	352 (10%)	370 (8%)	-	210 (17%)
House	200 (6%)	215 (5%)	200 (15%)	-

The designed occupancy of houses varies by school. At the University of Oregon there are 75 houses, each accommodating between one and five students. At the University of Portland each house holds between four and 17 students. Finally, at Oregon State University, the houses are co-op style where a few students share a room with desks and dressers, however, all beds are in a few bedrooms which are referred to as “sleeper rooms.”

At Oregon State University, one of the two apartment complexes is owned by College Housing Northwest and houses about 245 of the 352 total students who reside in apartments.

Finally, it should be noted that the unit type defined by Scion as “semi suite” is referred to as a “suite” unit by these institutions.

Rental Rates

Rental rates for each institution’s housing are shown in the attached table (note – Scion lists rates as quoted by the school, with prices generally shown as per month, per student; an * indicates prices are quoted per unit rather than per student).

	Total Enrollment	Housing Capacity	2006-07 Monthly Rates Low	2006-2007 Monthly Rates High
Oregon State University	19,100	3,467		
Triple			\$476	\$524
Double			\$517	\$606
Single			\$674	\$772
Large Single			\$711	\$813
Double as a Single			\$723	\$909
Bloss Semi-Suite			\$813	-
Co-op			\$506	-
1-Bedroom Traditional Apt.			\$400	\$420
2-Bedroom Traditional Apt.			\$435	\$450
3-Bedroom Traditional Apt.			\$470	\$490
1-Bedroom Terrace Apartment			\$530	\$550
2-Bedroom Terrace Apartment			\$560	\$600
3-Bedroom Terrace Apartment			\$690	\$710
University of Oregon	20,300	4,472		
Double			\$441	\$507
Double Semi-Suite			\$507	\$879
Single			\$529	\$750
Single Semi-Suite			\$922	\$1,075
*Studio Apartment			\$372	\$499
*1-Bedroom Apartment			\$395	\$665
*2-Bedroom Apartment			\$520	\$815
*3-Bedroom Apartment			\$666	\$815
*4-Bedroom Apartment			\$682	\$945
*5-Bedroom Apartment			\$866	\$965
Western Oregon University	5,030	1,241		
Double			\$523	-
Single			\$593	\$702
Semi- Suite			\$523	\$798
Butler Kitchenette Ste. (2 ppl)			\$778	-
Arbor Park Apartment (4 ppl)			\$557	-
*Family Housing 2-BR Apt.			\$560	-
*Family Housing 2-BR Townhouse			\$750	-
University of Portland	3,200	1,343		
Triple			\$456	\$546
Double			\$531	\$621
Double Semi-Suite			\$571	\$661
Single			\$622	\$711
Single occ. in double room			\$699	\$788
"Townhouse" Double			\$654	\$744
"Townhouse" Single			\$745	\$835
1-6 person House			\$252	\$600

Appendix B: Rental Market Analysis

With an enrollment of approximately 31,000 students and an on-campus housing occupancy of 1,600, about 29,400 PSU students live off-campus. While some students live at home and commute, many live off-campus, in downtown Portland and the surrounding area. Students have the option of finding housing through newspapers, websites or living in housing which is owned and run by College Housing Northwest.

College Housing Northwest is a non-profit organization providing housing for Portland State University, Oregon Sate University and Central Oregon Community College students. Any student attending a college or university in Portland is eligible to live in College Housing Northwest properties. Within a five to ten minute walk of the PSU campus are seven unique apartment buildings, all located in downtown Portland and owned by College Housing Northwest. There are fewer than 500 total units among these seven buildings. Scion has studied rental rates, advertised by College Housing Northwest, as well as rates found on *portland.craigslist.org*, *apartments.com*, *rent.com*, *housingconnections.org*, and *apartmentguide.com* for properties located in downtown Portland.

Rental Rates

PSU's website advertises that apartment prices in downtown Portland range from:

- \$500+ for a studio apartment
- \$700+ for a 1-bedroom apartment
- \$900+ for a 2-bedroom apartment

PSU's website also ascertains that outside of the downtown area, apartment prices are less expensive, about \$500+ for a 1-bedroom apartment and \$650+ for a 2-bedroom apartment. Shared housing and rooms for rent are also stated to typically cost around \$300 to \$450 per month, depending on location and amenities. Rooms may be furnished or unfurnished.

Below is information that Scion gathered from different websites, some of which are reported by PSU to be frequently used by students when looking to rent an apartment off-campus. These rental properties typically require a 12-month lease and are usually unfurnished. Normally, utilities are not included and residents are separately billed for gas, electricity, phone (if applicable), cable television and Internet services.

	Average Monthly Rental Rates		
	Studio Apartment	1 Bedroom Apartment	2 Bedroom Apartment
<i>Apartments.com</i>	-	\$666	\$790
<i>Apartmentguide.com</i>	-	\$691	\$874
<i>Rent.com</i>	\$497	\$551	\$691
<i>Housingconnections.org</i>	\$498	\$729	-
<i>Portland.craigslist.org</i>	-	-	\$1,085
<i>*Portland.craigslist.org</i>	-	-	\$781

*Rental rates listed in Vancouver, WA.

Apartments.com also listed average rental rates for a 3 bedroom apartment to be \$890 per month and *housingconnections.org* listed average rental rates for a shared room in an apartment to be \$333 per month.

At the majority of the buildings owned and run by College Housing Northwest, amenities include only water, sewer and trash pickup; students are responsible for their own telephone, cable television and electricity. Parking is also available at an extra cost. However, at Goose Hollow Tower and Goose Hollow Plaza, two of the more popular buildings, students pay their own electricity, but Internet is included in the rent. Further, rental parking is available for \$50 per month. Because College Housing Northwest does not differentiate based on marital status or graduate level anywhere in their housing, apartments with larger floor plans are generally a better fit for students with families. Therefore, studio apartments can have two tenants, one-bedroom apartments can have three tenants, and two-bedroom apartments can have up to five tenants. All units must have a current student as a resident; eligible roommates are qualified students, family members, domestic partners, and spouses. Below are the listed rental rates for Goose Hollow Plaza and Goose Hollow Tower.

	2006-2007 Monthly Rental Rates			
<i>Goose Hollow Plaza</i>	1 Bedroom (610 sq.ft) *(612 sq.ft) Apartment	2 Bedroom (784 sq.ft) *(759 sq.ft) Apartment	2 Bedroom (851-904 sq.ft) Apartment	Private Suite *Studio (465 sq.ft)
Month to month	\$766	\$932	\$1013-1054	\$537
10-month	\$752	\$915	\$994-1035	\$528
12-month	\$738	\$898	\$975-1015	\$518
<i>Goose Hollow Tower</i>				
Month to month	\$681-725	\$859-929	-	\$555
10-month	\$669-712	\$843-912	-	\$545
12-month	\$656-698	\$827-895	-	\$534

*Different square feet are listed for the Goose Hollow Tower apartments.

College Housing Northwest also requires a deposit and reservation fee totaling about \$270. However, they also offer a free shuttle bus to get students to and from campus.

Overview

Reviewing only the 12-month leases, there is a noticeable difference in price between off-campus apartments that students are able to find on their own in downtown Portland, using various websites, and the College Housing Northwest apartments.

	Average Monthly Rental Rates	
	1 Bedroom Apartment	2 Bedroom Apartment
<i>Apartments.com</i>	\$666	\$790
<i>Apartmentguide.com</i>	\$691	\$874
<i>Rent.com</i>	\$551	\$691
Goose Hollow Plaza	\$738	\$898
Goose Hollow Tower	\$656-698	\$827-895

At Goose Hollow Plaza, the two-bedroom rates listed above are for the small apartments only, with the larger apartments being more expensive. After taking the average of all the website rental rates listed above and the average of the Goose Hollow Plaza and Tower rates, prices are 10% higher for the one bedroom apartments and 11% higher for the two bedroom apartments in the College Housing Northwest buildings. Students seem willing to pay a premium to live in housing which is owned and run by College Housing Northwest.

Using the downtown apartment rental rates given to Scion by PSU, together with budgeted rates at University-owned housing for fiscal year 2007, Scion compared on-campus and off-campus property rates. Scion considered the average monthly rental rates, rounding to the nearest dollar, at six University-owned buildings that PSU believes are comparable to the off-campus building types listed below. Then the percent change between market rates and University-owned housing rates was calculated, rounding to the nearest percent, unless the percent change was less than one percent.

	2007-2007 Average Monthly Rental Rates			
	Studio	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	% Change
PDX Downtown	\$622	\$850	\$1,086	-
Ondine	\$505	-	-	Studio: -19%
West	-	\$710	-	1BD: -16%
Vintage	\$556	\$683	\$1,077	-
Blackstone	\$555	\$714	\$950	Studio: -0.2% 1BD: 5% 2BD: -12%
Parkway	\$560	\$720	\$945	Studio: 0.7% 1BD: 5% 2BD: -12%
Newer	\$648	\$920	\$1,085	-
Broadway	\$649	-	-	Studio: 0.2%
Epler	\$655	-	-	Studio: 1%

Appendix C: Area Graduate Programs

Possible Institutions with Graduate Programs Warranting Discussions About Residence Life Internships at Portland State University

Oregon State Universities

Portland State University

- **Psychology** – (Applied Psychology: Doctoral & Masters)
- **Counseling** – (Graduate Certificate: Couples, Marriage, Family Counseling, MA or MS in Conflict Resolution)
- **Graduate School of Education** – (Education Administration)

Concordia University

(15 min driving from PSU)

Portland, OR 97211

- **Education Graduate Programs** – (Masters of Education Administration, Masters of Education)

George Fox University

(40 min driving from PSU)

Newberg, Oregon 97132

- **Counseling** – (MA in Counseling, MA in family, marriage therapy, MA in school counseling, MS in school psychology)
- **Education** – (Masters of Education, Doctor of Education)
- **Leadership** – (MA in Organizational Leadership)
- **Psychology** – (PsyD)

Oregon State University

(1 hour 30 minutes driving from PSU)

Corvallis, Oregon 97331-4501

- **Counseling** - (MS, PhD)
- **Education** – (EDD, EDM, MS, PHD)

Pacific University

(40 min driving from PSU)

Forest Grove, Oregon 97116

- **Education** – (MA in Education)
- **Psychology** – (PsyD in Clinical Psychology, MA in Counseling Psychology, Masters of Occupational Therapy)

Southern Oregon University

(4 hours 40 minutes driving from PSU)

Ashland, OR 97520

- **Psychology** – (Master in Applied Psychology)

University of Oregon

(2 hours driving from PSU)

Eugene, OR 97403

- **Psychology** – (MD in Psychology, Masters in School Psychology)
- **Counseling** – (Masters in Counseling, Family and Human Services, Masters in Counseling Psychology)

University of Portland

(15 minutes driving from PSU)

Portland, OR 97203

- **Education** – (Masters of Education)
- **Psychology** – (MA in Psychology)

Washington State Universities**Antioch University Seattle**

(3 hours driving from PSU)

Seattle, WA 98121-1814

- **Education** – (MA Education)
- **Psychology** – (Masters in Child, Couple, Family Therapy, PsyD in Clinical Psychology, Masters in Organizational Psychology)
- **Counseling** – (Masters in Mental Health Counseling)

Central Washington University

(3 hours 45 minutes driving from PSU)

Ellensburg, WA 98926

- **Education** – (Masters in Administration)
- **Psychology** – (MS in Counseling Psychology, Organizational Development; M.Ed. programs in School Counseling, School Psychology)

City University

(3 hours driving from PSU)

Bellevue Campus

Bellevue, WA 98005

- **Education** – (Masters of Education in Guidance and Counseling, Educational Leadership)
- **Psychology** – (MA in Counseling Psychology; Certificates in Organizational Leadership, Individual Leadership)

Eastern Washington University

(5 hours 30 minutes driving from PSU)

Cheney, WA 99004-2447

- **Education** – (Masters in Education)

- **Psychology** – (MS in Counseling, Mental Health, School Counseling, Interdisciplinary; MS in Clinical Psychology, General/Experimental)

Gonzaga University

(5 hours 40 minutes driving from PSU)

Spokane, WA 99258-0025

- **Education** – (MA in Educational Administration)
- **Counseling** – (MA in Community Counseling, School Counseling)

Heritage University

(3 hours driving from PSU)

Toppenish WA., 98948

- **Education** – (Masters in Educational Administration, Counseling)

Northwest University

(3 hours driving from PSU)

Kirkland, WA 98033

- **Psychology** – (MA in Counseling Psychology)

Pacific Lutheran University

(2 hours 15 minutes driving from PSU)

Tacoma, WA 98447

- **Education** – (MA in Education)

Seattle Pacific University

(3 hours driving from PSU)

Seattle, WA 98119-1997

- **Education** – (M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, School Counseling; Doctor of Education)
- **Psychology** – (MS in Marriage and Family Therapy, PhD in Clinical Psychology, MA and PhD in Organizational Psychology)

Seattle University

(3 hours driving from PSU)

Seattle, WA 98122-1090

- **Education** – (MA in Counseling, Educational Administration, School Psychology)
- **Psychology** – (MA in Psychology)

University of Puget Sound

(2 hours 30 minutes driving from PSU)

Tacoma, WA 98416

- **Education** – (M.Ed.)

University of Washington

Bothell Campus (3 hours 10 minutes driving from PSU)

Tacoma Campus (2hours 20 minutes driving from PSU)

- **Education** – (Master of Education: Educational Administration)

Washington State University

Spokane Campus (5 hours 40 minutes driving from PSU)

Tri-Cities Campus (3 hours 45 minutes)

Vancouver Campus (30 minutes driving from PSU)

- **Education** – (Master of Education in Education Administration, Doctor of Education)

Western Washington University

(4 hours 20 minutes driving from PSU)

Bellingham, WA 98225

- **Education** – (Master in Educational Administration)
- **Counseling** - (MA in Rehabilitation Counseling, MS in Mental Health Counseling)
- **Psychology** – (MS in Experimental Psychology, Sport Psychology)