TO: Brad Black, Housing Facilities Capital Projects Manager

FROM: Brad Black, Housing Facilities Capital Projects Manager

DATE: 2.1.2011

SUBJECT: Facility Condition Summary and Replacement Recommendations

The following is a summary of the facility condition analysis performed on Bean, Carson, Earl, Hamilton and Walton residence halls. An assumption was made that Earl, Barnhart and Riley residence halls and Family Housing facilities would not be considered as facilities to be replaced and therefore are not included in the analysis at this time.

ASSUMPTIONS
The following assumptions were applied to the analysis of facility condition and associated costs:

- Gross floor areas and facility layouts are based upon the University’s book plans.
- Occupancy was based upon data from University Housing.
- Information on facility condition was gathered from:
  - Soderstrom Facility Condition Report, 2007
  - Herrick and Richards Seismic Upgrade Report, 1992 and 1993
  - Information from maintenance and custodial staff
  - Roof condition assessment performed by Umpqua Roofing in 2010
  - On-site review of facility conditions
- Costs are assumed to be based upon 2011 dollars
- Where possible, unit costs associated with the work were extracted from the last ECRH CD estimate.
- For consistency, the same formulae were used for each deficiency. In some cases an addition modification was applied to more closely tailor the anticipated scope of work to the facility.
- Costs of upgrading the quality of resident rooms and furnishings is included at a flat rate of $5,000 per bed ($3,000 furnishings, $2,000 improvements)
- No assumptions or costs were included about Housing or Res Life functional upgrades.
- Functional upgrades for the following were not included:
  - Food service areas
  - Relocation of the Housing Office
- Costs associated with asbestos abatement were included but only as placeholders.
- Phasing of work will have an impact on costs. Those costs were not considered here.
- Elevators were included for each residence wing that currently lacks them.
- The costs for installing access control and CCTV systems are included for each facility.
- Costs should be viewed as relative indicators of facility condition and rough order of magnitude of potential financial need. They should not be viewed as “hard” estimates.
- There will be additional unanticipated work that will increase costs. The extent is currently unknown.
DATA SUMMARY

With the exception of LLC, Carson and Earl Halls, the remaining residence halls were all constructed within approximately 2 years of each other. All appear to have benefited from similar levels of maintenance and repair over time. However, all of the facilities are over 50 years old and none of have benefitted from major rehabilitations, renovations or complete system replacements.

The levels of deficiencies observed in a facility are directly related to the age, quality of the original construction and the on-going maintenance and repair program. One would surmise that the oldest and/or largest facilities to have higher levels of deficiencies, be less energy efficient and provide less functional flexibility. The analysis appears to support that assumption. On a cost per gross square foot basis, Hamilton (the largest facility) and Carson (the oldest facility) represent the highest costs to remediate deficiencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENCE HALL</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>GROSS FLOOR AREA</th>
<th>ESTIMATED TOTAL DEFICIENCY COST</th>
<th>ESTIMATED DEFICIENCY COST PER SQUARE FOOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>216,849 sf</td>
<td>$34,881,146 (1)</td>
<td>$161/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>201,807 sf</td>
<td>$27,609,408 (2)</td>
<td>$137/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>80,000 sf</td>
<td>$10,726,826</td>
<td>$134/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson (3)</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>96,099 sf</td>
<td>$12,317,037 (1)</td>
<td>$128/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>161,575 sf</td>
<td>$19,643,082 (1)</td>
<td>$122/sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
(1) Other than ADA related costs, no costs are included for functional or food service improvements. (2) Replacement costs for Housing office are not included. (3) May have historical significance or be a candidate to be on the historic register

On a total cost basis, Hamilton, the facility with largest gross floor area, has the highest associated total deficiency costs. The analysis finds that while Hamilton is 7.5% larger than Walton in gross floor area its estimated total deficiency costs are approximately 26% greater that Walton’s. The difference in costs exceeds an expected difference of 7.5% increase due to floor area differences alone. The larger difference indicates that Hamilton is has a higher level of deficiencies, is in poorer condition than the other facilities and is therefore a better candidate for either replacement or total renovation.

ADA compliance was also examined at a high level. Costs to correct deficiencies associated with the lack of elevators to upper floors, ADA compliant hardware and restrooms lacking ADA compliance were included in the estimated costs.

Safety and security systems were examined, again at a high level. None of the facilities contain either access control or CCTV systems. Only Carson has an installed and functional fire sprinkler system. All facilities have fire alarm system that are or have reached the end of their service life. The costs for upgrading fire alarm systems and installing fire sprinkler, access control and CCTV systems are included for each facility.

SUMMARY

The costs presented should be viewed as relative indicators of facility condition and rough order of magnitude of potential financial need to bring them up to today’s standards. They should not be viewed as “hard” estimates. It is important to recognize that the cost estimates have made no assumptions about the level of functional modifications to the facility. Such modifications may vary based upon each facilities opportunities and limitations and may result in the loss of bed capacity. Finally, there will be additional unanticipated work that has not been anticipated here that will increase overall costs of correcting deficiencies.