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PURPOSE AND VISION

The Eastern Washington University Comprehensive Campus Master Plan (EWU CCMP) is a critical part of the university’s strategic planning process. It is a guide to plan and achieve a campus that reflects the programmatic and cultural needs of the university. The plan provides a means to track facility need as driven by both individual condition and overall institutional growth.

Effective strategic comprehensive campus master planning methods align the academic needs of the university with its physical needs, thus working to ensure that Eastern Washington University’s (EWU) facilities support the university’s mission, vision, and objectives. Comprehensive campus master plans are flexible and living documents, appropriate and applicable to both immediate and long-term university goals. Campus master plans address overlapping needs and potential shared capacities of university programs and services, and are by definition proactive in nature. Since the long-range goals of EWU must respond to the changing market for higher education, so too, the EWU CCMP must be dynamic and flexible in its structure, presentation, and implementation. The campus environment—its buildings, open space, and its neighbors—contribute significantly to student success, their collegiate experience, and their connection with the larger community. The condition of campus facilities, availability of instructional and research space, availability of desirable amenities, and options for a vibrant residential experience are vital to the successful recruitment and retention of EWU students, faculty, and staff.

BACKGROUND

Planning for new and improved university facilities are integral to the university’s strategic planning process since the first campus building was constructed on site in 1882. In recent years a more formal comprehensive campus master plan process has become a necessity for the university to document, align, and implement facility needs to achieve university goals. Also, the State of Washington Legislature, as a part of the biennial request for capital improvement funds, requires a comprehensive campus master plan.

The EWU CCMP in one of three documents considered by the State of Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the State legislature when evaluating requests for capital funds. This package of documents includes the biennial capital request, the ten-year capital plan, and the comprehensive campus master plan. The Washington State Legislature considers all three of these documents when it evaluates capital budget requests and assigns appropriations. Illustrating how well the individual projects and major and minor capital requests fit within the context of these three documents demonstrates that the university is proactively planning for the facilities that meet the needs of both the university and higher education in the State of Washington.

EWU continues to compete for dwindling state capital resources with other state agencies. In recent years, the Higher Education Capital Scoring Criteria assigned specific points for a project’s adherence to each university’s comprehensive campus master plan. As that process becomes more and more competitive, the alignment of EWU’s facilities planning process and funding requests becomes critical to the university’s success in receiving appropriations for state capital funds.

EWU completed its last comprehensive campus master plan in 2003 with a revision published in May 2005. Periodic updates and revisions of campus master plans reflect changes triggered by modifications in university direction and priorities. In the spring of 2010, EWU published the master plan in a web-based format. This update included a detailed tracking of the plan’s implementation. This format makes it easy to publish revisions and other updates and responds to the university’s goal of sustainability through the reduction of printed documents. EWU Facilities and Planning continues to update component studies that support the existing master plan. Those component studies and plans are stored on the web-based plan for future discussion, prioritization against the strategic plan, and ultimate implementation.
**CONTEXT**

EWU is a regional, comprehensive public university located in Cheney, with programs also offered in Bellevue, Kent, Seattle, Shoreline, Spokane, Tacoma, Vancouver, and Yakima.

The university offers undergraduate students education in more than 100 fields of study. EWU currently offers nine master degrees, one applied doctorate, one educational specialist degree, and 11 graduate certificates. EWU's transfer agreement with Washington State community colleges allows graduates of eligible two-year degrees to be admitted to EWU with junior standing.

**CHENEY CAMPUS, CHENEY, WA**

The main campus for EWU is located south of Spokane in the City of Cheney, a thriving community with a population of 10,820. The Cheney campus is the focus of this comprehensive campus master plan.

**RIVERPOINT CAMPUS, SPOKANE, WA**

In 1996, EWU established a presence on the Riverpoint Campus—a shared campus in downtown Spokane with Washington State University (WSU)—when the College of Business and Public Administration relocated from Cheney to Riverpoint, moving into the Riverpoint Phase I Classroom Building. In 1999, plans began for the development of a Riverpoint Campus building dedicated to the EWU health science programs. EWU’s health science faculty were an integral part of the design and development of space dedicated to the future of the anticipated Doctor of Physical Therapy program on the Riverpoint campus. Included in this design were a state-of-the-art anatomy laboratory, two large dedicated teaching labs, three smaller faculty research labs, including a special motion analysis laboratory, one dedicated classroom, shared classrooms, and faculty and administrative office space.

In November 2001, EWU received legislative approval to establish the first applied doctorate degree at a Washington regional university. The first Doctor of Physical Therapy class was admitted in September 2002, the physical therapy department’s having moved from Cheney to Riverpoint, moving into the Riverpoint Phase I Classroom Building. In 1999, plans began for the development of a Riverpoint Campus building dedicated to the EWU health science programs. EWU’s health science faculty were an integral part of the design and development of space dedicated to the future of the anticipated Doctor of Physical Therapy program on the Riverpoint campus. Included in this design were a state-of-the-art anatomy laboratory, two large dedicated teaching labs, three smaller faculty research labs, including a special motion analysis laboratory, one dedicated classroom, shared classrooms, and faculty and administrative office space.

In November 2001, EWU received legislative approval to establish the first applied doctorate degree at a Washington regional university. The first Doctor of Physical Therapy class was admitted in September 2002, the physical therapy department’s having moved from Cheney to Riverpoint.

**At Riverpoint, EWU offers undergraduate programs in business, communication disorders, health informatics technology and management, health services administration, interdisciplinary studies, and urban/regional planning. EWU’s graduate courses of study at Riverpoint include business/MBA, communication disorders, creative writing, dental education/RIDE, occupational therapy, physical therapy/DPT, psychology/counseling, public administration, social work, graduate teacher education, and urban/regional planning.**

EWU outreach programs housed at Riverpoint underscore and expand the university’s guiding principles through a variety of beneficial offerings for the region and its residents. Community-focused programs include Get Lit! (a spring literary festival with educational outreach projects throughout the year), a community dental clinic, and a joint EWU/Washington State University hearing and speech clinic. Area businesses are served through the Institute for Public Policy and Economic Analysis (sponsoring social, economic, and policy research for the Inland Pacific Northwest) and the Business Resource Center (providing business assistance and research to firms and associations in the greater Spokane region; and supporting sustainable business and green business practices).

EWU envisions further development and growth in its Riverpoint programs. New opportunities include applied doctorates in health sciences, a doctorate in dentistry (in collaboration with the University of Washington Dental School), gerontology, an MPH option in mental health, nuclear medicine, radiologic and imaging sciences, and a Water Center. Creating a new college and acquiring a new building, as ways to focus Eastern’s commitment to the greater Spokane region, are initiatives under current discussion.

**TURNBULL LABORATORY FOR ECOLOGICAL STUDIES, TURNBULL NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, CHENEY, WA**

Turnbull Laboratory for Ecological Studies (TLES) is an ecological field station located on the 15,500-acre Turnbull National Wildlife Refuge established in 1976 as a cooperative effort between Eastern Washington University and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, EVERETT, WA
Serving Snohomish and Island County residents, Everett Community College’s main campus is in North Everett, about 30 miles north of Seattle where EWU offers a three-year part time Masters of Social Work program.

NORTH SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, SEATTLE, WA
EWU and North Seattle Community College offer a four-year electrical engineering degree.

SOUTH SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, SEATTLE, WA
EWU at South Seattle Community College offers a Bachelor of Science in Technology: Applied Technology.

BELLEVUE COLLEGE, BELLEVUE, WA
EWU at Bellevue College offers upper division level courses that lead to five of EWU’s Bachelor degrees.

LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE, LONGVIEW, WA
EWU and Lower Columbia College collaboratively offer two baccalaureate degree completion programs. The first bachelor’s program is an entirely online degree in interdisciplinary studies. The second program offers a bachelor’s of science in applied technology that is delivered on the LCC campus by interactive television.

CLARK COLLEGE, VANCOUVER, WA
EWU offers four degrees at Clark College: Bachelor of Arts in Social Work, Master of Social Work, Bachelor of Sciences in Dental Hygiene, and a Bachelor of Science in Applied Technology.

PACIFIC NW UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES, YAKIMA, WA
EWU School of Social Work offers a Master’s of Social Work (MSW) through Pacific Northwest University of Health Sciences in Yakima, WA.

YAKIMA VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, YAKIMA, WA
In partnership with Yakima Valley Community College, EWU offers a Master’s of Social Work and a Dental Hygiene Expanded Degree program.

EWU STRATEGIC PLAN
The Eastern Washington University Board of Trustees, in their 2010-2011 goal for institutional strength and security, recommended that EWU develop a new five-year strategic plan (2012-2017). As this university strategic plan developed, it became important to update the EWU CCMP to reflect the future vision, values, and direction of the campus to support university goals.

The primary goal of the comprehensive master plan is to support the overall values, mission, and vision of EWU.

The strategic plan identifies linkages among EWU core themes, strategic goals, and the Board of Trustees goals. In this capacity, the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan “Inspiring the Future” has guided the comprehensive campus master plan.

The strategic plan identified the following key values:

STUDENT CENTERED LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
Students are the reason we exist

QUALITY
We strive for excellence in everything we do

ACCESS
We expand access to opportunity and success for students

INCLUSIVENESS
Our diversity makes EWU a stronger community

INTEGRITY
We foster a culture of respect, commitment, and honesty
PROCESS
The President’s Executive Council provided guidance and direction to the three-part master plan process. Several sessions apprised the Board of Trustees of the process and findings. Their observations and comments helped guide CCMP recommendations.

PHASE 1: ANALYSIS
Analysis included outreach to students, faculty, staff, and City of Cheney staff in the form of “Listening Sessions.” A review of planning documents and a detailed analysis of the campus documented campus systems and character. In addition, previously completed facility assessment reports provided data used to identify potential renovation, replacement, or removal of academic and residential buildings. Furthermore, an analysis of current full time equivalent (FTE) students and past growth trends provided a conservative FTE growth projection for the university.

PHASE 2: SYNTHESIS
Synthesis of multiple factors helped determine the FTE capacity of alternative scenarios for campus development. This resulted in a plan that concentrates development on the East Campus by building infill and replacement within a framework of open space corridors and quads. The plan includes residential development to support undergraduates and families and strengthens athletics and recreation.

PHASE 3: DOCUMENTATION
Final documentation is a bound printed report and appendix as well as a website for these documents that EWU Facilities and Planning will maintain and update.

LISTENING SESSIONS
Listening sessions held with faculty, staff, students, and City of Cheney staff, broadened the base of input and understanding of opportunities and issues as summarized in the following recurring themes of desires, needs, and observations:

- Increase the vibrancy and life on the campus—particularly after class hours
- Improve the campus perimeter to create a “welcoming” impression
- Exterior spaces, new buildings, and renovations have improved the quality of the campus
- Exterior spaces are beautiful, a source of pride in the campus community
- Foster a stronger relationship between the university and the surrounding community—visibility and outreach
- Accommodate growth of programs and “ownership” issues at the Riverpoint campus
- The West Campus does not feel like an integral part of the Cheney campus
- The Pence Union Building (PUB) needs improvement; its labyrinth of rooms and staggered floor elevations hinders access to the uses it offers
- Old residence halls are dated and lack “academic feel”—More housing, better housing, and a diversity of housing would make a positive impact on campus life and student retention
- Mid-size to larger venues for events are not available
- Upgrade technology throughout the campus
- Washington Street divides the campus and creates challenges for pedestrian crossings
- Washington Street will remain open—it will not be re-routed
- Elm Street is congested—it is a mix of pedestrian traffic, buses, cars, and delivery

OBJECTIVES
With broad based campus input in mind, the President’s Executive Committee identified the following key objectives for the EWU Comprehensive Campus Master Plan:

- Represent the “DNA of EWU”—supporting student access, opportunity, and personal transformation
- Be flexible—able to respond to changes in technology, pedagogy, and student demographics
- Align facilities with academic purpose and need
- Promote a campus environment that “feels like home” for EWU students
- Incorporate the “Gateway Project”
- Include the needs of the Riverpoint campus
- Coordinate with funding—“the plan must make sense”
PLANNING PRINCIPLES
The analysis of the campus, past planning studies, and input from EWU students, faculty, and staff identified the following principles to guide the master plan:

- Carefully evaluate each project with regard to renovation vs. replacement opportunities
- Locate and size all new or replacement buildings to optimize site utilization
- Improve the overall character of the campus with the implementation of each project
- Create and follow a framework that welcomes EWU’s neighbors and accommodates future campus expansion beyond existing boundaries
- Reinforce and improve the overall cohesion of campus, specifically linkages across Washington Street, whenever possible

VISION
The EWU CCMP captures two snapshots — planning horizons — of campus development to meet the needs of the projected enrollment for 2023 and 2033. Both planning horizons illustrate how the university can develop the Cheney campus to maximize student FTE capacity within EWU’s desired university culture and campus character. Both planning horizons identify the sequencing of projects in five phases, each corresponding to a biennial capital request cycle.

Planning Horizon 1’s initial phasing includes a series of projects already proposed by EWU. Subsequent phasing of improvements is contingent upon the sequenced completion of other projects to free up land for development.

Planning Horizon 2 responds to continued enrollment growth, identifying strategic steps the university must consider to achieve the projected enrollment. Both planning horizons limit development to land currently owned by the university and also assumes that all parking needs will be met by using surface parking lots.

REFERENCES
- NAC Architecture, Riverpoint Campus Master Plan 2009 Update, Spokane, Washington, October 1, 2012
In 1882, the Benjamin P. Cheney Academy opened its doors to more than 200 enrolling students. A generous contribution of $10,000 from Benjamin P. Cheney, a wealthy transportation industrialist, fulfilled the dreams of Cheney citizens who had long desired an institute for higher learning in their community.

The academy became the State Normal School at Cheney in 1889, the same year in which Washington was given its statehood. The school was proudly designated as an institution “for the purpose of instruction of persons, both male and female, in the art of teaching the various branches that pertain to a good common school.”

By the time it became Eastern Washington College of Education in 1937, it was already a fully accredited four-year, degree-granting institution, offering majors in numerous subjects. The campus expanded north toward the agricultural lands. The campus grew rapidly in size and program offerings in the decades following World War II.

In 1961, the name was again changed, this time to Eastern Washington State College (EWSC). It was increasingly evident that the region needed professionals in many fields. In response, EWSC added a wide range of undergraduate and graduate degree programs. The 1960s building boom included construction of the Science Building and Pearce Hall.

The first campus master plan appears to have been completed as a planning report in 1963. It proposed a strong and distinctive campus character with a cohesive arrangement of buildings that allowed for planned and unforeseen growth.

Finally, in 1977, the state Legislature changed the school’s name to Eastern Washington University.
CAMPUS LANDS AND CHARACTER-EXISTING

The Cheney campus has grown to more than 345 acres, extending north and west from its original eight-acre parcel. The East Campus, approximately 90 acres in size and in proximity to downtown Cheney, serves as the academic and residential core of the campus. The West Campus contains the majority of the athletic and recreation uses, a few non-campus uses, and the majority of student, faculty, and staff parking. These uses comprise approximately 40 percent of the 245 acres of land, the remainder of which are in agricultural uses. Washington Street physically and visually separates the two areas. Over the last decade the East Campus has undergone a great deal of beautification that greatly enhances the campus experience. The West Campus lacks such amenities.

EAST-WEST CAMPUS

While there is one campus, the campus community perceives it in two parts. This is partially due to the differences in uses that characterize the land. East of Washington Street, the campus contains core academic, administrative, undergraduate housing, and auxiliary uses while west of Washington Street, the campus’s core uses are athletics and recreation with some residential. There is also a striking difference in the treatment of the landscape. To the east, the campus is predominately lush and pedestrian oriented. To the west, the campus lacks extensive plantings and has numerous conflicts in pedestrian and vehicular circulation. The CCMP addresses these differences to make the campus whole in terms of its quality and image.

EDGES AND CONNECTIONS

The campus has grown incrementally, incorporating private lands and public streets. Thus, it has developed formal and informal connections within the campus and to the neighboring community.

The edges (1) of the campus are characterized by a mixture of buildings and open space punctuated by gateways (2) that announce the university to pedestrians and vehicular traffic. Due to the tight city street grid, there are numerous pedestrian and vehicular approaches to the campus (3) some of which require attention to minimize pedestrian-vehicular conflicts. Several parks (4) proximate to the east edge of the campus complement the residential scale of the surrounding neighborhoods (5). The campus is just few blocks away from downtown Cheney (6) which can be perceived as distant and unconnected to the university, an issue that needs to be resolved.
OPEN SPACE AND DAILY PEDESTRIAN ACTIVITY

Formal (1) and informal (2) pedestrian corridors traverse the East Campus with a few crossing Washington Street to the West Campus. Quads (3) and open space are present throughout. The heart of campus is University Campus Mall (4). It is the most activated outdoor space as it is framed by the Pearce Union Building (PUB), Patterson Hall, the JFK Library, and the Tawanka Commons, all with uses frequented by the campus community and its visitors.

RIDGES AND SLOPES

Sloping upward toward the west and the Palouse beyond, distinct ridges define subareas of the campus. These ridges tend to form terraces on the campus that while relatively flat as subareas, create steep slopes between each other. This is most apparent in the athletic and recreation fields on the West Campus (1) and the steeper slopes found in the vicinity of Washington and Elm streets (2) on the East Campus.
EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY | COMPREHENSIVE CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

AERIAL VIEW OF CAMPUS AND DOWNTOWN C, 2011

PLACENAMES—EXISTING

1. Morrison Hall
2. Streeter Hall
3. Dryden Hall
4. New Residence Hall
5. Electrical Substation
6. Rozell Plant
7. University Recreation Center
8. Louise Anderson Hall
9. Dressler Hall
10. Pearce Hall
11. Pence Union Building
12. Patterson Hall
13. Isle Hall
14. Student Health Center
15. Hargreaves Hall
16. University House
17. Senior Hall
18. Kingston Hall
19. Indian Education Center
20. Governor Martin Alumni House
21. Showalter Hall
22. Plant Utilities
23. Monroe Hall
24. Tawanka Commons
25. Normal School Heritage Center
26. Huston Commons
27. Sutton Hall
28. Holter House
29. Visor’s Center
30. Martin Hall

WASHINGTON STREET
ELM STREET
C STREET
COLLEGE AVENUE
CEDAR STREET
10TH STREET
4TH STREET
Williamson Hall
JFK Library
Science Building
Cheney Hall
Computing and Engineering Building
Cadet Hall
Robert Reid Lab School
Communications Building
Radio/TV Building
University Theater
Art Building
Music Building
Children's Center
WA State Digital Archives
Anna Maria Apartments
WA State Patrol Crime Lab
Red Barn
Student Family Housing
Modular Building Complex
PE Classroom Building
PE Activities Building
Jim Thorpe Fieldhouse
Aquatics Building
Special Events Pavilion/Reese Court
Facilities Complex
Roos Field
Chissus Field
Playfield 1
Playfield 2
Playfield 3
Surplus Receiving Building
LAND USE – EXISTING

The City of Cheney borders the north, east, and south edges of the East Campus. Blocks immediately adjacent to the north (1) are zoned for mixed use to encourage residential and commercial uses targeted to the campus community. Multifamily uses border “C” Street (2). College Avenue (3) connects downtown Cheney (4) to the campus. Greek housing dot the neighborhoods between the campus and downtown. Although only one-half mile from the University Campus Mall, downtown Cheney appears distant and unconnected to the daily activities of the campus community. Both the city and the university are eager to promote a stronger connection to the downtown and to encourage supporting uses along the border of the campus.
ELEVATION–EXISTING

While the majority of the East Campus is flat, the 2,470-foot elevation at the corner of Washington and Elm Streets is 60 feet higher than the elevation along “C” Street. The land steepens sharply north of the PUB as campus paths approach Washington Street. Much of this steepness is due to grading undertaken in the development of campus buildings and Washington Street. This presents an opportunity to correct the past grading to create a smooth and ADA-accessible connection between the West and East campuses. In addition, lands rise sharply to the north of Elm Street and west of Washington Street. Agricultural lands furthest west are excessively steep and unsuitable for the development of core campus uses while opportunities exist on the East Campus. The East Campus should be the first choice for academic and supportive development to build upon synergies of use. It offers the greatest area of contiguous accessible (flat) land with available infrastructure.
Clusters of similar primary uses and also shared topographic level areas serve to define campus zones. These zones influence the campus experience and efficiencies in their relationships to each other and their context. The administrative core is located in the historic core of the campus (1). While memorable in its image, its lack of active ground-floor uses dulls the connection between the campus and the downtown.

The university should consider acquisition of parcels bordering College Avenue (2) for long-term expansion and connection to the downtown. The existing residential halls cluster along Tenth Street (3), a steep climb from Elm Street. Privately owned parcels at the corner of Washington and Elm streets (4) create the “hole in the donut” and should be actively acquired for future campus uses.

The development of new science facilities planned along Seventh Street offers an unparalleled opportunity to introduce a complementary mix of uses in this area of the campus (5). When the university has renewed its residence halls, additional residence halls beyond Planning Horizon 2 may be needed. The university should consider acquisition and long-term use of properties along Elm (6) and “C” (7) streets to take advantage of adjacencies to core campus uses. These properties may also be used for academic programs. Family housing is best expanded to the west (8) from its current location as its smaller residential footprint and tighter building clusters are adaptable to the rolling topography.

Planning and design for the North Gateway project (9) will alter the current football stadium and offer opportunities to shift out some uses from the Phase One complex. (10) Undeveloped agricultural lands (11) should be land banked until the university reaches build out of the already developed areas of the campus.

There are two buildings in the West Campus that are not owned by EWU. The crime lab (12) is owned and operated by the Washington State Patrol. It is on University-owned property, is connected to campus utilities, and is maintained by EWU through an inter-agency agreement. The Archives building (13) is the same, owned by the Office of Washington State Secretary of State.
OPEN SPACE–EXISTING

As the campus grew, the only major open space of any quality was the greensward that flowed down from Sholwater Hall to Fifth Street. (1) The quality of this landscape was not evident in other areas of the campus as the university focused on new facilities on properties incrementally acquired. Today, this is not the case. EWU recently transformed its open space—now a point of pride to the university’s community. The University Campus Mall, (2) while having a great deal of paving to accommodate pedestrian flows and periodic events, is lushly dotted and framed by mature trees. Two major walkways exist that intersect at the mall: (3) formal rows of trees, lighting, and seating frame these pedestrian-open space spines.

Other areas of the campus lack this quality of open space. The open space south of the JFK Library (4) lacks the same quality of definition, partially due to the absence of facilities to frame and activate the space.

The West Campus open space quality is defined by its athletic and recreation fields. (5) However, these fields are not the predominant image as parking occupies most of the open areas adjacent to Washington Street. The West Campus’s image is further diminished by the lack of the pedestrian-open space spines evident in the East Campus.

Washington Street (6) open space image is tarnished by these adjacencies and could be greatly enhanced by an informal planting of trees that would visually flow from the East Campus to the West Campus.

OPEN SPACE – EXISTING

- Zone 1 - Picturesque
- Zone 2 - Main Quad
- Zone 3 - Pedestrian Malls
- Zone 4 - Open Space Opportunity
- Zone 5 - Athletics and Recreation
Overall transportation to the campus works well on an average day. Washington Street (1) southbound is the busiest approach to the campus. While some have suggested closing and rerouting Washington Street, it will remain open. Parking demands peak at 11:30 AM when many of the core lots are full while parking remains available in peripheral lots.

A tight grid of streets frame the north, south, and east edges of the East Campus offering multiple points of approach (2). Traffic flows along Washington (3) and Elm Streets (4) create challenges to pedestrian crossings that have engendered numerous suggested remedies.

Recent expansion of parking in the West Campus (5) will increase pedestrian flows crossing Washington Street. Some parking, located in the East Campus will be needed for future development while some lots will remain for visitors and ADA access.

Curbside parking on public streets accounts for a significant percentage of the total parking and is a management concern for the university and the city.

The Appendix to this facilities master plan contains a detailed memorandum on the campus’s existing transportation conditions—vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

### Vehicular Circulation and Parking - Existing

- **Public Streets**
- **Campus Streets**
- **On Street Metered Parking**
- **General Permit Parking**
- **Roos Field - Reese Court Parking**
- **Residence Hall & University Apartments Parking**
- **Other Parking - Campus Use**
- **Other Parking - Non Campus Use**
Transit is highly utilized by students to reach the campus. The university provides unlimited Spokane Transit Authority (STA) bus rides to all active students, faculty, and staff. The program is well utilized with 28 percent of eligible participants using the STA at least once per month for connections to Spokane and local destinations. Faculty and students use this system to connect to their classes on both campuses. Students living in nearby apartment complexes use the transit service.

The local school district buses stop along the campus to drop of students who use EWU facilities. The campus transit center adjacent to the PUB (1) creates conflicts with pedestrians and vehicles as buses enter from Elm Street and traverse tight lanes and turns within the PUB parking lot. When it snows, buses will not access the parking lot. While its current location energizes the center of campus, future plans related to the Gateway project call for relocating the transit center to the West Campus (2). The CCMP identifies a transit stop near the PUB and other locations alongside the campus edges.
PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FLOWS—EXISTING

While no quantifiable data was available, it is likely that less than ten percent of the campus population regularly commutes by bicycle or walking. Bicycle parking was over capacity in several academic and residential areas of the campus underscoring the need to increase such facilities.

Well-defined pedestrian corridors (1) traverse the East Campus providing a five-minute walk from the University Campus Mall (2) to the majority of the academic and auxiliary facilities and residential halls. North Tenth Street (3) serves as the pedestrian spine connecting the residence halls and the University Recreation Center to the East Campus.

Campus pedestrian spines are not complete and in places lack smooth connections to areas of the East and West campuses. This is especially apparent for the corridor that bounds the existing Science Building as it links to the corner of Washington and Elm Streets (4). The West Campus lacks the pedestrian corridor and open space improvements that contribute a great deal to the character of the East Campus.

A perceived issue for pedestrians is crossing roadways, specifically Washington (5) and Elm Streets. However, motorists typically yield for pedestrians and there were few reported collisions involving pedestrians. None were reported on Washington Street.
SERVICE ACCESS—EXISTING

Facility administrative, service, and maintenance facilities are located in two areas adjacent to Washington Street. (1) Accessing campus facilities for service and maintenance is required for the campus to function.

Service vehicles typically use city streets and pedestrian corridors. Several loading docks located in the core of the East Campus require such access. Adjacent to high use pedestrian corridors, these loading docks need to be screened.

Relocating the service area for the PUB from deep within parking Lot 10 (2) to a location accessed from Elm Street would reduce conflicts with pedestrian flows. Other loading areas, such as one at PE Activities Phase complex (3), are adjacent to or serve as primary pedestrian entries. They create functional and visual conflicts and require mitigation.

While the East Campus is amply accessible for service, the West Campus lacks a continuous service loop (4). Dumpsters proliferate throughout. Simple screening and painting of the dumpsters would go a long way in improving the campus’s appearance.
EMERGENCY ACCESS–EXISTING

The East Campus appears to sufficiently accommodate emergency access for fire. Much of this access uses public streets and campus pedestrian corridors. Review of the West Campus suggests improved access is needed bounding the play field (1). The proposed service loop road should also be planned to allow access by emergency vehicles (2).
UTILITIES—EXISTING
The condition of the campus utilities is fairly good with plans in place for upgrades, expansions, and additions as noted below.

UTILITY TUNNEL
The utility tunnel system appears to be in good condition. There are no signs of degradation or the need for replacement. 10th Street Utilidor needs minor lid replacements.

STEAM
Steam is adequate for the campus pending continued replacement of the existing boilers with higher efficiency units that will replace all five boilers with three boilers. The steam system is currently undergoing valve replacements throughout campus via a public works contract. Steam located under pedestrian walks helps to reduce snow build up.

ELECTRICAL
The electrical system is adequate for the next ten years with some upgrades needed on a project-by-project basis. An example of this is the proposed Gateway Project that may require a remote chilled water system. Its electrical demand would exceed existing capacity requiring an upgrade to the electrical system. The sub-station is nearing 80 percent total load and its relays need reprogramming.

GAS
No issues are foreseen in the campus gas system. However, the city’s gas main is undersized to handle the campus’s boiler capacity.

POTABLE WATER
Potable water lines are currently being replaced as the university undertakes ongoing improvements to the system.

CHILLED WATER
Chilled water is at capacity. The construction of the proposed Science I building will include remote-chilled water to serve Science buildings I and II and additional buildings in this area of the campus.

STORM WATER
The storm drainage system is adequate at this time. The university plans to capture storm water in reservoirs for irrigation. This will reduce the demand for potable water assuring an increased reserve for potable water and fire needs.

SEWER
The sewer system appears to be adequate for the foreseeable future. The outfall needs to be consolidated.

REFERENCES
:: Walter & McGough Architects AIA, EWSC Campus Planning Report 1, 1963
:: Fehr & Peers, Final Memorandum Existing Campus Transportation Conditions, March 14, 2013
Facility assessment of the university’s academic and residential buildings is a key tool in EWU’s Comprehensive Campus Master Plan (CCMP). The assessment helps determine near and long-term investment needs and strategies. The analysis revealed which facilities may require significant renovation or replacement and the schedule of such actions.

The assessment is one criterion of several used to determine a facility’s viability. The university uses other factors, such as the ability of a facility to meet current program demands and how efficiently it makes use of the land upon which it is sited.

### Facility Condition Index (FCI)

The Facility Condition Index (FCI) is the ratio of preservation backlogs over current replacement value. As a performance measure, it accounts for differences in the type and quality of buildings. Monitored over time, FCI can track average building conditions at the institutional level.

It is important to note that FCI assessments do not evaluate the programmatic condition of facilities, or their ability to accommodate the changing academic needs of an institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION SCORE</th>
<th>CONDITION CLASS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Superior - Newer</td>
<td>A building with major systems that are in extremely good condition and functioning well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>A building with major systems in good condition, functioning adequately, and within their expected life cycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair - Systems approaching end of expected life cycles</td>
<td>A building with some older major systems that, though still functional, are approaching the end of their expected life cycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Needs Improvement - Limited functionality</td>
<td>A building with some major systems that are in poor condition, exceed expected life cycles, and require immediate attention to prevent or mitigate impacts on function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Needs Improvement - Marginal functionality</td>
<td>A building with some major systems that are failing and significantly restrict continued use of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Building Assessment

The State of Washington Comparable Framework indicates significant FCI swings between various state-funded institutions during the years 2006-2008 and 2008-2010. These swings are documented on charts created to allow cross-institutional comparison of FCI over time.

It is unclear why swings of such magnitude exist. However, the most current data from 2010 suggests that, for state and mixed-supported buildings, EWU has the worst FCI values for state-funded institutions of higher education, with an estimated preservation backlog at 17% percent of total replacement value. Graphs of the FCI scores from these documents, both system specific and overall, facilitate comparison and relative evaluation of existing conditions amongst various buildings. This comparison of relative condition guided proposed approaches to future facility management.

While EWU facilities have been well maintained and are in relatively good condition for their age, FCI scores indicate that approximately one quarter of EWU’s state-funded academic buildings received a score equal or greater than 3.0 in the year 2010. The description of a 3.0 rating is: “Fair: A building with some older major systems that, though still functional, are approaching the end of their expected live cycles.”

These buildings represent nearly 79% of the total gross square footage found within state-funded buildings at EWU. Given the 2010 rating, it is reasonable to expect significant renovation, or in some cases replacement, will be warranted prior to 2033, the end of CCMP Planning Horizon 2.
**Facilities Condition Index (% of Replacement Value)**
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**SECTION 3 | FACILITY ASSESSMENT**

**EWU OVERALL FCI BY BUILDING**

**BUILDING CONDITIONS AND PRESERVATION BACKLOGS OF STATE CAPITAL-SUPPORTED BUILDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition Category</th>
<th># Buildings</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>% of Total GSF</th>
<th>Estimated Preservation Backlog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Superior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59,460</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>$200,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Adequate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>420,103</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>$7,330,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Fair</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,401,860</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>$81,255,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Needs Improvement, Limited Functionality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>368,400</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>$47,206,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Needs Improvement, Marginal Functionality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,249,823</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$135,993,519</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Office of Financial Management Comparable Framework, 2010 Update
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ASSESSMENT

In 2008 EWU Facilities and Planning conducted a campus housing assessment. This report reviews each residence hall’s existing conditions, including: site access, exterior walls, roof, interior, common areas, student residences, restrooms, mechanical, electrical, plumbing and structural. In addition, EWU conducted an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) survey of all the residence halls.

Interviews with facility staff suggest that several student residence halls are, with regard to existing conditions, some of the most problematic buildings on campus. The planning team consolidated condition scores to generate simplified graphs to facilitate cross comparison of residential halls. Data from the 2008 housing assessment report indicates that approximately 70 percent of existing housing facilities scored 3.0 or higher.

Several buildings scored 4.0 in more than one category of assessment. Of these, Dressler and Pearce halls received a rating of 4.0 in both the “Service Systems” and “Shell” categories. The description of the 4.0 rating is: “Needs improvement: A building with some major systems that are in poor condition, exceed exceptional life cycles, and require immediate attention to prevent or mitigate impacts on function.”

Due primarily to their date of construction, all residence halls, with exception of Snyamncut, are out of compliance with ADA standards. The majority of residence hall options currently available on campus may not meet the expectations of EWU students. Recent trends in campus housing suggest that providing improved amenities and also a variety of housing configurations may aid in attracting students to on-campus housing. With all of these factors considered, it is reasonable to expect that EWU will undertake major renovation or full replacement of many existing residence halls within the first planning horizon or early in the second planning horizon.
SECTION 4
ENROLLMENT
Changes in student enrollment can significantly influence long-range campus master planning affecting academic space, student housing, auxiliary services, and transportation and parking.

The number of students enrolled at the university is influenced by both the number of incoming students and retention or loss of current students. Growth resulting from both forms exemplifies and supports the mission of Eastern Washington University (EWU) and its focus to foster student success.

**STUDENT FTE PROJECTIONS**

In order to better understand the potential impact of enrollment changes on facilities, the President’s Executive Committee (PEC) requested that the planning team analyze several rates of growth. After careful consideration, the PEC agreed that an annual 2 percent full time equivalent (FTE) increase would be an appropriately conservative parameter for the Comprehensive Campus Master Plan (CCMP). This increase represents a slightly lower rate of growth than actually realized over the previous two biennia, which averaged approximately 2.8 percent per year between 2008-2012. Based on the 2 percent rate of growth, projections indicate that student FTE at all EWU locations will increase from approximately 12,100 in 2013 to approximately 14,600 by 2023 and 17,800 by 2033. Projections specific to the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.

With regard to the addition of state funded academic space, particular interest was placed on the impact of growth on the utilization of Category 110 classroom seating. Based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, the state target of 22 hours per week per seat is clear that 110 seating should not be part of student FTE driven demand of existing state-funded academic buildings on the Cheney campus aligns with current FTE levels and the 197 GSF/FTE benchmark recognized by the State of Washington.
### Housing

**Residential Halls**

Campus housing was a recurrent theme in many discussion forums. Many interviewees view housing as an important contributor to the vitality and character of campus and a contributor to student success.

Currently, EWU does not implement a first year freshmen live-on requirement. However, this topic is currently under consideration. With regard to this policy, the CCMP housing demand projections reflect a conservative phase-in first year full time freshman live-on scenario: a 70 percent capture rate in 2013, incrementally increasing to a 75 percent capture rate in 2023 (the end of Planning Horizon 1), and a 80 percent capture rate in 2023 (0.5% per year increase).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Headcount</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Bed Count</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others Headcount</td>
<td>8,425</td>
<td>8,594</td>
<td>8,765</td>
<td>8,941</td>
<td>9,119</td>
<td>9,302</td>
<td>9,488</td>
<td>9,678</td>
<td>9,871</td>
<td>10,069</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>10,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others Bed Count</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Bed Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Assumed growth of 2% per year, based on headcount.

First year freshman capture rate increases from 70% of total first year freshman head count in 2013 to 80% of total first year freshman head count in 2023 (0.5% per year increase).

Capture rate for “all others” is constant at 8% of all other head count. Target increase for “all others” is 2% between 2023 and 2033 (0.2% per year for 10 years). The basis for “all others” was determined by total bed count target of 1,800 beds for Fall 2013.

**University Apartments**

The CCMP projects demand for apartments and family housing based on the projected growth in student FTE, maintaining its current target of 10 percent of the student FTE throughout Planning Horizon 1 with a modest increase to 12 percent in Planning Horizon 2.
AUXILIARY SERVICES

Increasing enrollment will also place pressure on auxiliary service facilities. With the growth in student FTE, additions to the PUB, student recreation center, and food service facilities will likely be required toward the end of Planning Horizon I (2023), or shortly thereafter.

While the CCMP does not identify specific programmatic requirements associated with expansion, it does recognize that significant benefits can arise by carefully coordinating auxiliary facilities with other improvement opportunities in their immediate vicinity.

A prime example of such an opportunity is the planning, design, and construction of an addition to the PUB and of new facilities in the area occupied by the Pearce and Dresler halls, the Science Building, and the pedestrian walks and open space immediately surrounding them.

PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION

The CCMP appendix includes a parking and transportation study. This study reviewed existing parking data and reports supplied by EWU, conducted a new parking supply/demand study, and coordinated with transit authorities to incorporate current and future route and ridership information.

With the recent expansion of Lot 12, there are approximately 5,300 parking spaces available to EWU staff and students. Of these, approximately 1,700 are curbside (both free and metered) and approximately 3,600 are on campus.

In order to maintain a positive relationship with the surrounding community and provide convenient walking distance from parking to campus, EWU determined that additional parking spaces, if required, should be provided on campus rather than at surrounding curbside locations.

For a number of interviewees, availability of parking is considered an ongoing issue; with shortages being seen as the primary problem. The analysis determined that proximity and convenience, rather than capacity, are primarily responsible for perceived parking shortages.

As of Fall 2013, parking demand is approximately 4,100 spaces and, with exception of “game days”, current supply should accommodate projected student FTE growth through the year 2023.

With 11,500 student FTE in the year 2023, parking demand is estimated to be 5,000 spaces on a non-game day and approximately 6,100 spaces on a game day. In Horizon 2 (2033) 14,000 student FTE creates a parking demand of 6,100 spaces on a non-game day and 9,300 spaces on a game day, assuming expansion of the stadium.

While current total space count appears to meet demand projections through the year 2023, it is important to note that parking count over time is not a static condition. The CCMP’s concepts and recommendations suggest that a number of parking spaces currently located near the center of campus be removed. The intention of this to improve both safety and the pedestrian friendly character associated with the East Campus.

In addition, parking lots currently located on future building sites will be removed as those sites are needed. In order to accommodate both the improvements in campus character and new buildings associated with increased student FTE, the CCMP identifies facilities needs for each planning horizon. Subsequent sections of the CCMP describe this in more detail.

PROJECTED SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Based on the projected student FTE growth, the CCMP identifies demand for the four major program categories: state-funded buildings; residential halls, university apartments, and parking. As discussed previously, the housing demand projections used in the CCMP assumes “increased targets.” Combined with supply calculations based on retaining, renovating, demolishing, and constructing new facilities, the CCMP identifies facility needs for each planning horizon. Subsequent sections of the CCMP describe this in more detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BED COUNT DEMAND 2023-2033 - HORIZON 2</th>
<th>Basis @ 2023</th>
<th>Fall Yr 11</th>
<th>Fall Yr 12</th>
<th>Fall Yr 13</th>
<th>Fall Yr 14</th>
<th>Fall Yr 15</th>
<th>Fall Yr 16</th>
<th>Fall Yr 17</th>
<th>Fall Yr 18</th>
<th>Fall Yr 19</th>
<th>Fall Yr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST YEAR FRESHMAN HEADCOUNT @ 2%</strong></td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST YEAR FRESHMAN BED COUNT @ 2%</strong></td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL OTHERS HEADCOUNT @ 2%</strong></td>
<td>10,475</td>
<td>10,685</td>
<td>10,899</td>
<td>11,117</td>
<td>11,339</td>
<td>11,566</td>
<td>11,797</td>
<td>12,033</td>
<td>12,274</td>
<td>12,519</td>
<td>12,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL OTHERS BED COUNT @ 2%</strong></td>
<td>838</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BED COUNT @ 2%</strong></td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>2,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## All Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Horizon 1 - 2023</th>
<th>Horizon 2 - 20xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student FTE</strong></td>
<td>11,781</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student HC</strong></td>
<td>12,587</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>19,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cheney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Horizon 1 - 2023</th>
<th>Horizon 2 - 20xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student FTE</strong></td>
<td>9,236</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student HC</strong></td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty FTE</strong></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty HC</strong></td>
<td>349</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff FTE</strong></td>
<td>740</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff HC</strong></td>
<td>762</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of total FTE</th>
<th>% of total FTE</th>
<th>% of total FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman - First year</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>2.006</td>
<td>2.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman - All</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Bacc, Graduate, Non Matric</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total FTE</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Riverpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Horizon 1 - 2023</th>
<th>Horizon 2 - 20xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student FTE</strong></td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student HC</strong></td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All Other Locations and On-line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Horizon 1 - 2023</th>
<th>Horizon 2 - 20xx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student FTE</strong></td>
<td>599</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student HC</strong></td>
<td>769</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. FTE = Full-time equivalent
2. HC = Headcount
3. Does not include distance learning

### Cheney Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student FTE: Headcount ratio = 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student FTE:Faculty FTE = 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty FTE:HC = 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student FTE:Staff FTE = 12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Staff FTE:HC = 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Freshman First Year: All Freshman = 0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Riverpoint Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Student FTE growth per year = 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student FTE:Headcount ratio = 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Student FTE growth per year = 2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All Other Locations and On-line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Student FTE:Headcount ratio = 0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary Supply and Demand - Cheney Campus

#### Eastern Washington University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE</td>
<td>9,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student HC</td>
<td>9,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty HC</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff FTE</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff HC</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizon 1 - 2023</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student HC</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty HC</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff FTE</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff HC</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizon 2 - 2033</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student HC</td>
<td>15,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty HC</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff FTE</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff HC</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Program Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Student FTE</th>
<th>Student HC</th>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Faculty HC</th>
<th>Staff FTE</th>
<th>Staff HC</th>
<th>Stadium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>9,236</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### State-Funded Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>GSF/FTE</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Over (Under)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>WA State Benchmark</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>GSF/FTE</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Supply GSF</td>
<td>1,867,000</td>
<td>2,253,000</td>
<td>2,689,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Targeted GSF</td>
<td>1,819,000</td>
<td>2,246,000</td>
<td>2,708,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Over (Under Capacity) GSF</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>(86,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Residential Halls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Over (Under)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Beds-Supply</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Beds-Status Quo</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Beds-Increased Target</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Over (Under Capacity) Increased Target</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### University Apartments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Over (Under)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Units-Supply</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Units-Status Quo</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Units-Increased Target</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Over (Under Capacity) Increased Target</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Demand - Potential Gross</th>
<th>Demand Projected - Status Quo</th>
<th>Demand Projected - Status Quo + Increased Residential Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Curbside - Free</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>8,430</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Curbside - Metered</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Available Over (Under)</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Saturday Sell-Out Game Day Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Available Over (Under)</th>
<th>Saturday Sell-Out Game Day Demand + Status Quo Residential Targets</th>
<th>Saturday Sell-Out Game Day Demand + Increased Residential Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Available Over (Under)</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>(1710)</td>
<td>(2,081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Saturday Sell-Out Game Day Demand + Status Quo Residential Targets</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>8,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Saturday Sell-Out Game Day Demand + Increased Residential Targets</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>9,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** EWU, Mahlum, Fehr & Peers, 2013

**NOTES:**

1. For comprehensive institutions, State-funded facilities.
2. GSF = Gross Square Feet
3. Mix of residence halls and suites

**SUMMARY OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND - CHENEY CAMPUS**
SECTION 5 | CONCEPTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCEPT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

VISION
The CCMP captures two snapshots—planning horizons—of campus development to meet the needs of the projected enrollment for 2023 and 2033. Both planning horizons illustrate how the university can develop the Cheney campus to maximize student FTE capacity within EWU’s desired university culture and campus character. Both planning horizons identify the sequencing of projects in five phases, each corresponding to a biennial capital request cycle.

PLANNING CRITERIA
The following planning criteria govern the student FTE capacity of the campus:

- The residential target for undergraduates increases steadily from 18 to 23 percent by the end of Planning Horizon 2
- GSF and bed count of new residential buildings assumes maximum of five floors
- All required parking is accommodated with surface lots—however, the university may elect to implement structured parking for better proximity to core uses

The 2008 Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) Enrollment Capacity and Technology Study identified a maximum capacity of 11,500 FTE for the EWU Cheney Campus. A number of factors may contribute to the difference between the HECB and CCMP projected maximum capacity. However, the variable most likely responsible for this discrepancy is the estimated GSF of buildings that can be accommodated within existing campus boundaries. It is assumed that HECB based capacities on the continued long-term use of the existing buildings, many of which have poor site utilization.

PLANNING HORIZONS
The CCMP addresses two ten-year planning horizons:

Planning Horizon 1, years 2013 to 2023, tracks enrollment of the Cheney campus to accommodate 11,500 student FTE based on a two percent annual growth rate.

Planning Horizon 2, years 2023 to 2033, accommodates 14,000 student FTE, approximately the maximum capacity of the Cheney campus.

The CCMP, taking facility condition, site utilization, and property ownership into consideration proposes the replacement of several buildings whose systems are reaching the end of expected life cycles. This approach will allow EWU to increase density of the existing campus to maximize use of its current land holdings, precluding the need to acquire additional land.

OVERVIEW
Three primary categories of consideration—academic programs, facility condition, and enrollment—drive the concepts and recommendations of the Eastern Washington University (EWU) Comprehensive Campus Master Plan (CCMP). The concept and recommendations support the overall mission of the university through the implementation of physical improvements that strategically address these considerations.

The CCMP organizes future improvement and development of university facilities into three interrelated areas: state and non-state-funded buildings, on-campus student housing, and parking. Non state-funded functions include the student union and athletic and recreation facilities. The university will coordinate and implement associated expansion of infrastructure and utilities on an as-needed basis and as part of individual building projects.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM

ENROLLMENT

FACILITY CONDITION

VISION
ACADEMIC BUILDINGS

Utilizing the benchmark of 197 GSF of state-funded academic building per FTE combined with an assumed annual enrollment increase of 2%, nearly 406,500 additional GSF of state-funded academic space may be required at the Cheney campus by the year 2023. By 2033, consistent enrollment increases of 2 percent may require up to 902,000 additional GSF of state-funded academic facilities.

As academic space is added to campus inventory, it is important to note that, based on state benchmarking targets, EWU’s Cheney campus provides sufficient Category 110 seating to accommodate a significant increase in student FTE. With a current supply of approximately 7,800 seats, Category 110 classrooms are projected to easily meet student FTE driven demand of 7,400 seats through 2033. A detailed assessment of academic programming should be conducted in order to identify the specific areas of need with the projected 902,000 GSF.

HOUSING

The CCMP tracks on-campus undergraduate student housing needs associated with increased enrollment over the two planning horizons. Bed count demand reflects two capture rates.

Status Quo reflects bed count increases based on a consistent capture rate of 70 percent of new first year freshmen.

Increased Target reflects bed count based on a one half percent increase in capture rate per year over the duration of two planning horizons.

The increased target transitions residence hall capture rates for new incoming freshmen from an assumed 70 percent in 2013 to 80 percent in 2033. The phased planning horizons illustrate accommodation of the increased target rate with its higher bed count requirements.

With the 2013 opening of the new residence hall, Snyamncut, the university planned to permanently take Morrison Hall off line. The CCMP proposes to utilize Morrison Hall as swing space during later phases while same-site replacement of the majority of the existing residence halls takes place.

The CCMP proposes modest increases in the supply of university apartments from one percent to two percent of the total student FTE.
**Parking**

The CCMP increases parking supply to reflect the projected student FTE growth. It does not account for parking demand generated by the Gateway project in Planning Horizons 1 and 2 when the proposed expansion of seating from 8,500 to 15,000 and 25,000 respectively. The plan includes removing several parking lots within the East Campus to reduce conflicts with pedestrian movements and to use the sites for new building development. While the CCMP avoids the need to construct parking structures in both planning horizons, it does identify areas to be reserved for such use in the future when the cost of land justifies such expenditures.

**Zones of Opportunity**

The CCMP identifies several key zones of opportunity. The largest, and perhaps the most sequentially critical zone includes Pearce and Dressler halls, the Pence Union Building (PUB) and the Science Building (1). Opportunities presented by this zone include the creation of a new campus gateway at the corner of Elm and Washington streets, significant improvement of campus open space adjacent to the northwest edge of the PUB, and the creation of an accessible pedestrian route from the core of the East Campus to the West Campus’s athletic and recreation facilities. The strategic sequencing of the improvements maximizes the potential benefits of this area.

A second zone (2) currently occupied by Martin and Williamson halls and the Robert Reid Lab School offers unique opportunities associated with its immediate proximity to the University Campus Mall and other primary cross-campus pedestrian walkways. The opportunities associated with this zone are significant. They include increased transparency and student activity along the walkways, the formation of a new entry gateway along the southern boundary of campus (Seventh Street), and the creation of a new “anchor” building at the southernmost corner of the University Campus Mall. This new anchor building and its programs could orient toward the University Campus Mall, further enriching this important campus amenity.
PHASING
Each planning horizon includes five two-year phases corresponding with biennial funding cycles. The purpose of this phasing is threefold. Firstly, the phasing tracks a series of projects already proposed by EWU in the 2013-2023 Capital Plan and Capital Budget Request. Secondly, phasing proposes an allocation of projects intended to correspond with reasonable allocations of capital funding. Finally, the successful implementation of some proposed projects is dependent on prior completion of other proposed projects. The phasing plan outlines this interdependent sequence of plan development.

PLANNING HORIZON 1 – 2013 TO 2023
Planning Horizon 1, takes the Cheney campus up to a projected capacity of 11,500 student FTE. Planning Horizon 1 has five phases. Phases 1.1 through 1.3 consist primarily of capital projects previously identified by EWU. Several of these have, or soon will have, design studies completed.
PHASE 1.1

1.1.1 Expand Lot 12—completed in Spring 2013
1.1.2 Construct a new softball field
1.1.3 Remove Lot 16
1.1.4 Modify Lot 9
1.1.5 Construct a new transit center
1.1.6 Construct a new soccer field and track

With the exception of the new softball field, these projects are largely associated with, and driven by, the proposed Gateway Project that will significantly increase the seating capacity of Roos Field. In the event the Gateway Project does not move forward, the associated projects identified in this phase may occur on different time lines, some could occur in Phase 1.1, while others could shift to later phases or be eliminated entirely.
PHASE 1.2

1.2.1 Remove Lot 5
1.2.2 Demolish the Robert Reid School in preparation of the new Science I building
1.2.3 Construct Science I—already proposed by EWU; design study completed in 2010
   Shift Science I further south to allow for a pedestrian corridor
1.2.4 Replace Dryden Residence Hall
   Replacing Dryden Hall, rather than renovating it, allows for a significant improvement in utilization of the site, via an increased bed count.
1.2.5 Remove the modular classrooms
1.2.6 Construct Lot NP1 on the modular classroom site
PHASE 1.3

1.3.1 Construct a building on the Spokane Riverpoint Campus
1.3.2 Construct Science II
1.3.3 Demolish and replace Louise Anderson Residence Hall

Similar to Dryden Hall, the replacement of Louise Anderson allows for a significant improvement in utilization of the site, via increased bed count.

When combined with beds made available through the reactivation of Morrison Hall, the increased bed count provided by the replacement of Dryden and Louise Anderson halls will provide the swing space needed for the subsequent replacement of Pearce and Dressler halls.

Both Pearce and Dressler halls are in poor condition. Both are located in a key zone of opportunity to improve the campus. EWU should carefully consider the viability of replacing both Dryden and Louise Anderson halls prior to Pearce and Dressler so as not to jeopardize the replacement of Pearce and Dressler halls.

If replacement of Dryden and Louise Anderson halls would not allow EWU to replace Pearce and Dressler halls during Phase 1.4, EWU should shift either Dryden Hall or Louise Anderson Hall to Horizon 2 while recognizing the impact on the supply of available beds.
PHASE 1.4

1.4.1 Significantly renovate or replace the Science Building

Removing program from the existing Science Building within a key zone of opportunity requires careful consideration to the benefits of replacement over renovation of the building. The extent of retrofit required to convert the former Science Building to other functions, along with opportunities for higher site utilization may favor replacement over renovation.

Benefits of replacement include a reconfigured building footprint that offers a wider variety of design alternatives for the replacement of Pearce and Dressler halls. Also, it allows regrading of the entire area to provide accessible pedestrian routes that link the northern residence hall precinct with the PUB and the PUB to the athletic and recreation facilities in the West Campus.

Currently, a significant level of pedestrian traffic occurs between the residential halls north of Elm Street and the core of the East Campus. Much of this pedestrian traffic continues past the PUB to the University Campus Mall, connecting to East Campus buildings and also on to athletic and recreation facilities located west of Washington Street. The addition to the PUB and the replacement for Pearce and Dressler halls and the Science Building with new facilities that have active ground floor spaces will do much to enliven and strengthen these significant pedestrian spines.

1.4.2 Remove Lot 10

This will significantly improve the safety and the pedestrian character of the East Campus.

1.4.3 Renovate the PUB

This renovation includes relocation of the PUB’s loading and service areas to further improve the safety and character of the East Campus. Future design studies associated with renovation of the PUB should take into consideration other proposed improvements located within this key zone of opportunity bounded by the PUB, Elm Street, and Washington Street.
1.4.4 Replace Pearce and Dressler residence halls
Take Morrison Hall on line to serve as surge space to allow demolition of Pearce and Dressler residence halls.
Demolish Pearce and Dressler residence halls after occupancy of the replacement residence halls.
Design new residence halls to improve the pedestrian character of the East Campus by locating bedrooms above the ground level to maintain privacy while enlivening the open space of campus with active functions on the ground level.

1.4.5 Construct addition to the Computer & Engineering Sciences building

PHASE 1.5
1.5.1 Demolish and replace Isle Hall
1.5.2 Remove Lot 15
1.5.3 Expand the university apartments
1.5.4 Demolish the Anna Maria Apartments
1.5.5 Construct the Center for Alternative Energy
The precise location of the Center for Alternative Energy should be carefully planned to allow Lot NP2 to accommodate structured parking in the future.
1.5.6 Construct Lot NP2

PHASE 1.5
Planning Horizon 2, takes the Cheney campus up to its projected maximum capacity of 14,000 student FTE. This horizon also has five phases.
PHASE 2.1

2.1.1 Construct Isle II

2.1.2 Replace Martin and Williamson Halls

With its prominent location adjacent to the University Campus Mall, the Martin and Williamson site is an excellent candidate for the performing arts, fine arts, and communications programs.
PHASE 2.2

2.2.1 Relocate the One Room School House. Additional locations could be considered for the One Room School House.

2.2.2 Replace Huston Hall
The replacement of Huston Hall doubles the density currently offered by the existing building on a central site fronting University Campus Mall, the main campus quadrangle. The replacement also provides opportunities to significantly improve the relationship of Huston Hall to the adjacent main pedestrian spine that connects to the library and beyond.

2.2.3 Demolish Streeter and Morrison halls

2.2.4 Construct Lot NP3

2.2.5 Demolish the communications, music, radio, TV, and theater complex. Lot NP3

2.2.6 Construct a new residence hall

2.2.7 Further expand Lot 12 or construct NP4
PHASE 2.3

2.3.1 Remove Lot 1
2.3.2 Construct a new academic building west of Showalter Hall
2.4.1 Demolish the Plant Utilities, and construct a new academic building north of Showalter Hall

2.4.2 Demolish existing church, and construct a new academic building east of Showalter Hall

2.4.3 Demolish Holter House and construct a new addition to Sutton Hall administration building

2.4.4 Expand the PUB
   Locating the expansion of the PUB along the north and west edges of the existing building will create new active frontage along the University Campus Mall and the improved pedestrian walk and open space to the south of the Pearce and Dressler halls replacements. As this zone develops over time, EWU should consider locating upper division housing above the PUB addition.

2.4.5 Demolish Cheney and Cadet Halls to increase open space along Washington Street

2.4.6 Construct a new residence hall
PHASE 2.5

2.5.1 Remove Lot NP1
2.5.2 Construct a new recreation building
2.5.3 Construct a new recreation building
2.5.4 Construct additional new family housing
CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

The campus development guidelines describe parameters for the siting of buildings and the definition of pedestrian spines and open spaces. The intent of the guidelines is to achieve and enhance those qualities of the campus character that users admire today and to make most efficient use of one of the university's most limited resources—its land.

Campus buildings need to address two "clients." One client is the facility users. The other is the campus community. For the latter, each renovated and new building needs to contribute to quality of the whole of the campus.

The guidelines, therefore, set a character for the campus that builds upon areas of the campus admired today. The guidelines set a maximum building height and describe setbacks and build-to lines that define campus edges and pedestrian spines. In some cases, the guidelines identify building edges whose use and design need to foster ground floor activity in key areas of the campus.

The guidelines also identify primary building entries and sally ports to encourage use of the pedestrian spines. Buildings sited at the edges of the campus create an alternating rhythm of building and open space to allow the quality of the campus open space to spill out in a welcoming gesture to the surrounding community.

GUIDELINE 1 BUILDING HEIGHT

In order to maintain appropriate campus scale and preserve campus open space from excessive shading, the maximum height limit for academic buildings is five stories, with four stories along significant pedestrian routes being a preferable configuration whenever possible.

GUIDELINE 2 BUILDING SETBACK

In order to preserve the overall campus character and provide buffer space between campus buildings and the surrounding residential neighborhood, the guidelines include a 50-foot setback for all new buildings and any major additions that abut perimeter boundary lines.

GUIDELINE 3 BUILD-TO LINES

In order to maintain the current pattern of pedestrian thoroughfares that cross the campus, the guidelines establish a 100-foot wide build-to line (fifty feet to centerline of the pedestrian spine).

The Cheney campus has buildings constructed since the early 1900's. These buildings, through the use of similar construction material and scale, create a beautiful and largely cohesive campus environment. With the exception of several buildings, brick of similar color is the predominant and unifying material. Pearce Hall, Dressler Hall, The Phase and some portions of the Science Building, are notable exceptions to this consistency. A number of buildings constructed during the late 1960's and afterward, punctuate their brick exterior with larger expanses of glass near their main entry and lobby functions.

As EWU integrates new buildings, replacements, renovations, and additions on the existing campus, the university should use a material palette that continues to reinforce the unified image of the university.
Wherever possible, locate active functions such as lobbies, social areas, study areas, and interior circulation to enrich and activate the edges of buildings, particularly on the ground plane. Provide expanded areas of glass around main building entries and other active areas to visually connect interior building and campus open spaces.

New projects should strike a balance between higher density, height, and scale to promote a visually pleasant and welcoming character. In most instances, academic buildings orient their primary facades and entrances toward major campus open spaces and interior pedestrian walks. Buildings along the perimeter of campus account for the primary exceptions to this pattern. Examples such as Cadet Hall, Cheney Hall, Computer and Engineering, and Isle Hall orient away from the campus interior. One group that includes the Music Building, University Theater, Radio and TV, Art Building and Communications Building focuses almost entirely inward.

Newly constructed buildings located on the perimeter of campus should establish strong connections to both the interior of campus and the surrounding community.

With the recent addition of the student recreation center and the new residence hall, Snyamnknut, to the residence halls north of Elm Street, EWU has placed increased pedestrian traffic along North Tenth Street. Similar to other buildings located on the perimeter of campus, Dryden and Louise Anderson halls orient almost completely toward the surrounding neighborhood, rather than toward a shared pedestrian walk that leads to the East Campus academic and auxiliary buildings. When replaced, the new residence halls need to establish a strong relationship with the shared pedestrian walks and the campus open spaces they help define.
SUSTAINABILITY

EWU's sustainability goal is to promote environmental sustainability and reduce the impact of university operations on the environment. The university established a Sustainability Committee charged with being an instrument for the discussion of sustainability and energy conservation between the various campus stakeholders.

The following parameters promoted the need for the university to discuss sustainability and natural resource management.

CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

EWU is signatory to the American Colleges and University President's Climate Commitment (ACUPCC) publicly demonstrating the university's obligation towards sustainability and emissions reduction. Signatory agencies are required to develop institutional structures to guide the development and implementation of a Climate Action Plan (CAP), a comprehensive plan for the university to achieve climate neutrality within a prescribe time line.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION AND CARBON FOOTPRINT REDUCTION

The State of Washington through legislation (RCW 70.235) mandates state agencies to provide and implement planning to reduce greenhouse gas emission and reduce the carbon footprint on campuses including Eastern Washington University.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The university provides a leadership role in the community and along with other institutions across the nation is developing plans to minimize its operational impact on the environment. EWU has developed a set of tangible goals with time lines to meet the intent of the AASHE (Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education) and the ACUPCC. With EWU's commitment to environmental and climate neutrality issues, it recognizes the importance of implementing a formal gathering, review, and recommendation process for stakeholder engagement. To continually engage and communicate with university stakeholders will enhance EWU's commitment.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

EWU makes significant impacts with regards to conservation and sustainability in the areas of recycling, Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) building assurances, building automation, and plant operations. The university continues to look for new processes and projects that promote continuous improvement in natural resource management and campus sustainability.

HOW THE CCMP PROMOTES SUSTAINABILITY

The CCMP promotes sustainability in several ways:

- Increases development densities to maximize use of the land in balance with the desired character of campus's sense of place
- Uses infill development to increase the proximity of academic and auxiliary uses
- Sites new development to access existing utility services, minimizing the need to extend utilities into undeveloped areas of the campus
- Increases the convenience of public transit and university shuttles and increases the supply of housing to promote use of the campus's resources on a 24/7 basis and to reduce the dependence on the automobile to access the campus.
INSTRUCTIONAL UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

It is recommended that a detailed space utilization analysis be conducted for classrooms and teaching laboratories to understand current levels of room utilization and room fit. The room utilization assessment would assess the number of hours the room is in use during a peak week, thereby identifying potential opportunities for improved use. In addition to measuring utilization on the basis of time, a room fit, or right-sizing analysis, should also be conducted. The right-sizing analysis would determine whether or not EWU has the right mix of classroom sizes to support pedagogy and section sizes.

CLASSROOM CONVERSION

Pending the outcome of a detailed programmatic analysis, and in the event the State of Washington’s capital allocation process places higher emphasis on achieving utilization targets, EWU needs to consider conversion of selected 110 classroom space into other programmatic functions. The information established through the implementation of space need and utilization recommendations will serve to identify specific classrooms to be converted and the resulting functional changes. This conversion of 110 classrooms will benefit the university by making better use of its resources.

STUDENT HOUSING MASTER PLAN

A number of user groups referenced the importance and over-arching contribution of on-campus student housing to the character and vitality of the university, particularly after class and in the evenings. This perspective, combined with the current condition of existing residence halls, suggests that EWU should conduct an update of their current housing master plan. This analysis should reference the CCMP’s broad campus initiatives, expand on its enrollment projections, and test the viability of various phasing scenarios. Housing master plan alternatives should clearly outline, projected demand within various housing offerings, financial viability, and its relationship to phasing, provision for swing space, and interim deferred maintenance.

UTILITIES

Over the duration of Horizon 1 and Horizon 2, it is the intent of the university to plan and execute utility upgrades on a project-by-project basis. Upon adoption of the CMMP, EWU should conduct a broad assessment of campus utilities as they relate to phased increases of gross square footage identified in the plan.

PROPERTY ACQUISITION

While EWU currently holds a relatively large zone of undeveloped acreage along its western boundary, this area has significant topographic variation which poses challenges associated with construction, cost, and accessibility. This undeveloped area is also remote from the historic core of campus, its existing academic buildings, and student housing. Over time, development of this area would effectively shift the geographic center of campus to Washington Street and Roos Field, thereby necessitating a major flow of students and faculty through and around this area.

With this in mind, EWU should continue to track the availability of property, particularly that which is located in immediate proximity to the eastern and southern campus boundaries. Topography immediately adjacent to the historic campus core and proximity to the City of Cheney make these areas a preferable alternative for future campus development. An area near the intersection of Washington and Elm should also be considered as a candidate for future acquisition.
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