**PROJECT BACKGROUND NARRATIVE**

The existing 1200-bed Gage complex has outlived its life expectancy and it is scheduled to be demolished. Replacement housing is needed to house the 1200 students. The unit type in the existing Gage complex is traditional double rooms with common gang bathrooms per floor. Initially, MSU was planning 4 single-bedroom apartments to compete with the off-campus private apartments. However, working with the Steering Committee through a consensus building process with Residential Life, Facilities, University Cabinet & Deans, and Students, we concluded that replacement housing for “traditional rooms” would not be apartments. And, considering Residential Life’s mission, of building community the residential unit type and support spaces would need to be configured on the site and programmed in the building to reinforce that mission.

**Residence Precinct Study**

Summary of Workshops of January 12-13, 2005

Residential Life reinforces the university community by organizing the students into a variety of scaled communities. For example, the roommate in the dorm room, the Residential Coordinator (RC) communities of approximately 40 students per RC, the residence hall community of approximately 300 students. As students mature, their life style progresses from living in traditional rooms as freshman to a more independent life style, ultimately living in apartments as seniors.

![Student Maturation Diagram]

- **Freshman**
  - Traditional Rooms
- **Sophomores**
  - Semi-Suites/Suites
- **Juniors/Seniors**
  - Suites/Apartments
From the analysis of the MSU On-Campus Unit Types by Class it became clear that replacement housing for traditional rooms, most appropriately, would be semi-suites for freshman and sophomores and semi-suites and suites for upperclass students.

**MSU On-Campus Unit Types By Class**

- **Freshmen** 70%
- **Sophomores** 15%
- **Juniors** 8%
- **Seniors** 7%

% of students living on campus
Master Plan

After concluding, what we are building (semi-suites), and for whom (upperclass students), we reviewed the master plan and investigated site options for the most appropriate sites on campus.

The current campus master plan envisioned housing north of Maywood Avenue and south of Stadium Road.

After our workshops with Steering Committee, Residential Life, Facilities, University Cabinet & Deans, and Students, we concluded that the replacement housing would be built in multiple phases. Phase 1 would be comprised of a 600-bed housing complex for upperclass students on the Rugby Pitch site. Future phases would include a 180-bed freshmen housing with First Year Experience on the existing Parking Lot 13 and a 420-bed residence hall connecting to the A Wing of the existing Crawford Center. Since the master plan it was decided that the recreation and athletic fields would remain eliminating that areas ability to provide housing. A new site needed to be found.
**Site Conclusion**

Summary of Workshops of February 24-25, 2005

The siting of the 180-bed freshmen residence hall, north of Maywood Avenue concentrates the entire freshmen residence hall in one area to take advantage of the new location of the First Year Experience. The parking that is displaced on Lot 13 will be accommodated by the existing vacant spaces on campus. The two, 300-bed upperclass residence halls will be constructed west of West Road on the Rugby Pitch site. The future 420-bed housing is envisioned as an addition to the Carkoski residence halls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Freshmen are in one location</td>
<td>• Relocates parking to remote vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FYE is on main route to campus</td>
<td>spaces on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus becomes more pedestrian</td>
<td>• Fuel tank access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimize construction impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminates Stadium Road crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supports Student Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates Student Life quad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gage can offer single not double rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces food service requirements ($)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not need to think in 600 bed terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investigating Other Site Options

Summary of Workshops of January 19-20, 2005 - The following outlines other site alternatives that were investigated.

MSU Original Concept - Southwest Corner of Stadium Road and Ellis Avenue

Pros
- Creates image to Stadium Road
- Phased demo to maintain bed count
- Responds to bridge concept
- Responds to parking ramp concept
- Extends MP “Green Boulevard”
- Parking convenient to housing

Cons
- Cost of commons/food service
- Distance to campus
- Phased construction premiums
- Phased demo premiums (unfunded)
- Distance from other housing
- Mixing of sophs w/ jrs/snrs “off campus”
- Softball relocation funding?
- Land use driven by existing Gage
- Unknown site improvements/cost
- First Year students split on campus

Phase 1 -- Build 600 Beds
Phase 2 -- Demo Tower A
Phase 3 -- Build 600 Beds
Phase 4 -- Demo Tower B and Commons
Full Build Out -- Complete Landscape & Parking

Southwest Corner of Stadium and Ellis

North
More Site Options Investigated

The pros and cons of these options are noted in the appendix that includes the complete PowerPoint presentation presented during the series of workshop.