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ACC’S SERVICE AREA, INDICATED IN YELLOW, SPANS ACROSS EIGHT COUNTIES.
SUMMARY

- To meet Closing the Gaps (CTG) targets ACC must increase its enrollment 44% by 2025. This report is predicated on the assumption that the great majority of this growth may be campus-based, rather than distance-learning-based.

- The study recommends a hybrid strategy to meet the CTG goal, with approximately half the projected campus-based increase accommodated on existing campuses, and half on new sites:
  
  - Expand the District’s facilities planning to include Evening Centers (limited evening-only course offerings at area high school sites), New Campuses which would be built on sufficient land to allow expansion of facilities as enrollment growth occurs, and Existing Campuses which will sustain and/or grow enrollments in prescribed ways as suggested in this report.

  - New Campuses should be developed in high-growth areas, subject to successful annexation efforts to provide the revenue to support facilities and program expansions, on sufficient acreage to ensure the ability of the College to expand the campuses as growth needs and population projections dictate.

  - Land Acquisitions to support New Campuses should be planned in Round Rock/Pflugerville, Manor, San Marcos, and Bastrop County with the understanding that these would initially be developed as smaller campuses on sufficient acreage to support future growth as anticipated by the CTG demographic data.
In response to the CTG initiative, target headcount enrollment for 2025 represents a 44% increase with resulting implications for ACC’s facilities.

CONTEXT

Austin Community College retained Sasaki Associates in March 2005 to develop a strategic facilities master plan. The central purpose of the plan is to outline the best strategies for accommodating enrollment growth at the College until 2025. The target headcount enrollment for 2025 is 47,678, a 44% increase over the current enrollment of 33,039. The natural growth in the existing population over the same time period will be only 33%. ACC’s greater proportional increase will result from addressing the requirements of Closing the Gaps, a Texas statewide initiative to improve educational levels among underserved populations, including rapidly growing first and second generation immigrant populations, many of whom are Hispanic.

This initiative is seen as a social and economic necessity for the State of Texas, since the State Demographer projects that 33.8% of the population of Texas, and 29.9% in Travis County, will be Hispanic by the year 2020, and that the white workforce is aging. Community colleges are expected to play the major role in responding to the Closing the Gaps initiative. For ACC, this means anticipating where the growth will occur, acquiring appropriate land, and developing a cost-effective capital investment program.

Historically, ACC has been underfinanced in terms of facilities, relative to national averages and other Texas community colleges. When additional funds have become available, through increases in property tax revenue or annexation of additional out-of-district communities, the College has made a strategic choice for its investment priority to be in faculty and staff as a response to local communities’ demand for program expansion. While significant capital improvements have been funded in recent years, capital has not historically been available to finance the acquisition and development of the major new campuses with large enrollments that characterize many large community college systems across the country. As a result, ACC campuses tend to be on smaller acreage, have smaller buildings and instructional and student services space, are often “land-locked,” and have significantly higher enrollments per square foot than peer institutions.
**APPROACH**

This study focused on whether projected growth can or should be accommodated through new construction on existing campuses, or should be accommodated at new sites. The long-term cost-effective strategy here advocated considered:

- Size efficiency
- Annexation potential
- Access (both physical and relative to growth projections)
- Future flexibility beyond 2025
- Cost (in general)
- Competition

This report presents a hybrid solution, reflecting comments received since interim versions were presented. While the great majority of projected campus-based growth could ultimately be accommodated on existing campuses, with some selective land acquisition, the study does not recommend this approach, because market penetration rates\(^1\) would prevent the facilities being fully utilized. The study indicates that a preferred approach results in accommodating about half of projected growth at augmented existing campuses (at Riverside campus, depending on approvals, at Eastview Campus and at a relocated and enlarged campus at Pinnacle); and the other half on new campuses: at Round Rock / Pflugerville, north of existing campuses, and acquiring property to support future growth at San Marcos and Manor, and in Bastrop County. Campuses on ACC owned land might be developed initially at San Marcos, Manor, and in Bastrop County to provide improved service to outlying and newly annexed communities. Future adjustments to the State Demographer’s projections and the rate of adoption of distance learning will determine when these campuses should be expanded.

---

\(^{1}\) Market penetration rates are defined as the number of students enrolled exclusively at ACC campuses compared by age cohort to the estimated county population. For the purpose of this study, 2005 enrollments were used to compare with the State Demographer’s 2005 population estimates.
A comprehensive financial assessment, not included in the scope of this study, should be completed to verify these conclusions. Challenges to developing increased capacity at Riverside might result in accelerated pressure to develop campuses at Manor and possibly San Marcos.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

Currently, ACC operates seven campuses (Cypress Creek, Eastview, Northridge, Pinnacle, Riverside, Rio Grande and South Austin) in a relatively concentrated area relative to its large service area. The activity of these campuses is supplemented by a variety of learning centers (Bastrop, Fredericksburg, Georgetown, Hays, Lockhart, Round Rock, San Marcos and San Marcos-Lamar) and by extensive distance learning programs. The campuses vary in enrollment from 2,300 (South Austin) to 9,000 (Northridge), and in size from 5.44 acres (South Austin), to 44.9 acres (Riverside). In general, campuses are physically smaller and more land-constrained than the average community college. Based on analysis of instructional space standards campuses operate at capacity, except for campuses with recent construction such as Eastview, Cypress Creek and South Austin. Aggressive scheduling and high seat counts per square foot have allowed for highly efficient use of certain campuses, particularly Northridge. While these high efficiency levels result in lower costs, they may limit the College’s ability to experiment with emerging pedagogical trends such as replacing tablet desks with full-sized tables for project-based learning. They have also generated major parking shortages. More significant is the lack of space beyond the classroom. Most campuses lack the space for amenities and support services that may be important to attracting and retaining first generation college students.

**SPACE STANDARDS FOR FUTURE GROWTH**

ACC currently provides 29.8 gross square feet (GSF) per headcount student, significantly less than the approximately 50 GSF indicated by an interpretation of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) standards for colleges. The 50 GSF recommended by this study is the minimum possible interpretation of the THECB guidelines. Most community
colleges have found a need to exceed it. The average space per headcount student for community colleges across the country surveyed by the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP) is 100 GSF per headcount student, approximately double our recommendation. The Texas peer group used in this study provided 110 GSF per FTE student (58 GSF per headcount student).

Fully relieving these current space pressures in ACC, while simultaneously accommodating enrollment growth, would place too heavy a burden on the capital and operating budgets of ACC. The study recommends that SCUP standards of 100 GSF per headcount students be adopted for all new construction only, which will have the effect of gradually relieving space pressures in existing buildings, although THECB or SCUP standards will not be met for the system as a whole by this approach. Fully meeting national space use averages for community colleges would require approximately 2.6 times the capital spending proposed in this study, with corresponding increases in operating costs.

PARKING

Adequate parking is a dominant issue on community college campuses. Since most students at ACC are part-time and have work and/or family commitments, convenient access with available parking is a major concern, and may well influence the ability of ACC to meet Closing the Gaps targets for under-served populations. While ACC campuses have been built to include public transportation routes, public transportation is not a practical alternative for all students. Careful analysis of peak parking demand at ACC’s campuses indicates an upward revision of parking requirements to one parking space per three enrolled students. By this standard, there are major parking supply deficiencies on most campuses (5,982 additional parking spaces overall are indicated, a 100% increase).

ACC needs to double its current parking supply. Structured parking is a high-cost alternative which may divert future construction bonds to non-academic purposes. Improving class scheduling is a complementary cost-free alternative.
Because of the land-locked nature of most sites, adequate additional on-grade parking cannot be provided, and acquisition of expensive adjacent sites to provide additional on-grade parking may not be cost-effective. Structured parking, where land is available, is a high-cost alternative, since the College does not anticipate being able to recapture the cost of construction and operation through parking fees. ACC should consider exploring alternative funding strategies such as corporate partnerships and direct or indirect fee-based funding, such as leased parking from private developers. ACC should recognize, however, that the provision of structured parking does not generally permit increased enrollment, but only relieves current parking shortages and demand generated by the expansion of facilities.

A cost-free alternative strategy for reducing parking pressures is to explore the possibility of extending the majority of course offerings through Friday. Although it will not eliminate shortages, this strategy should be aggressively pursued, since it will also relieve pressure on classroom spaces, and this may have the potential of alleviating parking demand during peak use hours.

While a comprehensive financial analysis is required to substantiate the conclusion of this report, the recommendation, beyond the existing commitment to develop structured parking at Rio Grande, is to limit structured parking, at least for the near term, to Riverside, where significant enrollment increases can be achieved, and to rely on the provision of new seats at new campuses to reduce enrollment and consequently parking demand on other existing campuses. New campuses should be planned with sufficient land to accommodate on-grade parking at the ratio of one parking space to three headcount students. Since land costs will be significantly lower outside the city, and construction of parking decks can be avoided, this approach is almost certainly more cost-effective.
PRINCIPAL ISSUES WITH EXPANSION OF EXISTING CAMPUSES

Pinnacle
While Pinnacle Campus is not located in an area with major projected enrollment growth, ACC should consider the implications of the proposed Transit Oriented Development (TOD) overlay district, which would encourage rapid growth in this area. Recognizing the existing campus as having significant deferred maintenance issues, the acquisition of land adjacent to the existing site will allow for a new purpose-built facility, and future planned transit developments will make this an attractive location for students from a wide area.

Riverside
While Riverside has the largest land area of any campus, and has the potential to acquire adjacent sites, much of its land lies in a flood plain, and development potential is restricted. However, considerable expansion is possible on the site, particularly if structured parking can be built on the floodplain. Expansion calculations do not include use of the golf course currently owned by the College. The campus is well located to serve a large student population. A significant portion of the College’s specialized instructional programs is on this site, and the capacity for these programs could be expanded.

Rio Grande
Rio Grande provides minimal parking for its students, and site expansion options are limited and costly. While students at Rio Grande may continue to rely on public transportation and other parking venues in significant numbers, the College has committed to relieving the pressure on neighborhood streets by creating structured parking—a measure approved by voters as part of the ACC’s 2003 bond package. Renovation of existing property can relieve space pressures, but will not provide for substantial increased enrollment. In addition to space constraints, the Rio Grande campus faces significant deferred maintenance issues, and required renovations may require temporary relocation of some or all students from this campus. Logistics of renovation may make expansion of Riverside an early priority to provide swing space.
Population growth will be concentrated to the north and east of downtown Austin. Current capture rates will probably not meet CTG targets, and should be increased by strategically developing new sites.

Demographics and Growth Projections

The State Demographer’s projections assume that migration trends over the coming years will continue at half the rate of the previous decade. In addition to being inevitably imprecise, the projections are made at the county level, and provide no more nuanced indication of where actual population growth will occur. However, it is safe to assume that if growth occurs as projected, it will result in increased suburbanization of Greater Austin, and development will be concentrated where land costs are lower and where improved transportation infrastructure is planned. This means that population growth will be concentrated to the north and east of downtown Austin, in Travis and Williamson Counties, to a lesser extent to the south in Buda, Kyle, and San Marcos areas in Hays County, and to the east in Bastrop County. Much lower growth is projected to occur in the outlying parts of the Service Area, like Gillespie, Blanco, and Caldwell Counties. Current market penetration levels outside Travis County will not be sufficient to generate the student counts necessary to meet Closing the Gaps targets, and can be increased by the strategic placement of new campuses and centers.

New Sites and Right-Sizing

The College has been exploring the possibility of a new campus in the Round Rock / Pflugerville area, where the greatest population growth, and increased business and medical center development, are anticipated. In addition, ACC has been fortunate in securing a land donation for a future campus in San Marcos, subject to a successful local community annexation effort. While demographic projections document a future campus in Round Rock/Pflugerville area as a higher priority, development of an initial new campus of approximately 55,000 square feet in San Marcos, with future additions as demographics/enrollments necessitate, should remain part of the district’s Master Plan priorities. Early land acquisition for future development of a campus at this location could be followed by the relocation of existing programs, with the potential of expansion of the campus, as demand increases. Another important location for expansion is in the Manor area, where a significant portion of the major projected growth in Travis County will be located, accelerated by completion of the new SH-130 highway. As with Hays County, land should be acquired initially, and a first-phase campus established, with expansion to a full-sized campus following increased demand. As Bastrop’s population increases, the County might support a...
campus, and land should be purchased for this purpose. Current program offerings could then be moved to ACC owned facilities.

In general, any new site acquisitions should allow for development of campuses up to 12,000 students, with on-grade parking. Preferably, sites should be 100 acres, with a minimum acquisition of 50 acres. The larger sites will support development of ancillary campus activities, allowing the College to expand into the larger community role that community colleges have taken on in many parts of the country.

ACC’s current campuses are generally physically small. While hard data on the relative cost-effectiveness of larger campuses is not available, there are clear efficiencies in operating costs and the provision of services. Larger campuses are also better able to provide a more extensive selection of courses supplementing the core academic requirements currently offered at each of the main academic campuses. Currently, around 17% of ACC students attend more than one ACC campus; partially, this is because most workforce programs are not offered at all campuses due to cost, enrollment potential, specialized space needs, or because students were not able to get all the general education courses at the student’s preferred time. Larger campuses can also provide a fuller array of student services, and these may be important in attracting and retaining a larger proportion of currently underserved students.
Summary of Proposed Strategies

The overall strategy proposed is to acquire appropriately sized new campus sites with lower land costs in areas where high population growth is projected, and to move towards a larger average campus size, while gradually reducing space pressures on existing campuses through selective expansion. Structured parking should generally be avoided unless it is achieved through alternative financing means so that future bond packages are concentrated on instructional and support services needs. The strategy does not seek to bring ACC in line with prevailing space use standards in community colleges, but to reduce space pressures on existing campuses by applying prevailing standards to all new construction. This strategy of land acquisition, selective expansion of existing sites, gradual de-crowding, and new campus development in high growth areas supports a long-term vision for the future of the Austin Community College District.

In order to accommodate long-term growth, the alternative strategy of relying exclusively on the maximization of expansion on existing campuses through land acquisition is rejected as not being cost-effective and not positioning ACC to provide services in rapidly developing neighborhoods within the ACC service area.

Additionally, the study cautions against relying exclusively on distance learning programs to meet growth. Much of the underserved population is likely to come from first and second generation college students who often do not have home environments suited to distance learning, and who tend to prosper in full campus environments.

Detail supporting these recommendations, and additional analysis follow in the body of the report and in the appendices.

- Acquire sites in areas with lower land costs and high population growth
- Move towards a larger average campus size
- Limit structured parking due to cost
- Selectively expand existing campuses, gradually de-crowding them
- Be cautious about relying exclusively on distance learning programs to meet growth
Additional Analysis Required

The conclusion that maximizing expansion of existing sites is not cost-effective may require additional financial analysis, based on comparative land acquisition costs, and assessment of the costs of providing structured parking as against the costs of developing new campus sites. The College will also need to assess financial potential for a more aggressive strategy aimed at bringing ACC closer to prevailing standards in space allocation.

A detailed financial analysis of these recommendations should be undertaken.
CONTEXT FOR GROWTH AND ENROLLMENT STRATEGIES

DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERNS AND PROJECTIONS

The region’s projected population growth and anticipated demographic shifts will have strong and lasting effects on ACC’s decision-making process over the next twenty years. Currently, ACC’s service area spans eight counties in Central Texas. The College is well represented in this region with seven main campuses, a central facilities service center, and the Highland Business Center which houses most of the college’s administrative functions as well as its Continuing Education services. In addition to seven main campuses, ACC has eight Centers offering core academic courses, and a multitude of offsite workforce training locations in partnership with local businesses. This variety of locations and programs allows ACC to serve a variety of needs ranging from early-start programs and academic transfer credits to certificate programs for adult education.
In developing its long-range Facilities Master Plan, ACC must address the needs of a growing population that is diverse in both age and ethnicity. The Texas State Demographer’s office estimates the current Service Area population at approximately 1.5 million, and expects this will increase by 700,000, almost 50%, over the next twenty years. While nearly three-quarters of this increase is expected to occur in Travis and Williamson Counties, substantial growth relative to existing population levels is also anticipated in Hays and Bastrop Counties.
The demographic changes occurring throughout the region will require specific responses from the College. The growth in the Hispanic population offers a tremendous opportunity, and this population in particular will benefit greatly from a considerable ACC presence. With almost 400,000 new Hispanic residents expected in the region, the State's experts characterize this growth as being markedly younger than typical migratory groups, thus generating a higher demand for ACC's services. The majority of growth in the Hispanic population will occur in Travis County, with Williamson and Hays Counties having substantial growth relative to current population.
The overall growth in the population between the ages of 18 and 24 is also of great consequence. This age range represents the “traditional college-age student,” and the study anticipates adding approximately 75,000 young residents over the next twenty years—an increase of nearly 75 percent. These projections indicate the region will become younger on average, and this will have serious implications for post-secondary institutions and the local workforce. Williamson County is already experiencing these effects, as moderate housing prices and a variety of economic opportunities encourage younger residents to move north of the greater Austin area.
CLOSING THE GAPS

ACC shares the opportunity for educating the region’s population with both two- and four-year higher education institutions. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) drafted the Closing the Gaps (CTG) initiative because of declining resident enrollment in higher education and anticipated widespread population growth throughout the State. The four goals of the CTG initiative are to be met by 2015:

1. Close the Gaps in Participation—increase participation rates across Texas to add 630,000 more students

2. Close the Gaps in Success—increase by 50 percent the number of degrees, certificate and other identifiable student successes from high quality programs

3. Close the Gaps in Excellence—substantially increase the number of nationally recognized programs or services at colleges and universities in Texas

4. Close the Gaps in Research—increase the level of federal science and engineering research funding to Texas institutions by 50 percent to $1.3 billion

While these goals were established by the THECB, all higher education institutions are allowed to submit their own targets.

Because ACC exceeded the CTG targets it set in 2000, the College increased its targets for 2010 and 2015, and this study has extended the 2005 targets further to 2025 for use in the Facilities Master Plan. The College believes this strong growth can be attributed to a rise in Hispanic and other non-Caucasian enrollments, annual increases in Distance Learning programs, expansion of program offerings on ACC campuses, and new and innovative high school student outreach programs like the College Connection. The College Connection program, in particular, has increased 37 percent overall between Fall 2004 and Fall 2005. At the same time, both Hispanic and African-American enrollments have seen proportionately higher increases in this program.

In answer to the THECB’s CTG initiative, ACC enrollment target for 2025 is almost 48,000, a 44% increase over current levels. Instructional and student support space must expand to support this.
Based upon the 2005 CTG targets, ACC will look to enroll approximately 39,000 students by 2015, an overall net gain of 6,000 students over the next nine years. Extending these targets linearly to 2025, ACC should enroll nearly 48,000 students, effectively increasing the student population by roughly 14,600 students, or 44 percent. In order to meet its targets for minority enrollments, ACC would need to enroll about 11,000 additional Hispanic, African-American, and other non-Caucasian students by 2025. ACC should focus on expanding its instructional and student support space to accommodate this growth. Student support space provides a service to traditionally underserved populations that benefit greatly as their education continues well beyond classrooms and laboratories.
PROJECTING ENROLLMENT

The study developed strategies for assessing the College’s long-term growth potential. Both local and regional planning organizations dispute the location and magnitude of growth, and the study sought a clear solution for projecting enrollment through 2025, requiring its growth prediction strategy be based on current enrollment levels relative to existing populations.

Using the State Demographer’s 0.5 Population Growth Scenario (half the growth and migration rate of the previous decade), the study created the College’s baseline projected enrollment by applying ACC’s county market penetration rates to each county’s projected population in 2015 and 2025. These penetration rates were calculated by comparing the number of ACC students to the State Demographer’s estimated population across age cohorts. ACC enrolled the largest portion of the population in Travis County: 3.3 percent of the population in for-credit courses during the fall of 2005.

This methodology allows the College to view itself in the context of the State Demographer’s population projections. While implementing the Facilities Master Plan, the study suggests adjusting penetration throughout the Service Area to reflect changes in regional demographics, additions to the existing network of campuses, and potential capped enrollments at the University of Texas at Austin or Texas State University.

Off-campus and non-transfer coursework (“outside enrollment”\(^1\)), including distance education and the College Connection and Early College Start programs, were evaluated separately.

---

\(^1\) Outside Enrollments are best defined as students who may not require the use of the full range of on-campus resources, such as classrooms, laboratories and student services. The number of distance learning students includes those who are enrolled in on-campus courses in addition to telecommuting and those who are exclusively enrolled in distance learning programs.

Enrollment projections using current market penetration rates suggest ACC will fall short of its CTG targets. ACC can gain additional students by developing new sites in select regions.
By projecting future enrollment using current market penetration rates and steady growth in outside enrollments, the study expects ACC to increase its overall enrollment by 4,000 and 7,700 students by 2015 and 2025, respectively. On this basis, the College would fall short of its CTG targets. However, the major population increases in Williamson and Hays Counties provide an excellent opportunity for the College to gain additional students by expanding the system’s capacity in these regions. Meeting CTG targets will therefore require a balance between expanding capacity at existing campuses and developing new adequately-sized campuses.

With plans already in place to establish new locations to the north and south of the greater Austin area, the College is well poised to increase its market penetration in these two counties. Assuming these new locations eventually accommodate between 8,000 and 12,000 students, ACC market penetration in these counties would increase to levels comparable to Travis County. With these increased capture rates, ACC could enroll an additional 16,000 students by 2025, exceeding its extended CTG targets.
PROJECTED ENROLLMENT GROWTH WITH INCREASED CAPTURE RATES, 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Outside</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,080</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>48,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LOCATING POPULATION GROWTH

For future planning purposes, ACC should expect the most significant portion of population growth to occur to the north and east of Austin. While moderate growth is expected to the northwest and southwest, this does not justify the creation of new campuses within the time lines and demographics projected through 2025.

The State Demographer’s population projections give a sense of the magnitude of expected growth; the study developed different strategies to determine its potential locations. Given the magnitude of growth relative to the overall population projections, the study examined the creation over time of large new campuses in Travis, Williamson and Hays Counties. In remote areas, like Bastrop County, where demand is proportionately smaller by current estimates, new campuses should be initially phased with a capacity of 2,500 students, but have sufficient land for future construction and expansion.

A major contributing factor to growth is the construction of SH-130, which will connect major population centers north and south of Austin through the eastern edge of the City’s border. The completion of this highway will not only encourage business development east of Austin, but will stimulate residential growth in areas like Manor where SH-130 and Highway 290 intersect. The study anticipates new public transportation networks will develop near intersections like this, where residential and economic developments will most benefit from multi-modal transportation initiatives.
According to the CapMetro All Systems Go Long-Range Transit Plan, 2025 there are major infrastructure improvement projects planned for the greater Austin area. With the anticipated approval and construction of two urban commuter rail lines, the City’s center will be connected to the areas surrounding Austin on north-south and east-west axes. Already, some Independent School Districts (ISDs) are reporting significant increased demand for additional elementary schools and high schools in the surrounding Austin area. As these additional students grow older, demand for post-secondary institutions like ACC will increase. The College should plan to accommodate this need in the near future.

ACC should expect the most significant portion of population growth to occur to the north and east of Austin.
The Environmental Justice Census Tracts outlines criteria for potential areas where ACC should focus its efforts:

- At least 50 percent of the population should live in families earning less than 80 percent of the County's median household income
- At least 50 percent of the population should be of an ethnic minority
- At least 21 percent of the population should fall below the Federal poverty line.

Recognized as having traditionally underserved populations, these areas would greatly benefit from a strong ACC presence, and where possible, the College should expand existing campuses or acquire new sites to increase their capacity in them.
Possible limitations to residential growth occur to the northwest and southwest of Austin within the Edwards Aquifer. The Contribution and Recharge Zones contain strict regulations regarding storm water management, and large residential development will be further limited by the steep slopes and shallow soils that are found in these areas. In addition, these Zones contain a number of endangered species which also limits development potential. Growth in these areas is still possible, but it is likely that proportionally larger growth will occur in places with fewer development restrictions.
2005 STUDENT ENROLLMENTS, PEER BENCHMARKING GROUP
SPACE USE AND SCHEDULING

PROPOSED SPACE STANDARDS

This study incorporates a Benchmarking Study whose goal was to estimate an appropriate gross square feet (GSF) per headcount student for Texas Community Colleges like ACC. The Benchmarking Study generated a peer group to identify ACC's space surpluses and deficiencies. The following six community college districts in Texas were selected: Alamo Community College District, Dallas County Community College District, El Paso Community College, North Harris Montgomery Community College District, San Jacinto College District, and Tarrant County Community College.

These community college districts were selected because of their student enrollments, geographical location and regional educational environment. Including ACC, there are seven community college systems in Texas with more than 30,000 students. Of these large community college systems, four were used in the Benchmarking Study (Alamo, Dallas, El Paso and Tarrant County); Dallas is the largest of these with more than 50,000 students. The student full-time equivalent (FTE) to headcount enrollment ratio for these community colleges ranges between 0.5:1 and 0.6:1, similar to ACC’s ratio of 0.53:1.

In order to provide the most accurate assessment of space use, data was collected directly from each of the peer institutions. Comparisons focused on system-wide averages in order to minimize campus-by-campus variations in each institution’s data.

Several peer institutions have more than double ACC’s gross square footage. This study employs 50 GSF per headcount student as its proposed standard.
While the allocation of space varied by community college system and programmatic demands, the Benchmarking Study reached two broad conclusions:

- Total system gross square feet (GSF) is generally relative to the size of student enrollment. Most college districts have more than 2 million GSF (Dallas had the most in the peer group with more than 3.5 million GSF). In comparison, ACC currently maintains approximately 1 million GSF.

- The average GSF per FTE student for Texas community colleges approximates 110 GSF. San Jacinto had the highest ratio at nearly 140 GSF per FTE student. ACC’s current system-wide average is 29.8 GSF per headcount student, or 56.1 GSF per FTE student.

- Average campus size in benchmarking group is approximately 8,000 headcount – as compared to 4,500 for ACC.

The Benchmarking Study drew on the THECB Five-Factor Space Projection Model, an imperfect predictor for community colleges. The THECB model was originally developed for four-year colleges and universities, and its assumptions include utilization rates of instructional spaces, post-bachelor or research-oriented library use, and high ratios of full-time to adjunct faculty. In addition, the model includes non-E&G (Educational and General) spaces such as residence halls, intercollegiate athletic facilities, recreational facilities and student union space, which are inappropriate for community college planning.

In order to adapt the THECB model for ACC, the Benchmarking Study used Alamo Community College as a baseline then developed modifications based upon total GSF by use (teaching, library, office, support and non-E&G).
Instructional spaces were emphasized as community colleges typically have a higher percentage of total space dedicated to teaching. Slight adjustments were made to non-E&G space, because community colleges tend to have less space allocated to these areas than four-year institutions. On average, the adjustments made were 25% higher than the baseline but 35% less than the THECB model. As a result, the Benchmarking Study recommended 110 GSF per FTE student, as opposed to the THECB’s 175 GSF.

Similar modifications to the THECB Space Projection Model have been used in the long-term planning for several large community systems throughout Texas. While the actual modifications vary based on each college’s specific profile, this methodology is widely-accepted.

This study recognizes that ACC is a unique institution which has profitably relied upon extremely efficient use of space. Additionally, some of the peer institutions gross square footage included leased and rented spaces. In recognition of this, this study decided to adopt a lower space standard than that recommended by the Benchmarking Study. The minimum space suggested by THECB is 60 ASF per FTE student. This figure ignores the special needs of programs like Agriculture, Visual and Performing Arts, Architecture, Engineering, Computer and Information Systems, Health Sciences, Home Economics, Physical and Life Sciences, etc. However, it does suggest an attainable goal for the College of 50 GSF per headcount student.

In summary, the study’s recommendations for future campuses include:

- Reducing the suggested multipliers in the THECB model, making them more appropriate for community college planning.

- The basic structure of the model should remain intact in order to preserve its integrity, but its assumptions should always be revised based on updated benchmarking data or changes in ACC’s mission.

- Total calculated space need should average approximately 50 GSF per headcount student, but each space category may vary on a campus-by-campus basis, depending on campus identity and programmatic needs.

---

1 Assuming a net to gross ratio of 1.6 and ACC’s present FTE to headcount ratio
SCHEDULING AND PROGRAM ALIGNMENT

There is a large deviation in how efficiently instructional space is used across ACC campuses. High levels of efficiency, while desirable from a financial perspective, can have adverse effects on student persistence and success. For this reason, the study supports gradually increasing instructional space per student on existing campuses, and emphasizing student support space, either through new construction or through gradual reductions in enrollment, in order to improve attraction and retention of new students. This would include lounge and event space, student life space, and meeting rooms and services space. The study notes ACC should also increase library space to support increased an emphasis on informal and group study. For both faculty and staff, the College has a shortage of office space. As noted above, a space standard that can fully support these changes is not recommended at this time, unless additional capital funds become available.

ACC is studying its recent migration to a four-day/evening course scheduling format and the impact of returning to a five day format, in addition to expanded weekend offerings. While the current practice has benefited the College in some ways such as freeing time for faculty to address curriculum development and professional development needs, and has allowed access for corrective and preventative maintenance, it also produces additional pressure on already limited parking resources and campus over-crowding. Additional information on potential gains through scheduling efficiencies is available in the Capacity Study section of this report.

The high levels of space-use efficiency at ACC can have adverse effects on student persistence and success. ACC operates principally on a four-day schedule which can contribute to over-crowding, and exacerbate parking shortages. Specialized programs are space intensive and should be concentrated on a few campuses.
In addition to refining current scheduling practices, ACC should focus on offering a core academic curriculum large enough to meet the demands of each campus. With 17% of students enrolled at multiple campuses (some of which can be attributed to specialized courses only available at a few campuses), resolving these differences will help to promote a traditional college “feel.” Students will be able to stay on campus to socialize and study between classes. Campuses that provide a greater sense of community will better serve an increasing proportion of college students who choose 2-year institutions as their introduction to post-secondary education.

ACC should also continue to concentrate specialized programs, particularly workforce programs and Allied Health Sciences, on either one or two campuses. (Riverside should be expanded to support additional and expanded workforce programs, while a new Allied Health center should be created in Round Round/Plugerville.) These specialized programs are space intensive, with extremely high total square-feet-to-students-served ratios. These facilities require high use rates to remain fiscally efficient. Of course, ACC should ensure that specialized campuses are still accessible to all students within the Service Area when planning future campuses.
HANDLING GROWTH

STRATEGIC OVERVIEW

In attempting to meet the targets proposed by the Closing the Gaps initiative, ACC must maximize the value of its property in order to control the costs of growth. The study identifies two broad strategies to accomplish this. The first is to make the best use of assets on existing campuses, augmenting them by strategic land acquisition where advisable. The second strategy involves new land acquisition for the purpose of developing new campuses.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the capacity study indicate almost all the Closing the Gaps targets could be accommodated by strategic augmentation of existing facilities. However, market penetration rates imply the need to blend this strategy with new site acquisition for several reasons: high growth in selected areas of the Service Area, recognition that community colleges will absorb most of the State’s Closing the Gaps initiative, annexation-related initiatives that merit a facilities investment (some will not, but are still important to CTG), and matching population growth projections.

In general, when it comes to new land acquisition the study advocates sites that maximize future flexibility. In the long run, these sites should be able to support a headcount of approximately 12,000 students. To this end, the study recommends acquiring sites of 50 to 100 acres, with the larger size being preferable. Note that while it is important to buy or acquire land of sufficient size, the study does not advocate focusing on an immediate build-out of these sites. Where appropriate, sites could begin as small campuses serving local communities, and expanding over time as enrollment and local demographic changes dictate.

In some cases, where it may not be prudent to actually purchase large properties, the study recommends the purchase of options. This fits with the larger goal of ensuring flexibility for the College so that it is best able to deal with the vagaries inherent in growth and demographic projections.
A hybrid approach is mandated by site capacities and market capture rates:

Approximately half of projected growth should be accommodated by augmenting existing sites

The other half should come on new campuses

While it is important to buy parcels of sufficient size, an immediate build-out may not be appropriate

New sites should be established at Round Rock / Pflugerville, San Marcos, Manor, and Bastrop

The specific recommendations for new campus development are:

- Launch a new campus in Round Rock / Pflugerville to the north of existing facilities
- Depending on the results of the election, purchase land for a potential campus at San Marcos. The study further advocates obtaining an option for 50 to 100 acres of contiguous land to the current site under consideration for long-term strategic purposes. Current program offerings could then be moved to ACC owned facilities.
- Purchase or acquire sufficient land for a future campus at Manor, with a view to early establishment of small-sized campus of 2,500 students.
- Purchase or acquire sufficient land for a future campus in Bastrop County, if annexation is approved. As with San Marcos, current program offerings could be moved to ACC owned facilities.

CTG targets indicate ACC headcount enrollment should increase by approximately 14,600. The study estimates roughly half this growth would be accommodated by the new campus development outlined above. The other half of this growth should be accommodated via the strategic augmentation of existing facilities. The study advocates four actions as outlined in the capacity study:

- Continue to expand enrollment opportunities via Weekend Colleges, expanded certificate and degree options in Distance Learning, and Early College Start/College Connection outreach programs.
- Expand at Eastview and Riverside campuses
- Renovate the Rio Grande campus
- Study Pinnacle options as TOD plan unfolds

Note the suggested expansion of Riverside will involve the erection of at least one parking structure. In general, the study suggests concern over the long-term impact of parking garages on ACC’s capital budget, and the College should investigate alternative funding strategies that will not rely exclusively on bond initiatives. However, the study feels the advantages of expanding Riverside probably outweigh the potential loss of future spending flexibility. The study identifies Riverside as the best candidate to accommodate growth among the existing campuses, because its location lies in the heart
of predicted growth trends with excellent transit availability, and because the underserved population is likely to be attracted to expanded workforce programs, particularly those with a technical focus. Concentrating expanding workforce programs at Riverside is likely to be highly cost-effective.

If renovation of Rio Grande can be accomplished without mass temporary relocation of students, or if expansion of Riverside proves difficult to achieve, ACC should accelerate the development of new campuses at Round Rock / Pflugerville, Manor, and possibly San Marcos and Bastrop.

Improved facilities at Pinnacle should lead to increased enrollment. The possibility of transport oriented development around the current campus also points to prioritizing Pinnacle as a location for growth.

Suggested priorities, following completion of existing bond-funded commitments, are as follows:

- Expansion at Eastview and Riverside
- Land acquisition at Round Rock/Pflugerville, Manor, San Marcos, Bastrop County
- Development of new campus at Round Rock / Pflugerville
- Development of new campuses at Manor and in Bastrop County, relocation of existing offerings in San Marcos and Bastrop County from leased sites to ACC-owned facilities
- New construction at Pinnacle
- Facility expansion at San Marcos
- Facility expansion at Manor
- Facility expansion in Bastrop County

The sequence suggested above is tentative. Actual preferred phasing will be determined by enrollment demand. In executing these recommendations, the College will have to weigh many financial factors. In particular, the costs of structured parking and challenges to expansion at Riverside will need to be considered in relation to the cost of new land acquisition. The study's final recommendation is for the College to undertake a detailed financial analysis of the recommended growth strategies in order to ensure the maximum return on investment, and protect the College's long-term economic flexibility.
CAPACITY STUDY

The purpose of the capacity study was to determine the maximum headcount enrollment supportable on ACC’s current campuses, assuming certain strategic land acquisitions. There are three major constraints on capacity: parking, density, and scheduling.

PARKING

This study builds on the work of the 2004 Walker Study to estimate both current parking demand, and projected demand as enrollment increases. The methodology centers on two metrics: peak demand and fixed ratio. Peak demand is calculated via scheduling data on an hourly basis, and is based on the maximum number of students in class for some portion of a given hour on a given day. The study estimates demand to be 110% of this peak enrollment in order to accommodate parking needs of faculty and staff.

By analyzing peak demand, the study suggests a ratio of one parking space for every three headcount students. On this basis, ACC would need to double its current parking supply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING SPACES PER HEADCOUNT STUDENT</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>BY WALKER STUDY</th>
<th>BY PEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Creek</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastview</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Austin</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on Fall 2006 enrollment.
2 Existing supply divided by Fall '06 enrollment. This supply includes Cypress Creek’s planned addition on the completion of new construction and a 100 space parking lot expansion at Pinnacle.
3 The Walker projection for 2010.
4 Because South Austin is a new campus, detailed schedule information was unavailable. The study uses the system-wide average to determine peak demand.
The study addresses campus-specific issues below, but by comparison to peak demand it is immediately clear that previous projections underestimated parking demand, in some cases by as much as half.

The fixed ratio method applies a multiplier determined by national standards to total headcount enrollment, thereby generating the number of spaces required. For ACC, the system-wide average of 0.34 parking spaces per headcount student aligns closely with national standards (like SCUP) and Sasaki’s preferred recommendation for two-year Colleges of 1 space per 3 headcount students.

Parking demand can therefore be calculated either from the peak ratio for a given campus, or from the fixed ratio of 0.33. This allows us to measure both current deficiencies, and projected demands at future enrollment levels. Furthermore, comparisons of these two projections, particularly for current deficiencies, identify potential for improved efficiencies via better scheduling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT PARKING DEFICIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BY FIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Creek</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastview</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>1,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Austin</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By either method, the current parking deficit for the College as a whole is more than twice the estimate in the Walker study.
**DENSITY**

To assess a campus’s capacity we must establish a per headcount student space standard. The 2004 SCUP CFI Report indicates an average of 71 ASF per headcount student, excluding parking and residential considerations, and this corresponds closely to Sasaki’s general recommendation of 100 GSF per headcount. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board tailors its recommendations based upon campus profile. This study incorporates the finding of a Benchmarking Study which puts the THECB standard at 175 GSF per FTE student, and 110 GSF per FTE student for Texas community colleges based upon a peer study. This study believes 50 GSF per headcount student should be the goal for ACC because of ACC’s highly efficient approach to space utilization. See the Proposed Space Standards section for details.

However, even this recommendation of 50 GSF exceeds ACC’s current allocations. Current system-wide gross square footage is 983,198. Given Fall 2006 headcount enrollment, ACC currently has 29.8 GSF per headcount student. Note that recent new construction has increased this number. The study believes it is important to continue this trend. Gross square footage per headcount student is likely to have a direct impact on market penetration rates, and increasing these rates in key areas is a core component of meeting the Closing the Gaps targets.

For this reason, when considering additions to existing campuses, the study advocates the use of the full SCUP recommendation of 100 GSF per headcount student for the incremental population. Applying the existing rate of 29.8 GSF per headcount student to the current headcount enrollment of 33,039 and the SCUP standard of 100 GSF per headcount student to the incremental population on the way to the Closing the Gaps targets of 39,090 and 47,678 for 2015 and 2025 respectively, generates new institutional averages of 40.6 GSF per headcount student in 2015 and 51.3 GSF per headcount student in 2025. By applying the full SCUP recommendation to the incremental population, ACC will move its system-wide average toward our recommendation of 50 GSF per headcount student.

When considering new campuses, or as in the case of Pinnacle where the proposed TOD overlay district present an opportunity for expansions, the study uses 50 GSF per headcount student.

---

1 This includes 102,755 GSF at Highland and 52,741 GSF from the Central Service Center.

**By supplying 100 GSF per headcount student for incremental growth, ACC will move its system-wide average to the recommended level.**
SCHEDULING

By extending the current course offerings to include more Friday classes, the potential for increased efficiencies could provide two benefits. In reducing peak on-campus attendance, the strain on parking demand can be reduced, alleviating the need for costly garages, and, to a lesser extent, on-grade parking. Alternatively, increased classroom utilization allows for increased enrollment without affecting peak-time parking demand, and therefore requiring additional parking supply. Changes in scheduling, currently being explored by the College, may also allow for the temporary relocation of Rio Grande students during renovations, prior to construction of additional facilities elsewhere.

CAMPUSES

The study analyzes potential expansion on a per campus basis in light of the three parameters of parking, density, and scheduling. For this analysis, the study assumes on-grade parking spaces require 350 GSF, while structured parking spaces require 325 GSF. For undeveloped sites, our calculations suppose 30% will be open space, and 10% roads. Buildings are assumed to have three floors unless otherwise noted.

The expansion potential described is theoretical. The study only recommends expansion at Eastview, Riverside and Pinnacle, on the assumptions that development of a new campus or campuses will prove to be more cost-effective than restricting expansion to existing sites, and that closing the Gaps enrollment targets can only be met if ACC achieves increased market penetration in a wider range of districts in its service area. This increased market penetration will not be achieved unless ACC establishes a convenient and attractive physical presence through land acquisition and the development of new campuses and centers.
Cypress Creek

Since parking demand by peak (1,021) is lower than parking demand by headcount (1,123), there is unlikely to be any parking relief through improved scheduling on this campus. That said, while morning and early afternoon classroom utilization at Cypress Creek is excellent, classroom use falls dramatically between 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm, so there may be some potential for increasing enrollment without increasing parking demand by scheduling and encouraging more enrollments at non-peak times.

Applying the 100 GSF per headcount student standard, the study projects the 69,540 GSF new building in the northwest corner will support approximately 695 additional headcount students. This generates an additional parking demand of 209 spaces using the peak methodology and 229 spaces using the fixed ratio. If we include existing parking deficiencies, the parking space requirements are 411 (by peak) and 534 (by fixed ratio). We find the peak figure to be more realistic. It indicates a need for approximately 3.3 acres of on-grade parking.

The study supports the acquisition of Expansion Area 1 for this purpose. This site is 4.4 acres so there may be some small potential for additional expansion, depending on open space requirements.

The acquisition of Expansion Area 2, assuming 100 GSF and 0.33 parking spaces per headcount student, would support the addition of approximately 954 headcount students, requiring 315 parking spaces. The wisdom of acquiring this site is unclear. The study recommends further analysis of the land costs and demolition costs which would precede new construction on this site, and a comparison of these costs with the alternative of providing structured parking, or of accommodating the same level of growth on a new campus.

The study does not support the acquisition of Expansion Area 3, because it is not contiguous with the existing campus.

- The new building could allow for a small enrollment increase
- Land would have to be purchased to alleviate parking shortages
Eastview presents several opportunities for expansion, with or without additional land acquisition. Classrooms are currently under-scheduled and use could be increased on this campus. At peak, 36% of all headcount students are on campus (the second highest ratio in the system), and daytime class utilization averages only 32% (the Council for Educational Facility Planners, International use a target of 65%). The study estimates the campus could support an additional 840 headcount students if classrooms were fully utilized, although this could be hard to achieve given the specialized nature of the health-related programs offered at Eastview.

The existing site offers two locations for potential development. A roughly 50,000 GSF area in the northwest corner originally used as a detention pond is no longer needed for that purpose, because of improvements made to the drainage ditch crossing the site during site development work on the Health Sciences complex. Additionally, the existing portable building with a footprint of 2,507 GSF could be replaced by a permanent two story structure. At 100 GSF per headcount student, this additional space would allow for an enrollment increase of 1,025 headcount.

Because of the under-scheduling at Eastview, the study uses the fixed ratio methodology for determining parking demand. This establishes the existing deficit at 220 spaces. The enrollment increase from improved scheduling would create the need for 277 parking spaces, and the new construction would add 338 spaces to that. The total parking deficit would be 835 spaces.

The purchase of Expansion Areas 1 and 2 would meet this parking need with on-grade lots. Some additional enrollment would then also be possible. The study estimates that Expansion Area 1 could provide approximately 733 spaces without any open space. On this basis, Expansion Area 2 could support an increased enrollment of 893 headcount students while still fully meeting all parking demand, assuming two story buildings (Expansion Area 2 would contain 397 spaces in this scenario).

The study sees these acquisitions as more cost-effective than the construction of structured parking despite rising land costs in the area. A future financial analysis should consider these issues. Additionally, the expansion would provide the campus with greater flexibility moving forward.

- The only campus not operating at capacity
- The area formally used as a detention pond is available for development
- The existing portable building could be replaced with a permanent two-story structure
- Land acquisition is required to fully alleviate parking shortages
If neither Expansion Area 1, nor Expansion Area 2 is purchased, then the detention pond area would need to be used for parking. The study estimates roughly 143 spaces could be provided there. The remaining deficit could be met by the gains provided from improved scheduling.

The study does not see Expansion Area 3 as a viable option. There would be major slope issues as the campus expanded up the hill, and the complication of dealing with existing facilities currently owned by a school on the other side of the hill.

If these opportunities were followed, Eastview could increase its headcount enrollment by 2,758 without requiring any structured parking.

**Highland**

As the College has limited offerings for credit classes on this campus, the study proposes the Highland Business Center be treated as a low priority campus in terms of increased enrollment, and recommend no expansion plans in the timeframe through 2025.
Northridge

The study does not support the purchase of Expansion Area 1 because of slope and floodplain concerns, and therefore sees no expansion potential on the Northridge campus. Existing buildings are at maximum capacity, with significantly heavier use of classrooms than on any other ACC campus. While there may be a limited amount of space for new classrooms, there would be no way to handle any increase in parking demand. The campus currently has a considerable parking deficit of at least 1,110 spaces. If a location could be found for the Walker Study’s recommended garage, it would only provide 852 spaces, which would not even meet current demand. By contrast, reassignment of a portion of Northridge students to a new campus would reduce pressure on both classroom space and parking at Northridge, and would move ACC closer to meeting the space use targets recommended in this study. Consequently, the study supports new site acquisition and development rather than the construction of a parking structure at Northridge that fails to meet existing need. This strategy supports the general principle that it is preferable to invest in improving the learning environment by increasing the instructional and support space provided per student, rather than in parking structures, when a choice presents itself.
Pinnacle

Like Eastview, Pinnacle has a significant opportunity to either reduce parking demand or increase enrollment by improving scheduling. An unusually high 43% of total enrollment is on campus at peak time, by far the highest percentage of any campus in the system. Other than for some evening classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays, classroom utilization at Pinnacle is at most 33% after 3:00 pm, and usually much lower than this (this number only rises to 44% between 6:00 pm and 7:00 pm on Tuesdays and Thursdays, otherwise those days have similarly low utilizations). The importance of this under-utilization is revealed by the difference in current parking deficit when computed by peak verses fixed ratio. The fixed ratio prediction is only 385, the peak prediction is 848. The difference is over 3.7 acres worth of asphalt.

The study believes the most effective growth strategy for this campus would be to explore options for the acquisition of Expansion Area 1. Possible long-term strategies might include the resale of the existing campus as the study estimates the repair costs for this facility to be roughly $22,000,000.

Expansion Area 1, at 27.3 acres, is slightly larger than the existing site. The study assumes 50 GSF per headcount student (since we are suggesting replacing the existing site the incremental figure is inappropriate) and a parking ratio of 0.33. On this basis, the study calculates Expansion Area 1 could support 270,211 GSF of building, and thus 5,404 headcount students. This is an increase of 2,145 students over the current population.

The study does not support the acquisition of Expansion Area 2. Its close proximity to residential neighbors would likely limit its usefulness.

The potential increase in enrollment at Pinnacle is disproportionately high in comparison to the projected population growth in this area. However, projected improvements in public transportation and ease of access will probably make this an increasingly attractive site.
Rio Grande

The Rio Grande campus has a unique character because of its downtown location. Its current parking ratio of 0.05 spaces per headcount student suggests this is not as much a traditional car-oriented destination as other ACC campuses, although the pressure on neighborhood streets is severe. The College has committed to relieve this pressure through structured parking, as approved by the District’s voters. While available or potential sites do not permit providing the level of parking required, any relief is desirable.

The study strongly supports the acquisition of Expansion Area 1. This corner plot is a vital strategic holding for the campus, connecting its two current components. Although the site does not offer sufficient land area for a garage large enough to meet calculated demand, the College should explore the site’s potential for structured parking.

Expansion Area 2 would be required if a parking structure offering an adequate supply were to be built on land contiguous with the existing campus, but the study does not support this. The parcel is contained almost entirely within the 100-year floodplain. This is city-owned parkland, and we fear the regulatory and jurisdictional obstacles would be too difficult to overcome.

Similarly, the study does not support the acquisition of Expansion Area 3. It too is within the 100-year floodplain, and suffers from the same concerns as Expansion Area 2.

Expansion Area 4 could support a potential parking garage, although this garage would also not be large enough to meet the full demand.

The existing gymnasium structure could be converted into a classroom and office facility. The study estimates this would allow for an enrollment increase of approximately 310 headcount students, if no de-crowding were achieved.

- Faces significant deferred maintenance issues
- The existing gymnasium could be converted into a classroom and office facility
- Expansion Area 1, the corner lot, is a vital strategic acquisition
**Riverside**

The study sees Riverside as offering the best potential for expansion. The campus currently houses a significant portion of the College’s specialized academic programs, and there is expectation that these programs will grow significantly as part of the strategy for meeting Closing the Gaps targets.

Multi-story parking structures can probably be erected in the floodplain area of the existing site, with the proviso that the ground floor of these structures would not be available for use. Assuming garages of this type are built with four usable floors, and then once existing parking deficiencies have been met, the study estimates an additional 3,727 headcount enrollment could be added to the existing site. This would require approximately 124,246 GSF in new building footprint, possibly constructed in the site’s unused southern portion. Note that parking is the major restriction on the number of students that could be added, and that permission may be necessary to remove several trees.

Furthermore, the study recommends the purchase of Expansion Area 1 which has roughly 12 usable acres outside the floodplain. This land is essentially vacant. If growth on this area was serviced by surface parking then 2,116 headcount students could be added with 698 parking spaces.

Following the same strategy as on the existing site, with one or more parking garages in the floodplain section of Expansion Area 1, the site could support an additional enrollment of 3,150 headcount, requiring roughly 85,000 GSF of garage footprint.

If zoning regulations prevent the construction of structured parking on the floodplain, existing on-grade lots or eastern facilities like the tennis courts would need to be converted into garages.

Supposing structured parking on the existing site, and the purchase of Expansion Area 1 with surface parking, Riverside could increase its headcount enrollment by 5,843.

- A priority campus for expansion
- The current site has potential for increased build-out
- Expansion Area 1 to the north should be acquired
- Riverside could accommodate approximately 70% of growth on existing campuses
South Austin

The new South Austin campus facility is designed to accommodate an enrollment of 3,000 students. Additional capacity is possible by expanding the existing building, however, additional parking will have to be provided. The College is currently studying adding up to 150 parking spaces to the garage which would allow an enrollment increase of approximately 750, based on current enrollment and the current ratio of parking to students experienced at this campus. The College has also negotiated use of the Crockett High School parking across the street from the campus.

Some combination of the potential expansion areas could be considered. The study sees two possible strategies: the acquisition of Expansion Areas 1 and 3, or the acquisition of Expansion Areas 2 and 4. The study does not support the purchase of 1 without 3, or 2 without 4. Note that existing structures on all of these sites would have to be dealt with.
Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Maximum Theoretical Enrollment Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Creek</td>
<td>1,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTVIEW</td>
<td>2,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINNACLE</td>
<td>2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO GRANDE</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERSIDE</td>
<td>5,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AUSTIN’</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,305</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis suggests the maximum enrollment existing facilities could support if they were augmented with several strategic acquisitions of adjacent expansion areas and limited structured parking is 46,494 headcount (assuming none of this additional headcount enrolls at multiple campuses). This takes ACC past the 2015 CTG target of 39,090 and close to the 2025 target of 47,678. Market penetration rates suggest it is unlikely that these enrollment targets could be achieved in practice, hence the study’s recommendation to blend augmentation of existing campuses with the development of new sites (with each of these approaches supporting roughly half of the anticipated growth).

While existing sites could support most of the CTG target if they were augmented with strategic acquisitions and limited structured parking, market penetration rates suggest new sites must also be developed.

---

6 The bolded campuses are the ones this study recommends focusing on as part of its hybrid strategy to meet the CTG targets.

7 Capacity based on current parking ratios and an addition of 120 parking spaces to the garage. The development of new sites (with each of these approaches supporting roughly half of the anticipated growth).
ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

The study has outlined strategies for accommodating future enrollment growth. In order to help compare these strategies, and in answer to the Board of Trustees concerns over their financial implications, the study recommends the College undertake a focused analysis of the recommendations’ economic consequences. This analysis should incorporate operating and capital considerations with the purpose of providing order of magnitude estimates of the total cost over time. Additionally, the analysis should provide a financial roadmap for implementation, assessing the benefits of tax annexation elections and addressing the Board of Trustees questions regarding short and long-term cost savings, and the timing and size of bond referendums.

The analysis should address the following targeted questions:

- How to best balance the College’s short- and long-term financial goals
- How to best protect against the uncertainties inherent in population growth projections
- What will best allow the College to adapt to changes in regional, demographic, economic and business trends?
- What impact will growth have on the College’s debt burden?
- How might outside funding be generated? What are the potential areas for tax annexation and bond referendums?
- If a campus has a parking shortage, is it better to spend $5-12 million on a garage, or should those funds go toward new land acquisition and development?
- What is the optimal funding timeline?
**APPENDIX**

Cypress Creek Classroom Utilization

*daytime average does not include for use from friday through sunday

---

**Peak Use Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peak Use Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12H00</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11H00</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>11H00</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>11H00</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12H00</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Daytime average does not include for use from Friday through Sunday.
Northridge Classroom Utilization

*daytime average does not include for use from Friday through Sunday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>2,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>2,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>2,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>2,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>2,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>2,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>2,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>2,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>2,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>17H00</td>
<td>1,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>17H00</td>
<td>1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>17H00</td>
<td>1,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>17H00</td>
<td>1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>16H00</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peak Use Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12H00</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>11H00</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peak Use Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>2,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>2,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>2,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>2,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>17H00</td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>16H00</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Daytime average does not include for use from Friday through Sunday
Peak Use Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>13H00</td>
<td>1,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>14H00</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10H00</td>
<td>1,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9H00</td>
<td>1,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12H00</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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