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MISSION
Salisbury University is a premier comprehensive Maryland public university, offering excellent, affordable education in undergraduate liberal arts, sciences, pre-professional and professional programs, including education, nursing, social work, and business, and a limited number of applied graduate programs. Our highest purpose is to empower our students with the knowledge, skills, and core values that contribute to active citizenship, gainful employment, and life-long learning in a democratic society and interdependent world.

Salisbury University cultivates and sustains a superior learning community where students, faculty, and staff engage one another as teachers, scholars, and learners, and where a commitment to excellence and an openness to a broad array of ideas and perspectives are central to all aspects of University life. Our learning community is student-centered; thus, students and faculty interact in small classroom settings, faculty serve as academic advisors, and virtually every student has an opportunity to undertake research with a faculty mentor. We foster an environment where individuals make choices that lead to a more successful development of social, physical, occupational, emotional, and intellectual well being.

The University recruits exceptional and diverse faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students from across Maryland, the United States, and around the world, supporting all members of the University community as they work together to achieve the institution’s goals and vision. Believing that learning and service are vital components of civic life, Salisbury University actively contributes to the local Eastern Shore community and the educational, economic, cultural, and social needs of our State and nation.

VALUES
The core values of Salisbury University are:
- excellence
- student-centeredness
- learning
- community
- civic engagement
- diversity

We believe these values must be lived and experienced as integral to everyday campus life so that students make the connection between what they learn and how they live. The goals and objectives of our strategic, academic, facilities, and enrollment plans, as well as our fiscal commitments, reflect our fundamental values. In addition to these principal values, the University embraces the long-honored tradition of honesty and mutual regard that is and should be a defining characteristic of higher education. The “Salisbury University Promise” is a statement of integrity and respect for others to which we ask all new students to commit as a way of highlighting the University’s values and expectations for our students.
Salisbury University: A Maryland University of National Distinction

Planning Process

This Salisbury University Facilities Master Plan (FMP) update establishes a framework for the physical growth and change of Salisbury University over the next 10 years, based on projected enrollment growth and space needs. The planning process was undertaken under the leadership of the Office of the Vice President of Administration and Finance, with assistance from a steering committee of broad representation from across campus and with the technical assistance of consultants from the firm of Cochran, Stephenson, & Donkervoet, Inc.

This planning process and data collection were undertaken in 2007, and the planning process was completed in 2008. Where enrollment and other demographic data are discussed in the report, numbers have been updated to reflect the University’s modest growth in fall 2008. However, given the complexity of and time necessary to collect physical inventory data, numbers relating to inventory have not been updated and 2007 information is presented.

Several capital projects are identified and others are suggested in the FMP. The master plan does not attempt to design projects, but it does provide a conceptual site plan, illustrating the proposed development for the campus. This study is an update of the 2003 master plan, with additional recommendations concerning student life and residence halls. The facilities assessment included is based on the material in the previous study with editing, as appropriate.

Planning Input

In addition to the University Steering Committee meetings, input was sought from the campus community and its surrounding neighborhoods.

- In November 2007, an interview/focus group session occurred on campus with “town-gown” members. In addition to University and consultant staff, in attendance were representatives from the local Chamber of Commerce, the City of Salisbury, the Salisbury Area Property Owners Association (SAPOA), the Camden Neighborhood Association, and residents of the local community. At other “town-gown” meetings the University provided updates about future campus growth.
In March 2008, University representatives and its consultant met with the Salisbury-Wicomico County Planning and Zoning Commission and presented tentative five-year, 10-year, and future vision plans.

In May 2009, “A Leaders Look” event occurred on campus. Various stations, manned by University staff, were set up in the room and local leaders were given an opportunity to become familiar with Salisbury University’s comprehensive housing renovation plan, the Allenwood residence hall with first floor retail project, and the Franklin P. Perdue School of Business. In addition, one station was devoted to the University’s “future vision” for projects.

Simultaneously with the overall Facilities Master Plan process, market studies and surveys specifically related to student housing were taking place. This is more fully described in the “Student Housing & Residence Life” section of this Executive Summary.

Planning Efforts

As the planning process got underway in December 2007, the team described previously began three simultaneous efforts:

- Using existing information and information provided by the University, the team created the base site plan. This formed the basis for all subsequent plans.
- University staff gathered and evaluated significant statistics regarding population trends, enrollment characteristics and trends, academic programs, and space inventory, and furnished them to the team.
- The team interviewed a wide range of constituents from the University, the community, and local government.

Unique to this master plan effort was a focus on student housing and residence life, represented in the Student and Residential Life Needs Assessment (SRLNA) and the Comprehensive Housing Renovation Plan (CHRP). Beginning with a 2002 market study and informed by updated market data and two student surveys conducted during the early stages of this master plan, the SRLNA and CHRP identified significant needs to improve student life and student housing options. These needs were translated to recommended development projects, including new construction and renovation of existing student housing. This, in turn, helped to shape capital planning for the other campus facilities.
The planning team evaluated the existing buildings and sites, determining suitability of the facilities for existing and future needs of the University. Several schemes for future projects were proposed and evaluated. A draft plan was developed and shared with the campus community and the Salisbury-Wicomico County Planning and Zoning Commission. Changes were made as appropriate and a final Facilities Master Plan prepared.

As a result of this planning and evaluative effort, the University underscores the following points:

■ **Point 1:** Existing space is predicted to be well below the Department of Budget and Management’s Space Planning Guidelines in 2017. For instance, the University will have 60.2 percent of laboratory space, 29.9 percent of study facilities, 63.8 percent of athletic facilities, and 42.2 percent of central computer facilities allowed.

■ **Point 2:** As a USM-designated growth institution, the University has grown beyond recent enrollment projections. For example, enrollment projections through 2017 based on 2007 and 2008 data estimated a 6.8 percent increase in total fall full-time equivalent students (FTES) for the nine-year period between 2008 and 2017. Fall term FTES actually increased by 19.6 percent over a four-year period (from fall 2004 through fall 2008). This would strongly suggest 2007 projections are low and growth will likely be much higher through 2017. Without additional facilities, the ability to adequately serve higher enrollments will be strained.

■ **Point 3:** While the University has a number of facility needs documented in this plan, the need for a new library cannot be overstated. The existing library was constructed in 1958 and renovated in 1975 when the University only served approximately 2,600 FTES. Given the University’s current student body, the library has 4.87 square feet for every FTES. For the University’s peer institutions, the average 2008 net square feet (NSF) per FTES ratio was 12.44.

The resulting recommendations are presented in this Executive Summary.
Overview

Salisbury University is one of 11 degree-granting institutions in the University System of Maryland (USM). SU is a nationally accredited, four-year, comprehensive university offering 55 distinct undergraduate and graduate degree programs and five post-baccalaureate certificate programs. Serving more than 7,800 students\(^1\), SU is the largest of six\(^2\) higher education institutions on Maryland’s Eastern Shore and is a USM-designated growth institution. As the City of Salisbury’s second largest employer, the University is a major driver of the economy of the Lower Eastern Shore region.

The University offers 42 undergraduate degree programs leading to Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Arts in Social Work. Thirteen graduate programs lead to Master of Education, Master of Arts, Master of Arts in Teaching, Master of Business Administration, Master of Science, and Master of Social Work.

Four endowed Schools, each headed by a Dean, offer the instructional programs for Salisbury University. These Schools include the Fulton School of Liberal Arts, the Henson School of Science and Technology, the Perdue School of Business, and the Seidel School of Education and Professional Studies. Along with the Blackwell Library and Instructional Resources and its Dean, these Schools have direct responsibility for implementing the University’s curricula.

The University System of Maryland’s Board of Regents is the governing authority for SU. The President has overall operational authority and responsibility and exercises general supervision of all departments. Students, faculty, and staff also participate in the governance of the University.

In fall 2008, Salisbury University employed 379 full-time faculty, 599 full-time staff, 288 part-time faculty\(^3\), and 425 part-time staff.

SU is fully accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.

\(^1\) Information presented is for fall 2008.
\(^2\) For fall 2009, as of September 25, 2009, the University has 8,204 students.
\(^3\) Includes teaching assistants.
History and Character
In 1922, the State chose Salisbury as the site for a new two-year teachers college. It began operations as the State Normal School at Salisbury in September 1925. In 1963, the State Teachers College at Salisbury was renamed Salisbury State College. For the next 25 years, the institution expanded rapidly, increasing its enrollments and academic programs. Salisbury State College was renamed Salisbury State University in 1988 and Salisbury University in 2001.

Salisbury University’s students represent every geographic region in the State of Maryland, 31 states (including Washington, D.C.), and 62 countries.

The University Setting
Salisbury University’s campus is situated just south of the City of Salisbury’s business district. Metropolitan Salisbury has a population of 70,000 people and is the county seat of Wicomico County as well as the commercial center for Maryland’s Lower Eastern Shore. Although located in a developing and progressively urban setting, Salisbury University remains strongly rooted in the diverse communities and rural heritage of the Lower Eastern Shore.

Mission, Vision, and Values
Salisbury University has adopted a mission statement that reflects its purpose, which is “to empower our students with the knowledge, skills, and core values that contribute to active citizenship, gainful employment, and life-long learning in a democratic society and interdependent world.” Salisbury University strives to build on its recognition as a “top-tier institution” while achieving national eminence as one of the country’s best public comprehensive universities. The core values of Salisbury University are excellence, student-centeredness, learning, community, civic engagement, and diversity.
Strategic Initiatives

The campus community has been engaged in a process to update the University’s Strategic Plan and to develop a Strategic Enrollment Plan simultaneously with this Facilities Master Planning process. A draft plan was presented to the campus community for input and discussion in November 2008 and finalized in January 2009. The Salisbury University Strategic Plan 2009-2013 identifies the following goals for the next five years:

- **Goal 1:** Provide exceptional contemporary liberal arts education and academic and professional programs that are aligned with an increasingly competitive, global, and knowledge-based economy.

- **Goal 2:** Continue to attract and retain quality students.

- **Goal 3:** Promote and develop a student culture that places the highest priority on academic engagement and personal growth by leveraging the SU “small school feel” and strong student/faculty/staff interactions.

- **Goal 4:** Continue to build the resources—human, financial, physical, and external—that support student academic and engagement needs.

Sustainability

The issue of sustainability has become one that is central to planning and design. Global climate change, resource depletion, and environmental degradation have been recognized as serious issues. These issues are significantly increasing the cost of energy and raw materials; therefore, these issues are increasing the costs of both constructing and operating new buildings. It is important that Salisbury University design its new buildings to minimize negative environmental effects and costly energy usage.

The U.S. Green Building Council’s (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program attempts to codify and recognize what constitutes a “green” building. Salisbury University should assume that all future projects will be designed to a LEED Silver level at a minimum.
Cognizant of SU’s impact on the environment and the need to reduce negative effects, President Janet Dudley-Eshbach signed the President’s Climate Commitment of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) in 2007. A baseline carbon footprint for the campus has been developed, and across campus, groups of students, faculty, and staff are working together to identify initiatives to reduce SU’s carbon footprint. From the University’s 25-year-old recycling program to its careful planning of new campus facilities, SU’s commitment to sustainability is a major part of our overall master plan.

**Student Body Characteristics**

The University has 7,868 students\(^4\), of whom 88 percent are full time and 12 percent are part time. Females comprise 56 percent of the student body and minority student enrollment is 17.9 percent. The majority of SU’s students (92.5%) are enrolled in undergraduate programs. Almost 92 percent of all undergraduate students are age 24 or younger. The State of Maryland is home to 86.1 percent of the student body. A total of 1,750 students (24% of full-time undergraduate students) live on campus. An additional 890 students live in a nearby public/private housing development dedicated exclusively to students.

Between 2004 and 2008, headcount enrollment increased at an average of 3.33 percent per year. The undergraduate headcount increased at a slightly greater rate than the University as a whole, while the graduate headcount experienced a drop beginning in 2004 and remained low until a small increase in 2006. All four Schools experienced an increase in headcount enrollment between 2004 and 2008.

The five-year trends of actual credit hours provide a stronger indication of the vibrancy and stability of enrollments. Fall credit hour enrollments increased from 91,379 in 2004 to 109,313 in 2008. This 19.6 percent total increase represents an increase in undergraduate credit hours from 87,893 to 105,255 (19.8%) and an increase in graduate credit hours from 3,486 to 4,058 (16.4%) between fall 2004 and fall 2008. All of the Schools had an increase in fall credit hours during this time period.

---

\(^4\) Information presented is for fall 2008. For fall 2009, as of September 25, 2009, the University has 8,204 students.
Campus Facilities

The campus facilities inventory includes 56 buildings that contain approximately 1,641,277 gross square feet (GSF) of space (Refer to Exhibit ES-1: Existing Campus Map on page 11). The University classifies these buildings into three categories: State supported, non-State supported (auxiliary), and leased. The University owns approximately 155 acres of land.

Salisbury University’s buildings range in age from 84 years to new. The major campus buildings are built of durable materials appropriate for university structures. Many of the minor buildings were residences or small commercial structures and are not built to the same institutional standards. There are also a number of small buildings, originally intended to be temporary, that are modular and not constructed with materials or systems designed for long-term use.

The primary issues with the University buildings are related to inadequate size, changing needs, and the aging of infrastructure systems. Of greatest concern, and in dire need of replacement, is the existing library. The building’s infrastructure will not allow for the addition of technology and serves a student population that is already three times its capacity. For example, given the library size and the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) it serves, the 2008 net square feet (NSF) per FTES ratio is calculated at 4.87. For the University’s peer institutions, the 2008 NSF by FTES ratio is 12.44. Like the library, most of the Salisbury University’s buildings are overused. Programming and scheduling requirements demand that facilities be utilized in ways that do not fit their design. In some cases this may pose problems with systems adequately serving the space. These problems would be alleviated by the construction of additional space and renovation of existing space that would be designed to better meet the needs of a University that is designated as a growth institution in the USM. A description of the size and challenges of the major campus buildings as well as smaller buildings on and near campus is included in the full FMP.

In addition to campus buildings, the University has 10 acres of athletic fields. On the main campus there are 12 tennis courts. The other outdoor

Blackwell Library was in built in 1958 for a student body of fewer than 3,000.

Devilbiss Hall opened in 1967.

5 More detailed information regarding the existing library can be found in Chapter 3 of the Facilities Master Plan, “Facilities: Architectural.”
athletic facilities are located on the east campus including the 2,500-seat Sea Gull Stadium and a 400-meter, eight-lane track with grass infield. The University Fitness Club opened on the east campus in fall 2008 after the Salisbury University Foundation, Inc. purchased the former Merritt Racquetball and Fitness Club. The University is in the process of further expanding the east campus with the former Dresser facility at the corner of East College Avenue and South Division Street. The 19-acre property is being acquired by the SU Foundation. The University also purchased the former Paper People building on Bateman Street in May 2009, and the SU Foundation purchased the former Noland Plumbing building on South Division Street as an opportunity to relocate the University’s existing maintenance operations. The University plans to purchase the building from the SU Foundation in FY 2010. All of these developments will bring additional activity to the east campus.

Salisbury University currently has 27 parking lots that can accommodate 3,116 cars. In addition, a parking garage was completed in August 2009 that provides more than 800 additional parking spaces.

Water

The City of Salisbury provides domestic water to Salisbury University. The age of the campus water lines is a growing concern for the University, and water pressure has always been an issue. The current facilities are sufficient to provide service to the campus, but there is concern that there may not be adequate water service to support future expansion.

Water pressure is at the low end of the acceptable range. The lack of pressure is not a new issue with Salisbury University, but the campus has to rely on the City to improve its current system. Some of the lines are 50 years old and nearing the end of their designed life. Breaks are more likely to occur, and increased sedimentation will eventually lead to poor water quality and lower pressure.
Sanitary Sewer

The City of Salisbury provides sanitary sewer service to Salisbury University. While the current gravity piping system seems to be working sufficiently, many of the pipes are over 50 years old. The system in the vicinity of Fulton and Holloway halls appears to need replacement due to age and root growth.

Future growth of the University shall take into account the current system capacity and address any anticipated deficiencies.

Storm Water Drainage

Though the University’s storm drain system seems to be working properly, these pipes are also approximately 50 years old and experiencing some root growth. The service/delivery area adjacent to the Commons building is prone to flooding.

New additions to the University will require qualitative and quantitative analysis of future storm water management needs.
Projected Trends & Conditions

Enrollment

Projected enrollments through fall 2017, based upon 2007 and 2008 data, represented the combination of recommendations developed by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and Salisbury University. These projections primarily focused upon academic activities that were expected to occur during the prime daytime hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. by full-time and part-time students, faculty, and staff. Students enrolled during these hours are referred to as full-time day equivalent students (FTDES). The credit hour and Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) data take into account existing ratios between credit hours and WSCH by discipline, as well as the established total percentage differences between Lecture and Laboratory WSCH.

The University anticipated a steady, but controlled, increase in both graduate and undergraduate enrollments over the next 10 years. Total undergraduate student headcount was expected to increase from an actual count of 7,281 in fall 2008 to a minimum total of 7,938 by fall 2017. Undergraduate FTES was expected to increase from 7,017 in fall 2008 to 7,503 by fall 2017. Both graduate total headcount and FTES were expected to increase at a lower rate than undergraduate enrollments. Graduate headcount was projected to increase from 587 in fall 2008 to 676 in fall 2017, and graduate FTES was expected to increase from 338 to 351 during the same nine-year period. Total FTDES were expected to increase from an actual total of 6,005 for fall 2008 to a minimum of 6,598 by fall 2017. It was estimated that total undergraduate WSCH would increase, incrementally, from 107,673 WSCH in fall 2008 to 117,923 WSCH by fall 2017. Of this total, approximately 85,828 WSCH would be generated by lecture segments in fall 2017, and a total of 32,095 WSCH were expected to occur in laboratory segments for courses offered from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

It is important to note that the 2017 projections presented here were based upon information available at the time of this report’s original draft.
Recent trends, however, particularly in light of Salisbury University having been designated as a growth institution, strongly suggest that the future year enrollment levels anticipated at that time were exceedingly conservative. For instance:

- Projections here indicate a 6.8 percent increase in total fall FTES for the nine-year period between 2008 and 2017. Fall term FTES actually increased over a four-year period (fall 2004 through fall 2008) by 19.6 percent. This would strongly suggest that 2007 projections are low.

- The University experienced 21.6 percent growth in first-time student enrollment in the four-year period between fall 2004 and fall 2008. Not only have the University’s recruitment strategies proven effective, SU also has been successful in its retention efforts, as reflected by consistently high second-year retention rates. Between 2005 and 2008 SU’s second-year retention rate for first-time full-time students fell within a range of 83.6 percent to 87.4 percent.\(^6\)

- Similar to first-time student enrollment increases, the number of transfer student applications and admittances has increased significantly since 2004. Applications have increased from 1,478 in fall 2004 to 1,897 in fall 2008. The number of transfer students accepted increased from 1,172 in fall 2004 to 1,431 in fall 2008. The University has closed admissions to this group for three consecutive years (fall 2007, 2008, and 2009) as transfer student demand has exceeded available spaces.

- Enrollment data available in 2007 resulted in the projection of an overall headcount increase of 11.2 percent over the nine-year period between fall 2008 to fall 2017. In only three years between fall 2005 and fall 2008, however, overall student headcount actually grew by 12.3 percent (see Table ES-1 on page 14). Unless insufficient funding levels or facility space issues restrict enrollment increases, it is unlikely enrollment growth will be as small as predicted in 2007.

Consequently, the University, in its role as a USM growth institution, is confronted with the challenge of accepting and educating more students and more qualified students with insufficient financial and human resources as well as overused facilities.

The University expects to maintain its student/faculty ratio close to 17 to 1 through the year 2017. For master planning purposes, a conservative annual increase of 0.7 percent is projected for staff. Projected enrollment targets will require adjustment should funding not keep pace with the need to hire additional faculty and staff.

Academic Program

A number of academic program enhancements and additions at the University are in the development stage at any given time. SU anticipates no immediate deletions from its current program. Existing programs are evolving to take advantage of changes in instructional delivery methodology and technology. In addition, SU has received approval to offer a limited number of applied doctoral programs and is actively exploring the introduction of at least one such program in the near future. Each of the four schools has identified opportunities for growth.

Contemporary learning environments are required in order to remain competitive by retaining or attracting a representative level of the region’s and the State’s available student population. Salisbury University will stress renovating and rehabilitating existing facilities, as well as providing new facilities. Teleconferencing and online capabilities will make learning partnerships with other schools and businesses commonplace, including those with other countries.

### TABLE ES-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and Degree Program</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Percent Change 2005-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton School</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henson School</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdue School</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seidel School</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td>6,437</td>
<td>6,791</td>
<td>6,941</td>
<td>7,281</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Graduate</strong></td>
<td>572</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total University</strong></td>
<td>7,009</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>7,581</td>
<td>7,868</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Space Guidelines Allowance

The Maryland Department of Budget and Management’s Space Planning Guidelines, in conjunction with Salisbury University’s student enrollment and program projections, provide an initial assessment of facilities needs for the SU campus. The space guidelines calculations are used only as an aid in analyzing campus-wide space needs by room use category. Quality of spaces is not considered when using these guidelines, and they are not used in individual project planning. As of fall 2007, after updating for the addition of the new Teacher Education and Technology Center (TETC), Salisbury University had 82 percent of the overall allowable space for those categories subject to Space Planning Guidelines.

Guidelines are analyzed for the current space utilization and then projected out to fall 2017 (accounting for the TETC, the parking garage, and the new Perdue School of Business). The analysis shows that by 2017, after taking into consideration the demolition of Caruthers Hall, Salisbury University’s assignable space, as a percentage of total allowable space, is expected to decline to 77 percent. The University will be closer to, but still fall short of, the allowable space for classrooms and offices. More significantly, the University will have 60.2 percent of laboratory space, 29.9 percent of study facilities, 63.8 percent of athletic facilities, and 42.2 percent of central computer facilities allowed. The only space category for which SU meets and exceeds the eligible allowance is that of exhibition space, due to SU’s unique ownership of the Ward Museum of Wildfowl Art. The results of this analysis are presented in the full plan.

In addition to the quantitative indicators of space needs summarized here, the planning team assessed qualitative indicators of current conditions, program characteristics, and future space needs and desires based on observations by the consultants and views expressed by University personnel during interviews and via written statements. These observations and views are detailed in the FMP.

7 See Chapter 2 of Facilities Master Plan, “Academic Programs and Space Needs.”
Critical to the mission of Salisbury University is the goal to improve the quality of the student life and residence life experience on the campus. The University recognizes its strengths in the high satisfaction of our resident students, but it also acknowledges that increased student success is tied to further improvements in all areas of student life. Serving a predominately traditional-aged student population dominated by students who are living away from home, the responsibilities of and opportunities for providing high-quality programs in a small-scaled academic environment will strengthen the University’s niche and student profile. In addition, because of the University’s relatively rural location, SU has even greater responsibility to serve the out-of-class needs of students than would an institution located in a more urban environment.

Salisbury’s existing student housing includes a range of unit types. Four residence halls are traditional style, with double occupancy rooms off corridors and community bathrooms. These buildings range from 80 to 160 occupants each and are low-scale structures that form a small residential quad. Three high rises provide cluster-style housing, with groups of 10 to 12 students sharing a community bathroom. At six stories and 220 to 230 students, these buildings have less visual appeal. Dogwood Village is a series of factory-built, one-story structures with 140 single-occupancy bedrooms. Chesapeake Hall is a three-story, apartment-style building with 175 students in units of four double bedrooms each, while St. Martin Hall is arranged as semi-suites (two double-occupancy bedrooms share a bathroom) for about 290 students. The units in both of these buildings are entered from exterior corridors (hotel style).

Though current housing stock is dated and offers limited aesthetic appeal, campus housing is over-subscribed and demand for on-campus student housing has resulted in wait lists. Lounges have been converted to student rooms, and facilities within the buildings are intensely used. Wait lists for on-campus housing have ranged from 100 to 400 students in recent years; many students must find housing off campus.
The off-campus market provides a range of housing options. Popular, student-focused complexes offer single-occupancy bedrooms, multiple bathrooms, and full kitchens. Most are within a relatively short distance to campus and are reported to be very social. Other apartment complexes mix student and non-student populations, which appeals to students looking for a more studious environment, but also increases distances back to campus. Single-family residences fill in the rest of the off-campus stock. Older students equate these units with transitioning to the “real world.” Neighbors often find living adjacent to students to be problematic, however, placing stress on town-gown relations.

A 2002 housing market study by Anderson Strickler, LLC identified a demand for an additional 1,191 beds by fall 2011 if enrollments increased as projected by Salisbury University. Almost 900 were provided through the construction of University Park, a public/private partnership. Another 588 beds were constructed in an unaffiliated private project approximately one mile from the main campus in 2005. The 2005 Comprehensive Housing Renovation Plan (CHRP) proposed additions to add program space and link the corners of Choptank and Chester halls, and St. Martin and Chesapeake halls. Bathroom renovations, additional common spaces, and suite reconfigurations were proposed as part of the upgrades. In 2005, however, major reconfiguration of units was financially infeasible.

Those recommendations were reconsidered, and some adopted, as part of the current CHRP process, which was undertaken as part of this Facilities Master Plan update. The University has obtained approximately $50,025,000 from the State to fund renovations to existing halls recommended by the current CHRP.

In 2007, a Student and Residential Life Needs Assessment (SRLNA) also was conducted in conjunction with a follow-up housing market study. The studies were designed to integrate student life facilities into larger campus planning efforts. Like residence halls, student life facilities are overused. Students and administrators report a lack of gathering and meeting space, limited non-board food options, and severe overcrowding in athletic facilities. Commuters complain of isolation and inconvenience in their daily lives when on campus.

The CHRP and SRLNA were accomplished through meetings, focus groups, workshop sessions, and tours of campus and neighborhood facilities. Two Web-based student survey instruments were developed, allowing the planning team to get a view of student opinions beyond...
meetings and focus groups. In all, more than 1,000 students provided feedback to the planning process. Enrollment patterns and growth projections were used to create models of campus residency, providing the University and the team another tool to plan for future projects. The data and impressions collected through these efforts led to a series of proposals for renovations to existing housing and student life facilities and construction of additional student housing.

The Student Life Planning Committee and the Steering Committee considered several factors in setting the planning goal that is represented in this 2007 study:

- The Market Study shows a demand for up to 960 new beds, with approximately 600 of those on the main campus.
- Today’s demand for main campus beds is 2,340, housing 34 percent of all undergraduates.
- Today’s demand for all campus beds is 2,600, housing 39 percent of all undergraduates.
- The current on- and off-campus student housing market is at 97 percent capacity.
- The committees felt comfortable in planning for a total inventory of 2,300 to 2,600 beds, which represents a net gain of 600 to 900 beds. The predicted model is based on a goal to house 34 percent of undergraduates using near-term and mid-term enrollment, with sufficient numbers of students from each class year to establish critical mass.
- The University does not provide housing to graduate students, and this planning model assumes that the background market will continue to fill this need.

Research and the experiences of residential life professionals indicate that younger students are more successful when housed in more communal facilities and that upperclass students tend to remain on campus and are more satisfied when offered more independent living units. The balancing act for every institution is to determine where they need to place themselves between market desires and developmental ideals. The recommended program model includes a mix of units tied to the class year of students. The model factors in existing units by predicting the best future match for those beds. Comparing a unit mix to the existing inventory produces a gap analysis, showing what types of units should be added to the campus mix.
Based on these findings, the following recommendations were formulated for phased new housing construction. (Map references following each phase description refer to Exhibit ES-2: Opportunity Sites on page 20.):

**Phase I Housing: 1,000 Beds/Proposed Sites 1 & 2, Allenwood:**
The starting point is 600 new apartment-style units with single occupancy bedrooms. A later phase can be planned for an additional 400 beds. By adding apartment-style single beds, the University will be able to meet market demand to provide a new unit type for older students and create swing space to allow for renovations to existing housing. 

**Phase 2 Housing Program: 300-400 Beds/Proposed Site 3, Dogwood:**
The suggested program would continue to emphasize single occupancy bedrooms in suite or apartment-style units.

**Phase 3 Housing Program: 350 Beds/ Site 4, Devilbiss Lot:**
The suggested program would potentially create new housing for younger students on the sites adjacent to Allenwood or on the Devilbiss parking lot. Preliminary site studies suggest that 340 to 390 beds could be accommodated. For this site the recommended program could include hybrids of more traditional unit types.

**Future Housing Program: 750-1,000 Beds/ Site 5, East Campus:**
Future campus expansion and east campus development would support housing on east campus.

The planning team devised several alternative strategies to address student life needs including a consolidated amenity facility approach and a distributed approach. (A consolidated approach favors larger facilities in central locations to accommodate student life functions, while a distributed approach utilizes pockets of activities in new or existing facilities.) The ultimate solution may be a hybrid of both, but in the near term it seems more feasible to place campus life functions within existing buildings or as part of other new construction projects. The recommendation of this study is to take advantage of every opportunity available, within existing facilities or in projects planned, as part of the expanded housing program. Opportunities for student life program space within student housing projects include smaller-scaled lounges, meeting spaces, and recreational facilities. New construction will offer better options for larger-scaled, multi-purpose spaces.

---

9 More detailed information regarding Opportunity Sites is in Chapter 4 of the Facilities Master Plan, “Site Analysis.”
As currently configured, the Guerrieri University Center serves many campus life needs. However, based on the planning team’s evaluation of the building, relatively modest renovations could greatly improve the building’s functionality. The team recommends that, wherever possible, masonry walls should be removed to allow for visual interconnections between spaces.

The Commons is designed with conference-style, high-quality finishes. Meeting space on the second floor of the Commons should be more widely available for campus-wide meetings without current catering requirements. In the long term, the University may want to consider creating a second-story addition over the existing connector to the Guerrieri Center and over the loading dock area.

EXHIBIT ES-2
Opportunity Sites

Note: Number designations on the map refer to specific opportunity sites as discussed in Chapter 7 of the Facilities Master Plan.
Site Analysis

Campus Organization

The Salisbury University campus is defined by a system of roads, open spaces, and buildings. Some campus land holdings extend beyond the general boundaries. U.S. Route 13 and its commercial strip development and an existing railroad divide the campus into the main campus and the east campus. Bateman Street further divides the east campus into northern and southern areas.

The primary organizing element within the main campus is the mall, which establishes a north-south axis off which extend several other open spaces. The primary organizing elements within the east campus include Wayne Street and Bateman Street. The main and east campuses connect via the Route 13 pedestrian underpass.

Locating more people and functions near the south end of the main campus will serve to re-center campus while strengthening linkages from this end of campus to the mall. This can be accomplished through proposed housing at the Allenwood and Dogwood corners of campus. These developments also will serve to strengthen the University’s presence by completing the placement of significant architecture on the four corners of the main campus.

While the open spaces that organize the main campus tend to “knit” buildings and use areas together, the streets on the east campus tend to separate and divide. This is compounded by the nature of the uses along these roads – open athletic fields, vacant property, parking, and low-rise, commercial buildings. There is the opportunity to use these roads as a framework to improve the campus organization for the east campus. Bateman Street, College Avenue, and Milford Street can be reinforced with land uses and streetscape enhancements to better link the east campus with the main campus. As purchased properties increase activity in this area, it will naturally gain more of a sense of being part of “one campus.”
**Land Use**

Academic, administrative/support, residential, and parking uses are concentrated within the main campus; athletic, parking, and student housing uses comprise the southern part of the east campus; and vacant land and parking comprise the northern part of the east campus.

Generally, the distribution of land uses works well. There is a desire and need for more student housing on the main campus. To address that need, efforts are underway to develop a new 600-bed residence hall with first floor retail space through a public-private partnership. This development will be located on the southeast corner of the main campus on the site of what is currently the Allenwood shopping center. Additional large building footprints are recommended for the east campus.

Since the 2003 Facilities Master Plan, the University has been building new academic facilities on the main campus and relocating some of the parking facilities to the east campus. This has been a positive direction, in that additional development reinforces the compact main campus as well as enhancing the approach along Route 13. The compact campus was identified in discussions as a positive attribute. Most notable is the development of the new TETC, which establishes a presence at the corner of Route 13 and West College Avenue. As the campus develops on both sides of Route 13, there is an opportunity to anchor all corners with significant architecture. In addition to the Allenwood site, this should be considered at the Dogwood Village site, at the corner of Bateman and Division streets, at the corner of College Avenue and Division Street, and along College Avenue just east of the railroad.

As the density of the main campus increases, there is a corresponding opportunity to create a compact environment on the east campus. Athletic fields should remain south of Bateman Street, and new buildings should be located north of Bateman where they can begin to create a critical mass and compact district.

Open space surrounds the Teacher Education and Technology Center.
Access and Vehicular Circulation

Historically, the main entrance to Salisbury University was off Camden Avenue at Holloway Hall. More recently, multiple access points to the campus and its facilities provide several options for motorists without concentrating all of the vehicular activity in one location. Visitors arriving from the north along Route 13 are greeted by the new TETC building and are directed to Camden Visitors Parking Lot F. With the development of the new Perdue School of Business building, the larger drop-off loop at Henson Lawn will be eliminated and replaced with a smaller drop-off area between Route 13 and the new Perdue School, which will include a visitors/reception desk.

The existing way-finding signage is fairly effective at directing visitors to the appropriate campus entrance off Camden Avenue, and campus faculty, staff, and students to the appropriate parking along the perimeter of the main campus. It is important to continue to maintain and enhance an effective signage program. College Avenue will play a more important role as the Dresser Property is programmed with campus facilities. Therefore, it will be important to provide appropriate signage along Route 13 well before motorists have to make a decision to turn at College Avenue.

With completion of the parking garage on the east campus, Bateman Street’s role as an important front door for the east campus will increase, as will the role of Wayne Street. The City of Salisbury is currently planning to create a more continuous alignment of Bateman Street and Onley Road at Division Street. With the proposed new alignment, the intersection will be safer for pedestrians. This also will make it easier for motorists to use this as an efficient through connection to Snow Hill Road. While this is the objective of the City, it is not in the best interest of the University. Though vehicular traffic should not be eliminated from Bateman Street, Bateman should be designed as a pedestrian-friendly street. Traffic calming devices should also be considered for Bateman Street.

Bus service is provided to and from the main campus and east campus. Currently, there is one stop on the main campus in front of Caruthers Hall. Buses also stop at Dresser Parking Lot A, University Park, and
University Village. Bus service on the campus should be expanded to two pick-up/drop-off locations. In the future, multiple bus stops should be established on the east campus as new facilities, particularly parking resources, are developed.

The University should work with the City of Salisbury and State Highway Administration to explore redesigning Route 13 to make it more of an urban boulevard. This will not only make it more attractive, but it also will slow traffic and make it more compatible with pedestrian usage.

On the west side of the main campus, the University should explore the installation of traffic roundabouts with pedestrian crossings at the Camden Avenue intersections at both Dogwood Drive and West College Avenue. These will aid in slowing traffic and make pedestrian travel safer along this University border.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation**

Generally, pedestrian circulation functions well within the main campus. The primary circulation within the main campus extends along and off the mall, through Red Square, and between Chesapeake and St. Martin halls. A safe and convenient pedestrian connection between Allenwood and the rest of the main campus is lacking. The development of student housing on the Allenwood site, coupled with moving the Physical Plant to east campus, will improve pedestrian connections from this corner of campus to the mall. Even though adequate walkways are provided around Camden Parking Lot E, many pedestrians choose the shortest path through the parking lot. In addition, a path is worn in the lawn beneath the copse of trees on the northwest side of Henson Science Hall. This path accommodates flow between the Henson food court and the mall and should be replaced with a paved path.

The primary pedestrian circulation between the main campus and east campus utilizes the existing U.S. Route 13 pedestrian underpass at Bateman Street. The 2003 master plan recommended reinforcing the use of the existing Route 13 pedestrian underpass. The University is accomplishing this by placing a significant destination near each end.
Pedestrian crossing of Route 13 at College Avenue has increased, however, since the University began leasing the Dresser Parking Lot and opened the TETC. Consideration should be given to an improved pedestrian crossing—either an underpass or an overpass—of U.S. Route 13 at this northern location. Another enhanced crossing of Route 13 also should be considered at the southern end of campus at the intersection of Dogwood Drive. A significant number of students already cross at this location. A long signal time favoring Route 13, however, results in students crossing against the light. The University and the City of Salisbury should partner to create a safer pedestrian crossing in this location. In addition, a recently installed turning arrow at this location should be assessed for safety and effectiveness.

Pedestrian circulation on east campus is facilitated by sidewalks associated with the road network and functions well for the uses that exist currently. However, there are pedestrian safety concerns related to students crossing railroad tracks as well as walking in isolated areas at night. As the east campus evolves, accommodations for pedestrians will need to evolve as well, with greater consideration given for pedestrian safety. With the completion of the parking garage, the sidewalk will be enhanced between the garage and the underground walkway. Lighting also will need to be improved throughout east campus to enhance pedestrian safety.

There is no sidewalk along Milford Street between Route 13 and University Park. Students walk a short distance along Route 13 after crossing at Dogwood Drive and then cut behind the businesses and across the railroad tracks to reach University Park. While the distance between University Park and the Commons is about the same as the distance between the TETC and the Commons, the experience of the former walk is less pleasant because of the conditions described above.

As the bike system is expanded, the University should work closely with the City to coordinate this effort. The bike path proposed by the City along the north side of Bateman Street would make more sense on the south side, where it would tie into the pedestrian underpass.
Open Space

The campus includes a hierarchy of open spaces on the main campus, ranging from large open lawns to small intimate garden spaces. A description of the open space system is included in the FMP.

Focus group discussions confirm that the open space contributes significantly to the positive qualities of the main campus in terms of aesthetics and opportunities for play and social interaction. It is important to preserve, protect, enhance, and expand open space and make it more useable.

Because the mall is the central campus open space, consideration should be given to extending it to the south to provide a stronger visual and physical connection with the Commons and the Guerrieri Center. With the overuse of Holloway and Henson lawns, it is clear that additional large open spaces that can support active play and gathering are needed to alleviate some of the pressure on those spaces. This will be particularly important as additional student housing is developed. If Camden Avenue Parking Lot E is not used as an alternate site for the third phase of student housing, it is recommended that the lot be converted to open space.

Red Square is the crossroad for many students and faculty moving throughout the campus. The Square should be renovated in conjunction with development of the proposed new library to enhance this function and to serve as an appropriate forecourt for the new building.

The forest corridor stretching from Route 13 to Camden Avenue just south of Maggs Center is an important resource. There is an opportunity to expand and enhance it with the redevelopment of the southeastern corner of the main campus. Consideration should also be given to planning for a similar forest environment on a part of the east campus.

The most significant addition proposed for campus open space is development of a mall on the east campus. There is currently no traditional open space on the east campus. It will be important to establish this open space early to provide a framework around which to grow and to begin changing perceptions about the east campus.
As larger spaces are expanded and developed, consideration must be given to providing additional intimate and contemplative space, which also maintains safety. Building programs that include food service need to incorporate these elements adjacent to the outdoors where they can help to activate these spaces. The most successful open spaces are those that provide maximum flexibility for users and are comfortable for all. All open spaces should be named and marked.

Streetscapes are also an important part of the open space system. A variety of improvements are envisioned for the streetscapes around and through the University campus.

**Parking**

Salisbury University currently has approximately 3,960 available parking spaces. Most of the parking areas function quite well in terms of circulation. Stakeholders indicated that Dresser Parking Lot A is underutilized. SU has been successful over the years in avoiding the development of parking internal to the main campus and moving a significant amount of parking onto east campus and to the periphery. The new parking garage on Wayne Street, opened during August 2009, will help activate the east campus. An exception to this is Camden Lot E, which creates a visual and physical barrier separating the Commons building from the heart of the campus. Camden Lot E should be eliminated. Camden Visitors Lot F should be redesigned and perhaps expanded at the time Blackwell Library is replaced. Once the tennis courts are moved to the east campus as proposed, a new parking lot with 120 to 150 spaces is proposed to take its place on the main campus.

Additional parking should be developed on the east campus in the future to serve developments in that area and particularly the proposed fine and performing arts center.

The University will need to continue changing the mindset that parking should be immediately adjacent to the facilities it serves. Any expansion to parking lots on the west side of Camden Avenue should be divided into smaller lots and heavily landscaped.
Campus Landscape

The 155-acre Salisbury University campus enjoys its status as a national arboretum and includes a collection of over 2,000 species of plants. The campus is registered in the Maryland Big Tree Program and has several trees on Holloway Lawn that are among the largest in Maryland. In addition to plants, the University Arboretum includes a collection of over 26 sculptures. The plan details a number of recommendations regarding plant diversity, heights, and maintenance. It also recommends that additional sites for gardens be identified as a part of future developments, particularly on the east campus.

The University should continue moving in the direction of implementing the campus standards for benches, trash receptacles, and bike racks, just as it has for signage. Predominant paving materials should also be standardized in the future. Where possible, brick pavers should be incorporated into pedestrian paths.

As the campus landscape expands, it also will be important to provide adequate facilities for the horticulture staff. The University also should attempt a lawn restoration rotation program once additional open spaces are added.

The main campus is well illuminated, utilizing a standard ornamental fixture throughout the campus. Lighting problems seem to be isolated in a few specific areas or around a few maintenance issues. Consideration should be given to providing more site lighting throughout east campus, particularly along the streets where students travel and in the Dresser parking area. An increased number of lights on east campus will help increase the feeling of safety as the level of activity increases in this area.

The University might consider preparing a detailed landscape master plan that would identify desired species and plant locations with the overall goal of enhancing the arboretum. A detailed landscape master plan could provide much more specific direction than is possible with this Facilities Master Plan. Similarly, the University should develop a campus-wide lighting plan.
Salisbury University: A Maryland University of National Distinction

Recommendations/ Site Development

Opportunity sites throughout campus are identified in the FMP. Based on those, the following phased improvements are recommended. Most of these projects are needed under the current conditions at the University; as the population at the University increases, they only become more necessary. (Map references following each project description refer to the Exhibit ES-3: Illustrative Site Development Plan on page 34.)

Proposed Capital and System-Funded Projects

PHASE I (In Progress)

The Paper People Building: Several administrative departments will relocate to this facility. Renovations began in summer 2009.

Allenwood Shopping Center/Housing Phase I: New student housing is proposed for the Allenwood site. Completion of this 600-bed complex is scheduled for summer 2011.

Relocate Maintenance Operations: Relocation of the existing maintenance operations will free up desirable space near the center of campus and enable development of a second phase of housing on the Allenwood site. Planning is underway to relocate these operations to the Noland building site on South Division Street.

Holloway Hall Renovations: The north wing of Holloway Hall (vacated in summer 2008 by the Perdue School of Business) was renovated for use by the Psychology and Conflict Analysis and Dispute Resolution departments. Renovations occurred during summer 2009.

Perdue School of Business Building: Construction began in summer 2009. This will require the relocation of the Police Dispatch Office and razing the University Police building.
Parking Garage: This new 800-space, four-level parking structure was completed in August 2009.

Housing Renovations: Through the Comprehensive Housing Renovation Plan (CHRP), significant renovation of most of the existing student residences is planned. This is a five-year, phased project, during which only one housing unit will be “off line” at any one time. Construction began in summer 2009.

PHASE II (1 to 5 Years)

Streetscape Improvements: Improvements along Bateman and Wayne streets would help to visually integrate east campus with the main campus. The University is working with the City of Salisbury on a conceptual design that could be implemented in the next two years.

Library and Nabb Center (Academic Commons): We propose a new library totaling 200,000 square feet on three or more floors located at the Caruthers site. A new building will better meet the needs of the University than would a renovated facility with an addition. The Nabb Center should be a part of any new library. The Department of Budget and Management Part 1 Program (Project Justification and Scope) is complete. The Part 2 Program (Detailed Project Description and Requirements) will be completed by spring 2010.

Recreation Center: A Recreation Center is planned to be built on the east campus and will include at least four indoor basketball/multi-purpose courts, an indoor running track, fitness center with exercise machines and free weights, portable seating for 1,400, and minimal locker facilities, along with outdoor tennis courts to replace the existing ones. At about 65,000 square feet, this building would be one story of primarily pre-engineered metal construction.

Maggs Center Renovation: Maggs Center has not been renovated, with the exception of the pool, since original construction in 1977. A thorough renovation will take at least a year. Ideally, the proposed Recreation Center needs to be completed first, since taking the building off line would be extremely difficult before building an additional facility.

Housing Phase II: This project could be located either on the Dogwood site or at Allenwood.
PHASE III (6 to 10 Years)

**Welcome Center:** A Welcome Center, complete with a school spirit store possibly combined with the Admissions Office, should be constructed at a prominent location that is easily located by people unfamiliar with the SU campus. A location along Route 13 is preferable.

**Route 13 Pedestrian Underpass No. 2:** Offering the greatest concentration of classrooms anywhere on campus, the TETC draws a significant number of students to the northeast corner of the main campus near West College Avenue. Consideration should be given to an improved pedestrian crossing of U.S. Route 13 in this location. Another enhanced crossing of Route 13 also should be considered at the southern end of campus at the intersection of Dogwood Drive. A significant number of students already cross at this location. A long signal time favoring Route 13, however, results in students crossing against the light. The University and the City of Salisbury should partner to create a safer pedestrian crossing in this location.

**Fine and Performing Arts Center:** A new facility is proposed on the east campus that will anchor that side of Route 13 and be open to the larger community. This facility will contain seating for a minimum of 1,600 people.

**New Food Court (Satellite):** With the addition of the new library and academic commons on the site of Caruthers Hall, it will be necessary to establish a food court at this end of campus. This could be incorporated into the new library or located in an extension to the north/south wing of Fulton Hall. This would appropriately place the food court adjacent to Red Square and the mall, a major pedestrian travel artery.

**New Glass Studio:** The Art Department’s glass blowing studio in Fulton Hall is crowded and inadequate. A new, larger facility needs to be designed and constructed which is tailored specifically to the types of activities associated with a glass-blowing and kiln facility. A possible location would be to the east end of the tennis courts, adjacent to Fulton Hall.
PHASE IV (11 to 20 Years)

**New Classroom Building:** A new 70,000-square-foot classroom building could be located on the site of the existing Blackwell Library once that facility is replaced.

**New Field House:** A replacement facility for Maggs Center could be built adjacent to the Recreation Center on the east campus. The facility would be similar in size and program to Maggs Center. Once completed, Maggs Center would revert to more of a Recreation Center serving intramural sports and club teams and as a general exercise facility for students, faculty, and staff.

**Housing Phase III:** Additional student housing on or near the main campus will be needed in the future. This project could be located near Allenwood, at Camden Parking Lot E, or on the east campus.

**Parking Garage No. 2:** The University will eventually need to add a second garage that contains 800 or more parking spaces. If added at the Dresser site, this facility could serve the general population as well as the Fine and Performing Arts Center and recreation facilities described here.

**Devilbiss Hall Renovation:** Devilbiss Hall is now more than 40 years old and in need of significant renovations far beyond the minor work that was completed in 2003.

**Sea Gull Stadium Renovation:** This 25-year-old stadium is a modest representation of what is needed to support the athletic teams that use this artificial turf field. Significant renovations and an addition to this structure are proposed. After further study, total replacement may prove to be more economical.

PHASE V (Beyond 20 Years)

**New Classroom Building No. 2:** A second, 70,000-100,000 GSF classroom building could be built on the east campus at the Dresser Property.
Other Significant Projects

A number of projects that were discussed in the last master plan (2003) will need to be addressed at the appropriate time. These include:

**Data Center:** The current data center is 18 years old and needs replacement and expansion. A new center could be combined with the new Maintenance Facility or housed in an existing building.

**Public Radio Delmarva:** The WSCL/WSDL radio station is not owned by the University but has a long relationship with it. With the future of Caruthers in doubt, moving the station and its equipment is important.

**East Campus Complex:** Power Professional Building, now known as the East Campus Complex, can continue to provide swing space for the University. However, its location is far from the academic core, and the fact that it was not originally intended to serve as a University building suggests that at some point in the future it could be demolished in favor of athletic or residential use.

**Acquisition of Property:** The University should continue to pursue the acquisition of property adjacent to new or existing University facilities/land where the acquisition will allow for future growth or better use of existing space.

**Phasing**

The master plan will not be implemented all at one time; rather it will be implemented over a period of many years. As programmatic needs and funding sources change, the site development plan will be modified to respond to these changes.
EXHIBIT ES-3
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