COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Washington State Board

CLOVER PARK TECHNICAL COLLEGE

2026 Capital Planning Facility Report

State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

Facility Condition Survey — 2025 Cycle

Minor Works Preservation — 2027–2029 Biennium Capital Request

Portfolio	20 buildings · 616,204 GSF
Buildings surveyed	17 — 547,573 GSF
Weighted-avg condition	234 (Adequate)
2027 Minor Works request	$4,525,000
2027 preservation request	$1,771,000 (6 projects)
Deferred preservation backlog	$4,794,000 (13 projects)

CONTENTS

CLOVER PARK TECHNICAL COLLEGE 1
Contents 2
1. Executive Summary 4
2. College Portfolio Overview 7
3. Capital Planning Roadmap 9
3.1 Immediate biennium (2027–2029 request) 9
3.2 Mid-term (next biennium plus one, 2029–2033) 9
3.3 Long-term (7–10+ years, 2033 and beyond) 9
3.4 Cross-cutting system themes 9
4. Deficiency Inventory and Findings 11
4.1 Summary table 11
4.2 Findings detail 12
5. Building Profiles 23
BLDG 14 — Dental / NWCTHS / Labs / Classrooms (1981) — condition score 400 23
BLDG 31 — Culinary Arts (1974) — condition score 375 23
BLDG 16 — Technology (1983) — condition score 366 23
BLDG 2 — Class Rooms (1980) — condition score 342 23
BLDG 10 — Business Occupations (1993) — condition score 278 24
BLDG 11 — Communications (1940) — condition score 265 24
BLDG 17 — Administration (1962) — condition score 222 24
BLDG 23 — Student Center (2004) — condition score 207 24
BLDG 20 — Childcare Facility (2005) — condition score 194 25
BLDG 8 — Personal Care Services (1982) — condition score 192 25
BLDG 21 — Health Sciences Facility (2013) — condition score 146 25
6. Infrastructure Systems 26
7. Master Plan Alignment 27
8. Maintenance Capacity Snapshot 28
9. Decarbonization and Clean Buildings Compliance 30
9.1 The Clean Buildings Performance Standard 30
9.2 Clover Park's covered buildings 30
9.3 Aligning capital renewal with compliance 31
10. Appendix: Building Condition Detail 33
BLDG 14 — Dental / NWCTHS / Labs / Classrooms (1981) — condition score 400 33
BLDG 31 — Culinary Arts (1974) — condition score 375 34

BLDG 16 — Technology (1983) — condition score 366 34
BLDG 2 — Class Rooms (1980) — condition score 342 35
BLDG 10 — Business Occupations (1993) — condition score 278 36
BLDG 11 — Communications (1940) — condition score 265 37
BLDG 15 — Resource Center (1977) — condition score 259 38
BLDG 19 — Administration/Classrooms (1983) — condition score 256 39
BLDG 25 — Machine Trades (1940) — condition score 252 39
BLDG 17 — Administration (1962) — condition score 222 40
BLDG 23 — Student Center (2004) — condition score 207 41
BLDG 5 — Residential Construction (1940) — condition score 206 42
BLDG 3 — Transportation Trades (2001) — condition score 198 43
BLDG 20 — Childcare Facility (2005) — condition score 194 44
BLDG 8 — Personal Care Services (1982) — condition score 192 45
Pierce Co. Airport Site — South Hill Campus (1999) — condition score 190 46
BLDG 21 — Health Sciences Facility (2013) — condition score 146 47

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report covers Clover Park Technical College for the 2025 SBCTC Facility Condition Survey cycle, which informs the college's Minor Works Preservation capital budget request for the 2027–2029 biennium. The 2025 survey identified **22 capital deficiencies; the 19 with cost estimates total $6,565,000**. Of this, **$1,771,000 across 6 projects** is included in the 2027 preservation request, and **$4,794,000 across 13 projects** is deferred to future cycles. The remaining three deficiencies are flagged for inspection or monitoring and carry no current cost estimate.

Capital Planning Headlines

1. The 2027 preservation request is HVAC-led.

Mechanical work accounts for $1,647,000 of the $1,771,000 request (93%), spread across four buildings: BLDG 8 rooftop heat pumps ($688,000), BLDG 11 air-handling units ($524,000), BLDG 10 chiller ($314,000), and BLDG 16 heat pumps ($121,000). The remaining 7% is a BLDG 23 roof-membrane replacement ($86,000) and a BLDG 21 emergency-lighting battery replacement ($38,000). This is the inverse of the typical envelope-led request: roofing is a single $86,000 project this cycle, because the larger roof deficiencies all fall below the funding threshold and sit in the deferred set. Seven mechanical replacements drive the ask, and the average deficiency score for the included projects is 86.7 — the highest-scoring group in the survey.

2. The deferred backlog is mechanical and controls — and it is dominated by a single multi-building item.

The $4,794,000 deferred backlog is $2,509,000 HVAC (52%), $995,000 exterior closure, $708,000 roofing, $281,000 electrical/lighting, $248,000 interior finishes, and $53,000 plumbing. A single deficiency — the campus-wide replacement of obsolete Siemens building controls across six buildings (D08, $2,079,000) — is 43% of the entire deferred backlog and the most consequential item in this report for mid-term planning. By building, the multi-building items (controls and water heaters) carry $2,132,000, BLDG 20 carries $963,000 (soffit and cedar siding), BLDG 10 carries $551,000 (roof), BLDG 17 carries $413,000 (fan coils and roof), and BLDG 14 carries $329,000 (boilers and ceiling grid). This backlog is 2.7× the size of the 2027 ask.

3. The portfolio held its condition between 2023 and 2025.

The GSF-weighted average condition score moved only slightly, from 229 in the 2023 survey to 234 in 2025 — a five-point change, with the portfolio remaining comfortably within the "Adequate" band. Twelve of the seventeen surveyed buildings rate Adequate or better (one, BLDG 21, rates Superior at 146); five fall in a "Needs improvement" band, led by BLDG 14 (400), BLDG 31 (375), and BLDG 16 (366). Unlike portfolios where every building slips cycle-over-cycle, Clover Park's condition profile is essentially stable, which reframes the capital task as targeted system renewal in a handful of aging buildings rather than across-the-board decline.

4. Thirteen buildings come under the Clean Buildings Performance Standard within this planning window.

Washington's Clean Buildings Performance Standard (CBPS) reaches Clover Park's mid-size and large buildings on a staggered schedule. Nine buildings reach the Tier 2 benchmarking, energy-management-plan, and operations-and-maintenance deadline of July 1, 2027; four reach the Tier 1 deadline of June 1, 2028. Clover Park enters this window from an unusual position of strength: the campus is already substantially electric — electric boilers, electric water heaters, and heat-pump HVAC predominate — so the compliance pathway is energy-use-intensity (EUI) reduction through controls modernization and lighting, not fuel switching. The deferred controls item (D08, $2,079,000) and the deferred LED-lighting conversion (D16, $281,000) are precisely the qualifying measures the standard rewards. Section 9 develops this alignment.

Headline Numbers

Metric	Value
Total buildings (inventory)	20
Total portfolio GSF	616,204
Buildings surveyed (condition rating)	17 (3 buildings not scored this cycle)
Weighted-average condition score (surveyed)	234 (Adequate)
Buildings rated below “Adequate”	5 of 17
Total 2027 preservation request	**$1,771,000 (6 projects)**
Deferred preservation backlog	$4,794,000 (13 projects)
Total deficiencies identified (2025 FCS)	22
2027 infrastructure / program / URF request	$802,000 / $698,000 / $1,254,000
Total 2027 Minor Works request	**$4,525,000**
Prior biennium funded (2025–2027, all categories)	$6,115,000
Buildings under Clean Buildings Standard (within horizon)	13 (9 Tier 2 by 2027; 4 Tier 1 by 2028)

Capital Outlook

Immediate biennium (2027–2029). An HVAC-led preservation ask of $1,771,000 across 6 projects, concentrated in mechanical-system replacement (93% of the request) plus a single roof-membrane project and an emergency-lighting battery replacement. The request is defensible on score: all six funded projects scored 80 or above in the survey, against a deferred-set average of 54.5. The full 2027–2029 Minor Works request totals $4,525,000 once the infrastructure ($802,000), program ($698,000), and URF ($1,254,000) components are included.

Mid-term (4–6 years, 2029–2033). The $4,794,000 deferred backlog — overwhelmingly mechanical, controls, and building-envelope work — defines the next ask. The campus-wide controls replacement (D08, $2,079,000) is the single largest deferred item and is already phased in the survey across two biennia (four buildings in 2027–2029, two in 2029–2031); it should anchor mid-term planning because it both clears the largest backlog item and provides the instrumentation an energy-management plan depends on. BLDG 20’s cedar-siding and soffit work ($963,000) and BLDG 10’s shingle roof ($551,000) are the next-largest concentrations.

Long-term (7–10+ years, 2033 and beyond). The college’s master plan flags BLDG 31 (Culinary Arts) and BLDG 14 (Dental/NWCTHS) for replacement on growth and undersizing grounds, and BLDG 16 (Technology) and BLDG 10 (Business Occupations) for renovation. BLDG 14 is the lowest-scored surveyed building (400) and BLDG 31 the second-lowest among the renovation-band group (375); both warrant focused condition reassessment in advance of the next cycle, and capital committed to either should be scoped against the replacement timeline rather than spent piecemeal. No building is flagged for near-term demolition.

Clean Buildings compliance. The Tier 2 (2027) and Tier 1 (2028) compliance deadlines arrive inside the mid-term window and overlap with the buildings carrying the deferred controls and lighting backlog. Because Clover Park is already substantially electric, compliance turns on reducing measured energy-use intensity

rather than removing combustion end-uses — which makes the deferred controls modernization and LED-lighting conversion the central compliance-and-renewal opportunity this cycle. This is developed in Section 9.

2. COLLEGE PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW

Clover Park Technical College operates two campuses: the Main Campus (site 290A) in Lakewood, which holds the great majority of building area, and the Pierce County Airport Site (site 290G), represented in this survey by a single instructional building (the South Hill Campus). The Main Campus combines a small number of pre-war structures from 1940 with successive waves of academic and trades buildings added across the following eight decades. The oldest buildings — BLDG 11 (Communications), BLDG 25 (Machine Trades), and BLDG 5 (Residential Construction), all dating to 1940 — remain in Adequate condition despite their age, while the portfolio's newest and largest buildings, BLDG 21 (Health Sciences, 2013) and BLDG 24 (Center of Advanced Manufacturing, 2019), anchor the strong end of the distribution. The weakest conditions are concentrated not in the oldest stock but in a mid-period cohort — BLDG 14 (Dental, 1981), BLDG 31 (Culinary Arts, 1974), and BLDG 16 (Technology, 1983) — whose program-specific mechanical and finish systems have aged faster than the buildings around them.

Building Inventory

Building	Primary Use	Campus	GSF	Built	Score	Rating
BLDG 21	Health Sciences Facility	Main	56,648	2013	146	Superior
Pierce Co. Airport Site	South Hill Campus	Airport	59,833	1999	190	Adequate
BLDG 8	Personal Care Services	Main	30,083	1982	192	Adequate
BLDG 20	Childcare Facility	Main	12,128	2005	194	Adequate
BLDG 3	Transportation Trades	Main	80,509	2001	198	Adequate
BLDG 5	Residential Construction	Main	15,087	1940	206	Adequate
BLDG 23	Student Center	Main	47,988	2004	207	Adequate
BLDG 17	Administration	Main	30,203	1962	222	Adequate
BLDG 25	Machine Trades	Main	38,871	1940	252	Adequate
BLDG 19	Administration/Classrooms	Main	33,458	1983	256	Adequate
BLDG 15	Resource Center	Main	20,675	1977	259	Adequate
BLDG 11	Communications	Main	28,551	1940	265	Adequate
BLDG 10	Business Occupations	Main	19,175	1993	278	Needs improvement — maintenance
BLDG 2	Class Rooms	Main	9,190	1980	342	Needs improvement — maintenance
BLDG 16	Technology	Main	35,546	1983	366	Needs improvement — renovation
BLDG 31	Culinary Arts	Main	5,966	1974	375	Needs improvement — renovation

Building	Primary Use	Campus	GSF	Built	Score	Rating
BLDG 14	Dental / NWCTHS / Labs / Classrooms	Main	23,662	1981	400	Needs improvement — renovation
BLDG 12	Portable	Main	1,481	1977	—	Not surveyed
BLDG 24	Center of Advanced Manufacturing	Main	65,293	2019	—	Not surveyed
BLDG 6	Roofers Apprenticeship	Main	1,857	1974	—	Not surveyed

Score = 2025 canonical building condition score (BCS), drawn from the CONDITION worksheet of the FCS workbook (lower is better). Rating bands follow the SBCTC scale shown in Section 4.1. "Not surveyed" buildings are BLDG 6 (Roofers Apprenticeship, 1,857 GSF), BLDG 12 (Portable/Storage, 1,481 GSF), and BLDG 24 (Center of Advanced Manufacturing, 65,293 GSF, completed 2019 and too new to require a condition rating this cycle).

Age Profile

The portfolio spans almost eighty years of construction, from a 1940 pre-war core to a 2019 advanced-manufacturing building. The 1940 cohort (BLDG 11, BLDG 25, BLDG 5) is low- to mid-GSF and old, yet all three hold Adequate ratings — a reflection of sustained reinvestment in the trades buildings rather than original condition. The mid-period academic and program buildings are the most consequential aging cohort for capital planning: BLDG 14 (1981, Dental) is the lowest-scored surveyed building at 400, BLDG 31 (1974, Culinary Arts) scores 375, and BLDG 16 (1983, Technology) scores 366 — all three in the renovation band, and the first two flagged in the master plan for replacement. The modern anchors (BLDG 21, 2013, scoring 146 Superior; BLDG 24, 2019, not yet scored) hold the best conditions, but BLDG 21 already carries four deficiencies this cycle despite its strong overall score — a reminder that even a young building accumulates discrete system-renewal needs (failed emergency batteries, variable-frequency drives, a return fan) once original equipment begins to fail. The large early-2000s buildings — BLDG 3 (2001, Transportation Trades, 80,509 GSF) and BLDG 23 (2004, Student Center, 47,988 GSF) — sit mid-distribution and carry envelope and lighting work in the deferred set.

3. CAPITAL PLANNING ROADMAP

3.1 Immediate biennium (2027–2029 request)

The 2027 preservation ask of $1,771,000 (6 projects) is concentrated in mechanical-system replacement. HVAC is $1,647,000 — 93% of the request — across four buildings: BLDG 8 rooftop heat pumps ($688,000), BLDG 11 air-handling units ($524,000, the first one-third of a 38-unit phased replacement), BLDG 10 chiller ($314,000), and BLDG 16 heat pumps ($121,000, replacing six 2002 R-22 units). The non-mechanical balance is a BLDG 23 TPO roof-membrane replacement ($86,000) and a BLDG 21 emergency-lighting battery replacement ($38,000). The average deficiency score for included projects is 86.7 — every funded project scored 80 or higher, well clear of the 54.5 average for the deferred set. Beyond preservation, the full 2027–2029 Minor Works request adds $802,000 of infrastructure (three projects, detailed in Section 6), $698,000 of program work, and $1,254,000 of Urgent Repair Fund (URF) capacity, for a Minor Works total of $4,525,000.

3.2 Mid-term (next biennium plus one, 2029–2033)

The $4,794,000 deferred backlog across 13 projects defines the mid-term ask, and it is dominated by a single item. By system, deferred HVAC leads at $2,509,000, followed by exterior closure at $995,000, roofing at $708,000, electrical/lighting at $281,000, interior finishes at $248,000, and plumbing at $53,000. By building, the multi-building items carry $2,132,000, BLDG 20 carries $963,000, BLDG 10 $551,000, BLDG 17 $413,000, BLDG 14 $329,000, BLDG 23 $281,000, and BLDG 21 $125,000. The defining feature of the backlog is the campus-wide controls-replacement item: D08, the replacement of obsolete Siemens building controls across BLDG 8, BLDG 17 (north), BLDG 19, BLDG 20, BLDG 23, and BLDG 25, at $2,079,000 — 43% of the entire deferred total. The survey already phases this item across two biennia (four buildings in 2027–2029, the remaining two in 2029–2031). The mid-term ask is fundamentally a controls-and-mechanical renewal program with a secondary envelope component (BLDG 20 cedar siding $850,000, BLDG 10 shingle roof $551,000).

3.3 Long-term (7–10+ years, 2033 and beyond)

Two long-horizon decisions warrant attention now even though the buildings involved carry only modest deficiencies in the 2025 list. First, the master plan flags BLDG 31 (Culinary Arts, 1974, condition 375) and BLDG 14 (Dental/NWCTHS, 1981, condition 400) for replacement, both on growth-and-undersizing grounds with an explicit energy-efficiency note. BLDG 14 is the lowest-scored surveyed building and carries deferred boiler ($81,000) and ceiling-grid ($248,000) work plus an excluded fire-alarm panel; BLDG 31 generated no deficiencies at all. Capital committed to either building should be scoped against the replacement timeline rather than spent on piecemeal repair — particularly the BLDG 14 boiler and ceiling-grid work, which would be stranded by a replacement. Second, the master plan flags BLDG 16 (Technology, condition 366) and BLDG 10 (Business Occupations, condition 278) for renovation — modernization and program change respectively. BLDG 16's 2027 heat-pump replacement (D02) and BLDG 10's 2027 chiller replacement (D03) are defensible interim mechanical investments, but the buildings' broader renovation scope should be planned before further major system spending.

No building is flagged for near-term demolition. The remaining renovation-band building, BLDG 2 (Class Rooms, 1980, condition 342), carries no deficiencies this cycle but sits at the threshold where component-by-component makes decisions and should receive a focused condition reassessment in the next survey.

3.4 Cross-cutting system themes

Building controls modernization.

The single largest theme this cycle is the obsolescence of the Siemens building-automation controls across six buildings (D08, $2,079,000). The existing controllers and sensors no longer communicate with newer campus control technology, limiting the college's ability to integrate with its energy-management system and modernize HVAC operation. This item is both the largest deferred deficiency and the enabling infrastructure for everything the Clean Buildings Standard requires: an energy-management plan and an operations-and-maintenance program both depend on modern digital controls to demonstrate and sustain compliance. Sequencing this replacement early — as the survey's two-biennium phasing already contemplates — is the highest-leverage move in the portfolio.

Lighting.

The BLDG 23 LED-lighting conversion (D16, $281,000) is the portfolio's clearest decarbonization-adjacent opportunity: an LED-and-controls upgrade is a qualifying energy-efficiency measure under the Clean Buildings Standard and directly lowers the energy-use intensity the standard measures. It is deferred this cycle on cost-threshold grounds but should be bundled with the controls modernization in the same building.

Roofing.

Roofing is split between the request and the backlog: the BLDG 23 TPO membrane ($86,000) is funded in 2027, while the BLDG 10 shingle roof ($551,000) and BLDG 17 north shingle roof ($157,000) are deferred. The two deferred roofs are straightforward envelope work with no regulatory exposure and can be sequenced on condition into 2029–2031.

An already-electric campus.

Clover Park is unusual among community and technical colleges in how far its building systems have already moved off fossil fuel. The deficiency record is dominated by electric boilers (BLDG 14, D10), electric water heaters (D17, serving BLDG 2, BLDG 8, and BLDG 10), heat pumps (BLDG 8 and BLDG 16), and a modular chiller (BLDG 10) — not gas-fired equipment. The practical consequence for capital planning is that the college does not face a large fuel-switching bill to meet the Clean Buildings Standard; its compliance path runs through efficiency (controls, lighting, and high-efficiency replacement at end of life) rather than electrification. This is a materially less expensive compliance posture than gas-heated peer campuses face, and Section 9 develops it in full.

4. DEFICIENCY INVENTORY AND FINDINGS

The 2025 survey recorded 22 deficiencies across the surveyed buildings. They are ranked below by deficiency score (higher is more urgent), with budget estimate as a tie-break. Six are included in the 2027 preservation request ($1,771,000), thirteen are deferred to future cycles on cost-threshold grounds ($4,794,000), and three are excluded — flagged for inspection or monitoring rather than priced. The deficiency score combines the condition-based priority scores recorded in the survey; the SBCTC rating bands that govern the building-level condition score appear beneath the summary table.

4.1 Summary table

ID	Building	Component	System	Score	Budget	Status
D01	BLDG 23	Roof	B30 Roofing	91	$86,000	Included
D02	BLDG 16	Heat pumps	D30 HVAC	90	$121,000	Included
D03	BLDG 10	Chiller	D30 HVAC	87	$314,000	Included
D04	BLDG 8	Heat pumps	D30 HVAC	86	$688,000	Included
D05	BLDG 11	Air Handling Units	D30 HVAC	86	$524,000	Included
D06	BLDG 21	Emergency backup power	D40 Fire Protection	80	$38,000	Included
D07	BLDG 17	Fan coil units	D30 HVAC	66	$256,000	Deferred
D08	Multiple	Controls	D30 HVAC	65	$2,079,000	Deferred
D09	BLDG 20	Soffit	B20 Exterior Closure	62	$113,000	Deferred
D10	BLDG 14	Boilers	D30 HVAC	58	$81,000	Deferred
D11	BLDG 10	Roof	B30 Roofing	55	$551,000	Deferred
D12	BLDG 21	Variable frequency drives	D30 HVAC	55	$76,000	Deferred
D13	BLDG 21	Return fan	D30 HVAC	55	$17,000	Deferred
D14	BLDG 17	Roof	B30 Roofing	54	$157,000	Deferred
D15	BLDG 20	Cedar siding	B20 Exterior Closure	51	$850,000	Deferred
D16	BLDG 23	Lighting	D50 Electrical	51	$281,000	Deferred
D17	Multiple	Water heaters	D20 Plumbing	51	$53,000	Deferred
D18	BLDG 14	Ceiling grid	C30 Interior Finishes	46	$248,000	Deferred
D19	BLDG 21	Sound-proofing	B20 Exterior Closure	40	$32,000	Deferred
D20	BLDG 14	Fire alarm control panel	D40 Fire Protection	25	—	Excluded
D21	BLDG 16	Fire alarm control panel	D40 Fire Protection	25	—	Excluded
D22	BLDG 24	Storefront	B20 Exterior Closure	22	—	Excluded

Included rows shaded green; excluded rows shaded grey. “Multiple” indicates a deficiency spanning more than one building (D08 controls and D17 water heaters).

SBCTC building condition rating bands

Condition score (BCS)	Rating
≤ 175	Superior
176 – 275	Adequate
276 – 350	Needs improvement — maintenance
351 – 475	Needs improvement — renovation
476 – 730	Replace / renovate

4.2 Findings detail

D01 — Roof, BLDG 23 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**91**	**Budget estimate**	$86,000
Bldg condition score	207	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	B30 Roofing	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof well	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Facility Use (50%)

Problem Description

The roof well on Building 23 (constructed 2004) is not draining properly. There is significant vegetation buildup and standing water throughout the area, indicating chronic drainage issues. The thermoplastic polyolefin (TPO) roofing membrane is heavily degraded, with exposed reinforcing fibers showing advanced deterioration. Ponding water and organic buildup have caused ongoing leaks in the area above the kitchen. The existing slope does not provide adequate drainage, and the condition poses a risk to the building's structure and interior finishes. The roof area is approximately 1300 square feet and contains eight mechanical units that must be protected or temporarily removed during re-roofing.

Repair Description

Replace the degraded TPO roof membrane and re-slope the roof well to ensure proper drainage. Coordinate work around the eight mechanical units to maintain functionality and prevent future water intrusion.

D02 — Heat pumps, BLDG 16 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**90**	**Budget estimate**	$121,000
Bldg condition score	366	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 16, constructed in 1983, contains multiple heat pumps that are nearing the end of their service life. The existing units were installed in 2002 and use R-22 refrigerant, which is no longer manufactured due to environmental regulations under the EPA's Clean Air Act. These systems show declining performance and

require frequent maintenance. The refrigerant type and system age make repair parts difficult to source and energy efficiency low compared to modern units. A phased replacement plan is recommended, beginning with six heat pumps during the upcoming biennium to maintain reliable heating and cooling service.

Repair Description

Replace six existing 2002 heat pumps using R-22 refrigerant with new high-efficiency units as part of a phased replacement plan for Building 16.

D03 — Chiller, BLDG 10 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**87**	**Budget estimate**	$314,000
Bldg condition score	278	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Mechanical yard	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 10, constructed in 1993, is served by an AirStack modular chiller system (model ASP30X2H2R1) equipped with four fans and four compressors. Since installation, the college has reported persistent operational issues, suggesting improper manufacturing or installation. The chiller uses R-410A refrigerant but has experienced repeated failures and inefficiencies that have compromised its ability to maintain consistent cooling performance. Due to ongoing reliability problems and the age of the unit, full replacement is recommended to ensure dependable service and compliance with current energy efficiency standards.

Repair Description

Replace the existing AirStack modular chiller system with a new, properly sized, high-efficiency chiller. Ensure correct installation and commissioning to restore reliable cooling for Building 10.

D04 — Heat pumps, BLDG 8 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**86**	**Budget estimate**	$688,000
Bldg condition score	192	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 8 at Clover Park Technical College was constructed in 1982. The rooftop contains four Trane heat pump units that are original to the building and have surpassed their expected service life. The unit nameplates are illegible due to weathering, and the metal housings show extensive rust and surface deterioration. These signs of corrosion, coupled with the degraded labels, indicate advanced age and declining performance. Previous facility surveys also identified similar issues with aging HVAC equipment nearing the end of its useful life, requiring high levels of maintenance. Continued operation poses reliability and efficiency concerns for the building's heating and cooling system.

Repair Description

Replace the four deteriorated rooftop heat pump units with new, energy-efficient models suitable for Building 8's existing electrical and mechanical systems.

D05 — Air Handling Units, BLDG 11 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**86**	**Budget estimate**	$524,000
Bldg condition score	265	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Attic	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 11, constructed in 1940, contains 38 air handling units (AHUs) that are near the end of their service life. The units exhibit multiple failure types, including coil and belt failures, and show widespread wear consistent with age and continuous use. Many components are corroded or leaking, and mechanical performance has degraded, leading to uneven air distribution and reduced system efficiency. Due to the number of units and their advanced deterioration, a full replacement is necessary but should be implemented as a phased project to minimize operational disruption.

Repair Description

Replace the air handling units in Building 11 through a phased plan, targeting one-third of the units per biennium until all 38 are replaced.

D06 — Emergency backup power, BLDG 21 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**80**	**Budget estimate**	$38,000
Bldg condition score	146	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D40 Fire Protection	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Mechanical	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), System Use (50%)

Problem Description

Building 21 relies on a bank of 16 backup batteries (12-volt units) to power the emergency lighting system during a utility outage. Two batteries have exploded, and the remaining units show bulging and heat damage. These conditions indicate internal failure and possible thermal runaway, which compromises required egress illumination and creates fire, off-gassing, and acid-leak hazards. The system is part of life-safety infrastructure and must provide reliable power to code-required emergency lighting for occupied spaces in this building (constructed 2013).

Repair Description

Replace all 16 failed and damaged 12-V emergency-lighting backup batteries as a full set and dispose of them properly. Test the charger/inverter, cabling, and ventilation after installation, then function-test the emergency lighting and document commissioning.

D07 — Fan coil units, BLDG 17 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	66	**Budget estimate**	$256,000
Bldg condition score	222	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Attic	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), System Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 17, constructed in 1962, contains approximately 20 fan coil units that are part of its central air handling system. These units are failing due to a known manufacturing defect. The failure is widespread, affecting performance, reliability, and temperature control throughout the building. The mechanical system consists of hot water boilers, fan coil units with refrigeration compressors, and a closed-circuit cooling tower. The equipment is in fair condition but shows notable deterioration and inconsistent operation, requiring constant maintenance to sustain air distribution and occupant comfort

Repair Description

Replace 20 fan coil units in Building 17 with new, high-efficiency models compatible with the existing air handling and hydronic systems.

D08 — Controls, Multiple (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	65	**Budget estimate**	$2,079,000
Bldg condition score	0	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), System Use (75%)

Problem Description

The Siemens building control systems in Buildings 8 (constructed 1982), 17 North (constructed 1962), 19 (constructed 1983), 20 (constructed 2005), 23 (constructed 2004), and 25 (constructed 1940) are outdated and increasingly unreliable. These systems no longer communicate effectively with newer campus control technologies, leading to inconsistent temperature control, inefficient scheduling, and higher maintenance needs. Several controllers and sensors are obsolete or unsupported, limiting the college's ability to integrate with the energy management system and modernize HVAC operations. The controls are at the end of their service life and do not meet current building automation standards.

Repair Description

Replace Siemens controls in four buildings during the 2027–2029 biennium and the remaining two buildings during the 2029–2031 biennium. Integrate new digital controls with the campus-wide energy management system.

D09 — Soffit, BLDG 20 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**62**	**Budget estimate**	$113,000
Bldg condition score	194	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	North side	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (75%)

Problem Description

The north side of Building 20 shows extensive water damage in the wood soffit. The material is saturated and rotted along nearly the entire north elevation. The metal gutters are leaking at multiple seams, allowing water to backflow onto the soffit and saturate the wood. Evidence of prolonged exposure suggests that water is bypassing the drip edge or flashing, causing deterioration of the soffit framing and paint failure. The south side remains in acceptable condition. The affected area is approximately 500 linear feet.

Repair Description

Replace the gutters, downspouts, and wood soffit along the north side of Building 20. Install continuous, sealed gutter seams and ensure proper slope and flashing to prevent future water intrusion.

D10 — Boilers, BLDG 14 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**58**	**Budget estimate**	$81,000
Bldg condition score	400	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Deferrable
Location	Mechanical	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 14 (constructed in 1977) contains two electric boilers that are likely original to the building. Both units require frequent repairs and have experienced recent contactor failures, which the college replaced to maintain basic operation. The boilers are 150-gallon capacity units and appear to be operating beyond their expected service life. Their condition suggests declining reliability and efficiency, and the college should anticipate full replacement within the next biennium.

Repair Description

Replace the two existing electric boilers with new high-efficiency electric models sized to meet current heating load requirements.

D11 — Roof, BLDG 10 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**55**	**Budget estimate**	$551,000
Bldg condition score	278	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	B30 Roofing	**Deferability**	Deferrable

Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 10, constructed in 1993, has an asphalt shingle roof that shows significant deterioration. There is heavy vegetation and moss buildup across large areas of the roof surface and within the gutters, indicating prolonged moisture retention and poor drainage. The shingles are nearing the end of their service life and exhibit curling and organic decay. The presence of extensive moss and mineral staining on the exterior wall below the main entry downspout suggests leaks and water overflow. Due to the level of biological growth and potential moisture intrusion, the roof likely cannot support an additional shingle layer. The condition of the sub-roof and underlayment should be verified during replacement to determine if rot or structural degradation has occurred.

Repair Description

Replace the asphalt shingle roof and all associated gutters and downspouts. Inspect and repair any damaged sub-roof materials caused by moisture intrusion.

D12 — Variable frequency drives, BLDG 21 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	55	**Budget estimate**	$76,000
Bldg condition score	146	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Mechanical	**Priorities**	System Use (75%), Increased Operating Cost (25%)

Problem Description

Building 21, the Health Sciences Facility (constructed 2013, 56,648 GSF), contains four variable frequency drives (VFDs) that serve the HVAC and hydronic circulation systems. Three units have failed completely, and the fourth shows a total amp reading of zero, indicating probable failure. The VFDs are original to the building and are essential for controlling fan and pump speeds to maintain air balance and energy efficiency. Their failure has compromised system reliability and efficient motor operation, leading to manual override conditions that increase wear on mechanical components. Replacement is required to restore automatic control and protect the HVAC equipment from electrical and mechanical stress

Repair Description

Replace all four failed VFDs in Building 21 with new units compatible with the existing control system. Test, calibrate, and commission all drives to restore full automated system functionality.

D13 — Return fan, BLDG 21 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	55	**Budget estimate**	$17,000
Bldg condition score	146	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate

Location	Mechanical	**Priorities**	System Use (75%), Increased Operating Cost (25%)

Problem Description

The return fan serving the air handling unit in Building 21 (constructed 2013) is nearing the end of its useful life. The fan assembly and related components show signs of wear that limit system reliability and performance. As the fan continues to degrade, it poses a risk of failure that could disrupt building ventilation and indoor air quality.

Repair Description

Replace the return fan and associated components to restore full air handling capacity and ensure reliable operation of the ventilation system.

D14 — Roof, BLDG 17 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**54**	**Budget estimate**	$157,000
Bldg condition score	222	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	B30 Roofing	**Deferability**	Deferrable
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

The north roof of Building 17, constructed in 1962, is asphalt shingles that have reached the end of their service life. The shingles show extensive deterioration and there are active roof leaks affecting the building interior. The existing roof likely lacks adequate underlayment protection, and the degraded shingles no longer provide a watertight barrier. The damage is limited to the north slope; the south roof appears functional. Moisture intrusion should be addressed promptly to prevent further damage to the roof decking and interior finishes.

Repair Description

Replace the asphalt shingles on the north roof of Building 17. Inspect the roof decking and underlayment for moisture damage and replace as needed to restore a watertight assembly.

D15 — Cedar siding, BLDG 20 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**51**	**Budget estimate**	$850,000
Bldg condition score	194	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	South elevation	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), Increased Operating Cost (75%)

Problem Description

Building 20 (constructed in 2005) has a cedar board exterior cladding system that is experiencing significant moisture intrusion. Moisture is being trapped behind the cedar siding, causing board ends to warp and pull

away from the wall batts. The south elevation shows the most severe deterioration. Repeated repainting efforts have failed to address the underlying moisture problem. Peeling paint and surface distortion indicate persistent moisture buildup beneath the finish layers. The condition suggests inadequate ventilation or flashing behind the siding, allowing trapped moisture to damage both the cladding and substrate over time. Re-cladding is required to restore envelope performance and prevent further decay

Repair Description

Replace the existing cedar siding with fiber cement (Hardie) panel cladding, prioritizing the south elevation. Include proper drainage, flashing, and ventilation details to prevent future moisture intrusion.

D16 — Lighting, BLDG 23 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**51**	**Budget estimate**	$281,000
Bldg condition score	207	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	D50 Electrical	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Event room	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Quality of Use (50%)

Problem Description

The lighting in Building 23 (constructed in 2004) event space is outdated and inconsistent. Fixtures use a mixture of compact fluorescent and T5 lamps with varying color temperatures, creating uneven illumination and poor light quality. Many fixtures exhibit dimming, flickering, and partial outages. While replacement bulbs are still available, the electronic ballasts are obsolete and no longer supported. The overall light levels in the space are inadequate for its function as an event venue, resulting in poor visibility and user dissatisfaction. A full redesign and retrofit are needed to provide uniform illumination and energy efficiency consistent with current LED standards.

Repair Description

Replace all existing T5 and compact fluorescent lighting fixtures with new LED fixtures. Redesign lighting layout to provide consistent color temperature and adequate illumination levels for event use.

D17 — Water heaters, Multiple (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**51**	**Budget estimate**	$53,000
Bldg condition score	229	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	D20 Plumbing	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), Increased Operating Cost (75%)

Problem Description

Clover Park Technical College has electric, storage-type water heaters in Buildings 2 (constructed 1980), 8 (1982), and 10 (1993) that are past their useful life. Field tags indicate approximately 120-gallon units, manufactured by Rheem, with a manufacture date of 2005; these tanks are 20 years old now and will be 22 years old at the time of funding. Typical age-related risks are present: reduced efficiency, corrosion and anode depletion, sediment accumulation, and potential failure of temperature-and-pressure relief

components. The 2023 condition survey already identified water heater replacement as a need in Building 8 (Personal Care Services), confirming the campus-wide trend of end-of-life domestic hot water equipment. Replace the oldest units first to reduce failure risk and improve energy performance.

Repair Description

Replace the electric water heaters in Buildings 2, 8, and 10 with new high-efficiency electric models sized to match existing demand (~120 gallons), including seismic anchorage, dielectric isolation, full-port isolation valves, code-compliant mixing valve set to 120°F, recirculation controls, and insulation on all accessible hot-water piping. Remove and dispose of existing units; reconnect electrical, piping, and controls, test, and commission.

D18 — Ceiling grid, BLDG 14 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**46**	**Budget estimate**	$248,000
Bldg condition score	400	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	C30 Interior Finishes	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Cooridors	**Priorities**	Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (75%), Quality of Use (25%)

Problem Description

Building 14 (constructed 1981) has extensive ceiling grid deterioration on both levels one and two. The suspended ceiling system shows widespread staining, cracks, broken and sagging grid members, and misaligned tiles. The condition is most severe in the main corridors, where the sagging and discoloration are visually distracting and detract from the building's interior appearance. Some classrooms also exhibit similar deterioration, though to a lesser extent. The existing grid system and suspension supports appear aged and may no longer provide adequate structural support for the ceiling panels.

Repair Description

Replace the deteriorated ceiling grid and tiles throughout the corridors on both levels, including all grid suspension components.

D19 — Sound-proofing, BLDG 21 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	**40**	**Budget estimate**	$32,000
Bldg condition score	146	**Status**	Deferred — below threshold
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Mechanical well	**Priorities**	System Use (50%), Quality of Use (50%)

Problem Description

The soundproofing material within the mechanical well of Building 21 (constructed in 2013) has deteriorated. Large sections of the acoustic insulation are separating from the enclosure walls, with fragments breaking loose and being drawn into the nearby mechanical equipment. This creates maintenance and safety concerns, including potential damage to fans, coils, and motors. The mechanical

well is approximately 600 square feet with 10-foot-high walls, and the failing insulation compromises both sound attenuation and mechanical system reliability.

Repair Description

Replace all deteriorated soundproofing material throughout the mechanical well with new high-density acoustic panels securely fastened to the enclosure walls.

D20 — Fire alarm control panel, BLDG 14 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	25	**Budget estimate**	—
Bldg condition score	400	**Status**	Excluded — monitor / re-inspect
System	D40 Fire Protection	**Deferability**	Future
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), System Use (50%)

Problem Description

The fire alarm control panel in Building 14 (constructed in 1981) experiences frequent nuisance tripping. This recurring malfunction has been noted during annual fire inspections and poses reliability and safety concerns for both buildings. The system's age and repeated faults suggest that key panel components or field devices are failing. Continued false alarms may cause occupant complacency and interfere with response readiness. If additional issues arise before the next scheduled inspection in December 2025, the system should be prioritized for corrective action; otherwise, replacement can be deferred to the next biennium.

Repair Description

Repair or replace the malfunctioning fire alarm panel and associated devices in Building 14 to restore full system reliability and code compliance.

D21 — Fire alarm control panel, BLDG 16 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	25	**Budget estimate**	—
Bldg condition score	366	**Status**	Excluded — monitor / re-inspect
System	D40 Fire Protection	**Deferability**	Future
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), System Use (50%)

Problem Description

The fire alarm panel in Building 16 (constructed 1983) is original to the building and has been identified as a concern by the local fire department. The system experiences intermittent issues and has been flagged for review during the next scheduled inspection in December 2025. The panel's age raises reliability and code-compliance concerns, as components may no longer meet current fire safety standards or manufacturer support requirements. If the fire marshal identifies additional deficiencies, the system may need to be upgraded sooner.

Repair Description

Replace the original fire alarm panel with a new code-compliant system that integrates with campus fire safety infrastructure.

D22 — Storefront, BLDG 24 (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	22	**Budget estimate**	—
Bldg condition score	0	**Status**	Excluded — monitor / re-inspect
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Deferrable
Location	South entrance	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), Quality of Use (75%)

Problem Description

Building 24, constructed in 2019, features a modern aluminum storefront glazing system at the south entrance. The insulated glazing units in this area show visible fogging between panes, indicating seal failure and loss of insulating gas. While the issue is limited in scope, it suggests early degradation of the window seals or minor thermal bridging issues that may worsen over time. The affected glazing should be monitored for spreading condensation, glass staining, or changes in visibility that could affect the thermal performance or appearance of the entry façade.

Repair Description

Monitor fogging in the south entrance glazing for progression. Reassess and, if seal failure worsens, replace affected insulated glass units at the next facility assessment cycle in two years.

5. BUILDING PROFILES

The eleven buildings below are those carrying capital deficiencies this cycle or flagged in the master plan, ordered from weakest to strongest condition score. Each profile pairs the building's 2025 condition score with its deficiency activity and its weakest-rated components from the survey. Six surveyed buildings carry no deficiencies and no master-plan flag — BLDG 15, BLDG 19, BLDG 25, BLDG 3, BLDG 5, and the Pierce County Airport Site — and are documented in the Appendix condition tables rather than profiled here.

BLDG 14 — Dental / NWCTHS / Labs / Classrooms (1981) — condition score 400

BLDG 14 is the lowest-scored surveyed building in the portfolio. The 1981 structure houses dental and Northwest Career & Technical High School programs, and its weakest-rated components are roofing, ceiling finishes, and life-safety systems. It carries deferred electric-boiler replacement (D10, $81,000) and a deferred suspended-ceiling-grid replacement (D18, $248,000), plus an excluded fire-alarm-control-panel deficiency (D20) that is flagged for corrective action pending inspection rather than priced.

The master plan flags BLDG 14 for replacement on growth and undersizing grounds, with an explicit note that the building is not energy efficient. The deferred boiler and ceiling-grid work should therefore be evaluated against the replacement timeline rather than funded as standalone repairs, since either could be stranded by a replacement decision.

BLDG 31 — Culinary Arts (1974) — condition score 375

BLDG 31 is a small (5,966 GSF) 1974 culinary-arts building scoring in the renovation band, with its lowest component ratings in life-safety, fire-safety, and remaining-useful-life. Notably, it generated no capital deficiencies in the 2025 survey — its low score reflects accumulated age and remaining-life factors across components rather than a specific failed system.

The master plan flags BLDG 31 for replacement, citing undersizing relative to program needs and poor energy efficiency. Because no deficiencies were identified, no preservation funds are committed to the building this cycle — an appropriate posture for a replacement candidate — but its renovation-band score warrants a focused condition reassessment in the next cycle to confirm the replacement timeline.

BLDG 16 — Technology (1983) — condition score 366

BLDG 16 is a 1983 technology building scoring in the renovation band, with weakest ratings in life-safety, fire-safety, and exterior closure. It carries a funded 2027 heat-pump replacement (D02, $121,000) — replacing six 2002 units still charged with R-22 refrigerant with new high-efficiency equipment — and an excluded fire-alarm-panel deficiency (D21) flagged by the local fire department for review.

The master plan flags BLDG 16 for renovation to modernize its instructional infrastructure. The 2027 heat-pump replacement is a defensible interim mechanical investment, but the building's broader modernization scope should be planned before further major system spending, and the fire-alarm panel resolved as part of that effort.

BLDG 2 — Class Rooms (1980) — condition score 342

BLDG 2 is a small (9,190 GSF) 1980 classroom building in the "needs improvement — maintenance" band, with weakest ratings in fire-safety, structure, and plumbing. It carries no standalone deficiency, but it is one

of three buildings sharing the deferred electric-water-heater replacement (D17, $53,000 across BLDG 2, BLDG 8, and BLDG 10).

With no individual deficiency and no master-plan flag, BLDG 2 requires no dedicated capital this cycle beyond its share of the multi-building water-heater item, though its score places it at the threshold for closer monitoring in the next survey.

BLDG 10 — Business Occupations (1993) — condition score 278

BLDG 10 is a 1993 business-occupations building at the boundary of the Adequate and maintenance bands, with weakest ratings in fire-safety, roofing, and HVAC. It carries a funded 2027 chiller replacement (D03, $314,000) — replacing an undersized AirStack modular chiller with a properly sized high-efficiency unit — and a deferred shingle-roof replacement (D11, $551,000), the single largest deferred roofing item in the portfolio. It also shares the deferred water-heater item (D17).

The master plan flags BLDG 10 for renovation associated with a new program in the building. The 2027 chiller replacement addresses an immediate mechanical need; the deferred roof and the planned program change should be coordinated so the envelope work is timed to the renovation rather than executed separately.

BLDG 11 — Communications (1940) — condition score 265

BLDG 11 is one of the three 1940 buildings, housing communications programs and rating Adequate despite its age — a testament to sustained reinvestment. Its weakest components are fire-safety, HVAC, and roofing. It carries the funded 2027 air-handling-unit replacement (D05, $524,000), structured as the first one-third of a phased replacement of 38 units across three biennia.

The phased AHU approach is a prudent way to manage a large mechanical-renewal need without a single outsized capital event; the 2027 tranche should establish the unit specification and sequencing for the two follow-on biennia.

BLDG 17 — Administration (1962) — condition score 222

BLDG 17 is a 1962 administration building rating Adequate, with weakest ratings in roofing, fire-safety, and appearance. It carries two deferred deficiencies — fan-coil-unit replacement (D07, $256,000) and a north-side shingle-roof replacement (D14, $157,000) — totaling $413,000. Its north wing is also one of the six buildings in the campus-wide Siemens controls-replacement item (D08).

Both deferred items are below the 2027 threshold but are straightforward renewal work; the fan-coil replacement should be coordinated with the building's controls modernization under D08 so the mechanical and control upgrades are commissioned together.

BLDG 23 — Student Center (2004) — condition score 207

BLDG 23 is the 2004 student center, rating Adequate, with weakest ratings in roofing, HVAC, and insulation. It carries the funded 2027 TPO roof-membrane replacement (D01, $86,000) — the highest-scoring deficiency in the survey at 91 — addressing a roof well that does not drain properly, and a deferred LED-lighting conversion (D16, $281,000). It is also one of the six buildings in the campus-wide controls item (D08).

The deferred LED conversion is the portfolio's clearest energy-use-intensity reduction opportunity and should be bundled with the building's controls modernization under D08; together they position the building well for

its Clean Buildings Tier 2 obligation. (The 2027 budget summary lists this building's condition as 208; the canonical worksheet value of 207 is used here.)

BLDG 20 — Childcare Facility (2005) — condition score 194

BLDG 20 is the 2005 childcare facility, rating Adequate on score but carrying the second-largest deferred concentration in the portfolio at $963,000. Its weakest components are exterior closure, roofing, and floor finishes. The deferred work is a cedar-siding replacement converting to fiber-cement (D15, $850,000) and a soffit repair (D09, $113,000); the building is also in the campus-wide controls item (D08).

The cedar-siding replacement is by far the largest single envelope deficiency in the deferred set and the main reason this otherwise sound building carries so much backlog. It is straightforward exterior work with no regulatory exposure and can be sequenced on condition into a future biennium.

BLDG 8 — Personal Care Services (1982) — condition score 192

BLDG 8 is a 1982 personal-care-services building rating Adequate, with weakest ratings in roofing, glazing, and ceiling finishes. It carries the largest single funded mechanical project in the 2027 request — replacement of four deteriorated rooftop heat-pump units original to the 1982 building (D04, $688,000). It also participates in both the campus-wide controls item (D08) and the multi-building water-heater item (D17).

The 2027 heat-pump replacement addresses end-of-life equipment that has reached forty-plus years of service. Coordinating it with the building's controls modernization under D08 would allow the new units and the new digital controls to be commissioned as a single integrated system.

BLDG 21 — Health Sciences Facility (2013) — condition score 146

BLDG 21 is the 2013 health-sciences building and the only Superior-rated building in the portfolio (146), as well as one of its largest at 56,648 GSF. Its weakest components — roofing, life-safety, and fire-safety — are all in good condition relative to the rest of the portfolio. Despite its strong overall score, it carries four deficiencies: a funded emergency-lighting battery replacement (D06, $38,000) and three deferred items — variable-frequency-drive replacement (D12, $76,000), a return-fan replacement (D13, $17,000), and sound-proofing work (D19, $32,000).

BLDG 21 illustrates that a strong condition score does not eliminate discrete system-renewal needs: a young, well-rated building still accumulates specific equipment failures as original components reach the end of their service life. The funded battery replacement restores emergency-lighting reliability; the three deferred items are minor and can be sequenced together in a future cycle.

6. INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS

Infrastructure and site-system work is funded separately from building-preservation deficiencies but draws on the same Minor Works capital pool. This section records what the college secured in the prior (2025–2027) biennium across all Minor Works categories and the three infrastructure projects in the 2027–2029 request.

Prior biennium funded — 2025–2027 (all categories)

Clover Park secured $6,115,000 in Minor Works funding for the 2025–2027 biennium across five categories. Infrastructure was the largest at $2,490,000 — dominated by a $1,539,000 potable-water-line replacement, plus primary switchgear ($258,000), two cooling-tower projects ($324,000 combined), a pump station ($77,000), a three-phase transformer ($267,000), and a potable-water meter ($25,000). Facility work totaled $1,322,000, program work $1,295,000 (led by a $1,150,000 Business Occupations project), URF $629,000, and roofing $379,000 (a Personal Care Services roof).

Minor Works category	Funded 2025–2027
Infrastructure	$2,490,000
Facility	$1,322,000
Program	$1,295,000
URF	$629,000
Roof	$379,000
Total	**$6,115,000**

2027–2029 infrastructure request

The 2027 request includes three infrastructure projects totaling $802,000. The dominant item is a communication-line replacement ($763,000) running the East-site perimeter into the central communications room; the other two are a primary-switchgear asset ($24,000) and a vault ($15,000).

System	Component	Asset #	Budget estimate
Electrical	Primary switchgear	1287	$24,000
Communication	Communication Line	1380	$763,000
Communication	Vault	1381	$15,000
Total — 3 projects			**$802,000**

On the radar for 2029–2031

The prior biennium's heavy infrastructure investment — particularly the potable-water-line and cooling-tower work — suggests the campus is mid-way through a sustained utility-renewal program. The deferred building-preservation backlog (Section 4) does not include site-utility items, so the principal 2029–2031 infrastructure questions are the continuation of the communication-line and electrical-distribution upgrades begun this cycle and any follow-on water-system work. These should be confirmed against the college's facilities-condition and utility-master-planning records in the next cycle.

7. MASTER PLAN ALIGNMENT

Clover Park's Main Campus master plan is moderately current — a full plan dated 2014 with a 2019 update — and the college has just added a new Eastside Tacoma site with a 2025 plan, signaling active growth planning. The Pierce County Airport Site plan is older (full 2005, no update), but the single building surveyed there generated no deficiencies. The pre-survey reported the following capital priorities.

Master planning currency

Campus / site	Full plan	Last update
Main Campus (290A)	2014	2019
Pierce Co. Airport Site (290G)	2005	N/A
Eastside Tacoma	2025	2025

Reported capital priorities

Action	Building	Name (FPMT)	Driver
Renovation	**BLDG 16**	Technology (290-16)	Modernize — improve instructional infrastructure
Renovation	**BLDG 10**	Business Occupations (290-10)	Change — new program(s) in building
Replacement	**BLDG 31**	Culinary Arts (290-31)	Growth — undersized to meet needs; not energy efficient
Replacement	**BLDG 14**	Dental / NWCTHS / Labs / Classrooms (290-14)	Growth — undersized to meet needs; not energy efficient
Demolition	—	None	None identified

The 2027 capital-repair recommendations are broadly consistent with these priorities. The two buildings flagged for renovation both receive targeted 2027 mechanical investment that keeps them serviceable through an eventual modernization: BLDG 16 (Technology, flagged to modernize) receives its heat-pump replacement (D02, $121,000), and BLDG 10 (Business Occupations, flagged for program change) receives its chiller replacement (D03, $314,000). Neither building receives envelope or finish funding that a renovation would supersede — the deferred BLDG 10 roof (D11, $551,000) is appropriately held for coordination with the planned program change rather than funded now.

The two replacement candidates are handled with appropriate restraint. BLDG 31 (Culinary Arts) generated no deficiencies and receives no funding. BLDG 14 (Dental/NWCTHS) carries only deferred boiler and ceiling-grid work and an excluded fire-alarm item — no preservation funds are committed to it this cycle, which is the correct posture for a building the master plan identifies for replacement on growth and energy-efficiency grounds. No building is flagged for demolition, so no capital is at risk of being spent on a building slated for removal.

Two alignment items to track for the 2029 cycle. First, the replacement timelines for BLDG 31 and BLDG 14 should be confirmed and scoped, including the program-space and energy-efficiency objectives the master plan cites, so that deferred repairs in BLDG 14 are not funded into a building that may be replaced. Second, the new Eastside Tacoma site (2025 plan) will introduce its own capital and condition-survey obligations in future cycles and should be integrated into the college's facilities-condition reporting going forward.

8. MAINTENANCE CAPACITY SNAPSHOT

The in-house staffing roster below is from the 2025 pre-survey input document. Contract-maintenance and materials figures were not refreshed and are carried forward from the 2023 FCS cycle as noted. All ratios use the surveyed building area (547,573 GSF), consistent with the prior cycle's methodology.

In-house maintenance staffing (2025 pre-survey)

Position	Hours / week	Annual cost
Utility Worker 1	40	$53,682
Utility Worker 1	40	$53,682
Maintenance Mechanic 2	40	$82,225
Maintenance Mechanic 3	40	$84,498
Maintenance Mechanic 4	40	$94,208
Maintenance Mechanic 4	40	$94,208
Total — 6 FTE	**240**	**$462,503**

Derived metrics

Metric	Clover Park	State average
In-house maintenance FTE	6	—
Contract maintenance FTE (carried from 2023)	0.5	—
Combined FTE	6.5	—
GSF per maintenance FTE	84,242	74,279
Total maintenance spend	$633,503	—
Maintenance cost per GSF	$1.16	$1.48
APPA self-rating (5-level scale)	Managed Care (3 of 5)	—

Clover Park's maintenance organization runs lean and low-cost: it covers 84,242 GSF per FTE against a state average of 74,279 (about 13% more area per person), and spends $1.16 per GSF against a state average of $1.48 (about 22% below average). The notable development this cycle is that in-house staffing grew from 4.0 FTE in 2023 to 6.0 FTE in 2025 — a deliberate investment that pulled the GSF-per-FTE ratio down from a very stretched 122,241 in 2023 toward the state norm, while raising cost per GSF from $0.89 toward the $1.48 average. In other words, the college has been actively closing a maintenance-capacity gap rather than letting it widen.

The college's APPA self-rating of "Managed Care (Level 3 of 5)" places it in the middle of the APPA service-level scale — adequate, reactive maintenance that keeps systems running but leaves limited margin for preventive work. The composition of the deferred capital backlog — overwhelmingly HVAC and controls, much of it end-of-life — is consistent with a program that is keeping aging equipment running rather than getting ahead of it. Even with the recent staffing increase, absorbing the new benchmarking, energy-management-plan, and operations-and-maintenance obligations that the Clean Buildings Standard imposes from 2027 (Section 9) will likely require either further staffing, contract support, or the very controls-modernization investment (D08) that would let a smaller team manage the portfolio more efficiently.

Capital reinvestment context

Industry guidance (APPA and NACUBO) places an appropriate annual capital-reinvestment rate at roughly 2–4% of current replacement value (CRV) for a stable facilities portfolio. Clover Park's combined identified preservation need this cycle — $6,565,000 of priced deficiencies, plus the infrastructure, program, and URF components of the request — would normally be assessed against portfolio CRV to judge whether reinvestment is keeping pace with deterioration.

9. DECARBONIZATION AND CLEAN BUILDINGS COMPLIANCE

Washington's Clean Buildings Performance Standard (CBPS), administered by the Department of Commerce under RCW 19.27A, is now a binding constraint on how Clover Park's larger buildings are operated and re-equipped. For a technical college the standard is not an abstract sustainability goal — it is a compliance deadline attached to specific buildings, backed by penalties, and overlapping the controls and lighting work already sitting in this report's deferred backlog. This section maps which Clover Park buildings are covered, when each must comply, and how the 2027–2029 capital request can be sequenced so that required repairs and required decarbonization are funded as one coordinated effort. Clover Park enters this from an advantaged position: because its building systems are already substantially electric, its compliance path runs through energy-efficiency rather than the costly fuel-switching that gas-heated campuses face.

9.1 The Clean Buildings Performance Standard

The standard applies in two tiers based on a building's gross floor area. Tier 1 covers nonresidential buildings of 50,000 GSF and larger and imposes a measured energy-use-intensity (EUI) target along with benchmarking, an energy-management plan, and an operations-and-maintenance program. Tier 2 covers buildings between 20,001 and 50,000 GSF and, in its first compliance phase, requires benchmarking, an energy-management plan, and an operations-and-maintenance program — an enforceable EUI target for Tier 2 buildings is expected later in the rollout. Compliance dates are staggered by building size:

Tier	Building size (GSF)	First-phase obligation	Compliance date
Tier 1	90,001 – 220,000	EUI target + benchmarking + EMP + O&M	June 1, 2027
Tier 1	**50,001 – 90,000**	**EUI target + benchmarking + EMP + O&M**	**June 1, 2028**
Tier 2	**20,001 – 50,000**	**Benchmarking + EMP + O&M (EUI target later)**	**July 1, 2027**

The two compliance dates that fall on Clover Park are highlighted: July 1, 2027 for the college's nine Tier 2 buildings and June 1, 2028 for its four Tier 1 buildings (all of which fall in the 50,001–90,000 GSF band). Non-compliance penalties run up to $5,000 plus $1.50 per square foot of floor area, assessed annually until the building conforms. Commerce has also offered early-adopter incentive payments — on the order of $0.85 per square foot for Tier 1 and $0.30 per square foot for Tier 2 buildings that demonstrate early compliance — which can partially offset the cost of qualifying upgrades.

9.2 Clover Park's covered buildings

Thirteen of Clover Park's buildings exceed the 20,000 GSF coverage floor — four Tier 1 (June 1, 2028) and nine Tier 2 (July 1, 2027), totaling 551,320 GSF. The remaining seven inventory buildings are each below 20,000 GSF and are not currently covered. The table pairs each covered building with the building-specific deferred backlog identified for it in Section 4.

Building	Tier	Compliance date	GSF	Score	Deferred backlog
BLDG 3	Tier 1	June 1, 2028	80,509	198	none
BLDG 24	Tier 1	June 1, 2028	65,293	—	none

Building	Tier	Compliance date	GSF	Score	Deferred backlog
Pierce Co. Airport Site	Tier 1	June 1, 2028	59,833	190	none
BLDG 21	Tier 1	June 1, 2028	56,648	146	$125,000
BLDG 23	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	47,988	207	$281,000
BLDG 25	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	38,871	252	none
BLDG 16	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	35,546	366	none
BLDG 19	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	33,458	256	none
BLDG 17	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	30,203	222	$413,000
BLDG 8	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	30,083	192	none
BLDG 11	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	28,551	265	none
BLDG 14	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	23,662	400	$329,000
BLDG 15	Tier 2	July 1, 2027	20,675	259	none

Tier 2 buildings face the earlier deadline (July 1, 2027), but their first-phase obligation — benchmarking, an energy-management plan, and an operations-and-maintenance program — is administrative rather than capital-intensive. The Tier 1 buildings have one more year (June 1, 2028) but must hit a measured EUI target, where physical upgrades become the binding requirement. The building-specific deferred figures shown total $1,148,000; in addition, the campus-wide Siemens controls item (D08, $2,079,000) lands almost entirely within these covered buildings — five of its six buildings (BLDG 8, 17, 19, 23, 25) are covered — and the BLDG 23 LED-lighting conversion (D16, $281,000) is itself the deferred figure shown for that building. Taken together, the great majority of the deferred backlog sits inside the covered set.

9.3 Aligning capital renewal with compliance

The central planning observation of this report is that Clover Park's deferred backlog and its Clean Buildings obligations are largely the same scope of work seen from two directions — and that, because the campus is already electric, that work is efficiency work rather than fuel-switching. The deferred controls, lighting, and mechanical items are precisely the levers an energy-management plan would pull to meet an EUI target.

Why an already-electric campus is well-positioned

The deficiency record is dominated by electric equipment: electric boilers (BLDG 14, D10), electric water heaters serving three buildings (D17), rooftop heat pumps (BLDG 8 and BLDG 16, D02 and D04), and a modular chiller (BLDG 10, D03). There are essentially no gas-fired end-uses in the deferred list to remove. For a gas-heated campus, Clean Buildings compliance typically forces an expensive electrification program — replacing combustion heating and hot-water systems with heat pumps. Clover Park has largely already made that transition, so its compliance cost is confined to efficiency measures: modernizing controls, converting lighting to LED, and specifying high-efficiency electric equipment at the point of replacement. This is a materially cheaper compliance posture, and it means the college's existing deferred backlog, if specified correctly, doubles as its compliance program.

Two deferred items carry most of the compliance value

Building controls modernization (D08, $2,079,000). Replacing the obsolete Siemens controls across six buildings is both the largest deferred deficiency and the single most important compliance enabler in the portfolio. Modern digital controls are the instrumentation an energy-management plan depends on to measure, demonstrate, and sustain an EUI target; without them, the Tier 1 buildings cannot readily prove compliance and the Tier 2 buildings cannot operate the energy-management plans they owe by July 1, 2027.

Five of the six buildings in this item are covered. Sequencing it early — as the survey's two-biennium phasing already contemplates — is the highest-leverage compliance move available.

LED lighting conversion (D16, $281,000). The BLDG 23 lighting conversion is the lowest-cost, highest-certainty EUI reduction in the portfolio. LED conversion with modern controls is a qualifying energy-efficiency measure under the standard and is typically the first measure an energy-management plan identifies. BLDG 23 is a Tier 2 building due in 2027, so this item directly serves a near-term deadline.

High-efficiency at the point of replacement

The funded 2027 mechanical projects — BLDG 8 heat pumps, BLDG 11 air-handling units, BLDG 10 chiller, BLDG 16 heat pumps — are already specified as high-efficiency electric replacements, which means the 2027 request itself advances EUI reduction in four covered buildings. The planning implication for the deferred set is the same: as the deferred mechanical items (fan coils, boilers, VFDs) reach replacement, specifying them as high-efficiency rather than like-for-like converts spending the college must make anyway into Clean Buildings progress and positions the covered buildings to capture the early-adopter incentive (roughly $0.85 per square foot Tier 1, $0.30 per square foot Tier 2) rather than exposure to the up-to-$5,000-plus-$1.50-per-square-foot penalty.

Recommendation

Before the 2027–2029 request is finalized, the college should obtain a Clover Park-specific Clean Buildings determination that (1) confirms each covered building's tier and current benchmarking status in the Clean Buildings Portal, (2) confirms whether the college complies on the building-level Tier 1 / Tier 2 pathway rather than as a district energy system, and (3) initiates the benchmarking and energy-management-plan work the nine Tier 2 buildings owe by July 1, 2027. With that determination in hand, the deferred controls, lighting, and mechanical scope in Section 4 can be re-specified as qualifying upgrades and folded into the capital request as coordinated compliance-and-renewal projects.

10. APPENDIX: BUILDING CONDITION DETAIL

The 20-component condition-score breakdown for each of the seventeen surveyed buildings, ordered from worst to best overall score. Each table is reference data for drilling into a building's score; there is no narrative. The Weighted Score column reflects SBCTC's adjusted component weighting, so an individual row's weighted score may not equal a simple rating × weight product, while the column total equals the building's canonical condition score.

BLDG 14 — Dental / NWCTHS / Labs / Classrooms (1981) — condition score 400

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	2	8	16	Concrete frame & stair towers; metal stud exterior wall framing
Exterior Closure	2	8	16	EIFS-random cracks
Roofing	3	10	30	Single-ply PVC membrane-1998; skylights
Floor Finishes	3	6	18	Vinyl tile-surface wear; sheet vinyl; carpet; concrete; ceramic tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	12	CMU; gypsum board; concrete
Ceiling Finishes	5	6	30	Lay-in tiles-random water damage
Doors & Hardware	3	6	18	Interior p-lam doors w HM frames and sidelites; exterior HM doors/frames-surface wear
Elevators	3	6	18	2 stop
Plumbing	2	8	16	Copper, cast iron, steel and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1600amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	3	8	24	Lay-in, ceiling-mount, recessed can and wall mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	3	10	30	
Fire Safety	3	10	30	
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to present
Maintenance	3	7	21	
Remaining Life	4	6	24	
Appearance	3	6	18	Exterior is very utilitarian
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	5	6	30	
HVAC	2	8	16	2 HW boilers; AHUs; closed loop heat pump system-new in 2011
Total weighted score			**400**	*Needs improvement — renovation*

BLDG 31 — Culinary Arts (1974) — condition score 375

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	8	CMU walls; wood columns & glu-lam beam roof structure
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	CMU, metal fascia 2017
Roofing	1	10	10	Built-up, metal roof 2017
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Carpet; quarry tile; sheet vinyl; vinyl tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	13	CMU and gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	13	Exposed glu-lam beams, lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	2	6	12	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Galvanized, copper, cast iron and steel piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	3	8	25	1200amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	3	8	25	Lay-in and surface mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	3	10	31	
Fire Safety	3	10	31	
Modifications	3	7	22	Interior remodel in 2004; average construction
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Building is of average construction, but totally too small and inadequate for program
Appearance	3	6	19	Exterior is very utilitarian
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
HVAC	2	8	17	Packaged rooftop HVAC unit-2009; deteriorated make-up air unit 2015
Total weighted score			**375**	*Needs improvement — renovation*

BLDG 16 — Technology (1983) — condition score 366

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	8	Concrete structure w finish coat
Exterior Closure	3	8	24	Metal stud wall framing w EIFS-random cracks
Roofing	2	10	20	Single ply hypalon-2002; standing seam metal roof

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Floor Finishes	4	6	24	Vinyl tile-lots of wear and cracks throughout; carpet; ceramic tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	12	Fluted CMU; gypsum board; concrete; wood paneling; ceramic tile; wood strips
Ceiling Finishes	4	6	24	Lay-in tiles-water staining; concrete structure; gypsum board
Doors & Hardware	3	6	18	Interior p-lam doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	3	6	18	2 stop
Plumbing	3	8	24	Copper, cast iron and some galvanized piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	2000amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in parabolic and ceiling mount fluorescent lights; pendant HID
Life/Safety	3	10	30	
Fire Safety	3	10	30	
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to present
Maintenance	3	7	21	
Remaining Life	2	6	12	
Appearance	3	6	18	Building exterior is very utilitarian
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	3	6	18	
HVAC	3	8	24	Packaged rooftop heat pumps w electric strip heaters-2002
Total weighted score			**366**	*Needs improvement — renovation*

BLDG 2 — Class Rooms (1980) — condition score 342

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	3	8	25	Wood frame manufactured structure
Exterior Closure	2	8	17	Plywood siding
Roofing	1	10	10	Composition roof 2015; skylights
Floor Finishes	3	6	19	Carpet; ceramic tile; sheet vinyl; vinyl tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	12	Gypsum wall board; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	12	Gypsum board and lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Plumbing	3	8	25	Galvanized, steel and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	3	8	25	225amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	2	8	17	Ceiling-mount, recessed can and lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	2	10	21	
Fire Safety	3	10	31	
Modifications	3	7	22	2009 interior remodel was well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	3	6	19	Interior renovation completed in 2009
Appearance	3	6	19	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	3	6	19	Double glazing
HVAC	2	8	17	Split system heat pumps 2012
Total weighted score			**342**	*Needs improvement — maintenance*

BLDG 10 — Business Occupations (1993) — condition score 278

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	8	Concrete & steel structure
Exterior Closure	2	8	16	CMU; stucco-random cracking; metal fascia
Roofing	3	10	30	Composition shingles-2009; framed glass canopies at entries
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Ceramic tile-random cracks; carpet-surface wear and puckering
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; CMU; ceramic tile wainscot
Ceiling Finishes	3	6	18	Lay-in and direct-adhered tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	18	Interior wood doors w/ HM frames, exterior HM doors/frames-surface wear
Elevators	1	6	6	2 atop
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, ABS and steel piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	800amp 480/208v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, recessed can and ceiling mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	10	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Fire Safety	5	10	50	Sprinler heads have been recalled
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to present
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	3	6	18	Building exterior is not very attractive
Insulation	1	6	6	
Glazing	3	6	18	Operable units
HVAC	3	8	24	AHUs with compressors; electric duct heat; air cooled chiller-2011
Total weighted score			**278**	*Needs improvement — maintenance*

BLDG 11 — Communications (1940) — condition score 265

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	8	CMU; structural steel studs; wood roof beams; glu-lam beams
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Stucco and metal fascia
Roofing	2	10	21	Composition shingles-1997
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Carpet; vinyl tile; ceramic tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	13	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile; exposed structure
Doors & Hardware	2	6	13	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames/sidelites; metal coiling doors
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron and steel piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	2000amp, 480/277v; 200kW generator set
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in and ceiling-mount fluorescent lights; studio fixtures
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	5	10	52	Sprinkler heads have been recalled and should be replaced.
Modifications	1	7	7	1997 and 2001 renovations appear to have been well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	3	6	19	Exterior is not very attractive

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Insulation	2	6	13	
Glazing	3	6	19	
HVAC	3	8	25	2 HW boilers-2001; air cooled chillers; 4 pipe AHUs
Total weighted score			**265**	*Adequate*

BLDG 15 — Resource Center (1977) — condition score 259

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	9	Concrete tilt-up; glu-lam beam framed roof
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Concrete; corrugated metal fascia; aluminum window walls; CMU; plywood panels
Roofing	2	10	21	Single-ply hypalon; standing seam metal; TPO single-ply 2016
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Vinyl tile; quarry tile; carpet; ceramic tile; concrete aggregate
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; ceramic tile; concrete columns
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in and direct-adhered tile
Doors & Hardware	2	6	13	Interior p-lam and wood doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames-significant wear
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, steel and galvanized piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1200amp 480/277v; six disconnect rule
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, ceiling mount and hanging fluorescent lights; pendant HID
Life/Safety	2	10	21	
Fire Safety	2	10	21	Addressable FA, no sprinklers
Modifications	1	7	7	Lab remodel in 2011 was well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	2	6	13	Interior space renovation planned for 2012
Appearance	3	6	19	Building exterior is not very attractive
Insulation	2	6	13	
Glazing	5	6	31	
HVAC	2	8	17	Rooftop packaged heat pumps 2013
Total weighted score			**259**	*Adequate*

BLDG 19 — Administration/Classrooms (1983) — condition score 256

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	8	CMU bearing walls; open web steel roof joists
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Metal flat and corrugated panels-2006/2009
Roofing	3	10	30	Standing seam metal; TPO single-ply membrane in mechanical well-2010
Floor Finishes	2	6	12	Carpet; vinyl tile; ceramic tile; sheet vinyl
Wall Finishes	2	6	12	Gypsum board; concrete; CMU; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	12	Lay-in tile and direct-adhered tile; metal deck pan
Doors & Hardware	3	6	18	Interior wood glazed doors w HM frames and HM doors/frames-surface wear; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	2	6	12	2 stop Dover
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron and galvanized piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	2000amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, recessed can and hanging fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	2	10	20	
Modifications	1	7	7	2006 first floor remodel throughout, well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	3	6	18	Building is very utilitarian;
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	3	6	18	
HVAC	2	8	16	Rooftop packaged heat pumps2006/2010
Total weighted score			**256**	*Adequate*

BLDG 25 — Machine Trades (1940) — condition score 252

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	4	8	33	CMU with seismic improvements and furred walls; wood columns & roof trusses

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Exterior Closure	3	8	25	CMU; corrugated metal panels; aluminum window walls
Roofing	2	10	21	Standing seam metal with corrugated metal sided monitors
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Linoleum tiles; concrete; ceramic tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	13	Gypsum board; CMU; ceramic tile; lay-in tile; vented metal tile
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	13	Exposed wood trusses; wood deck; lay-in tiles
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Interior HM doors/frames; exterior aluminum glazed doors/frames; metal coiling doors
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron steel piping; porcelain and SS fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	3000amp 480/277v; 1600amp main distribution panels
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Hanging and lay-in fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	1	7	7	Substantial 2004 renovation corrected years of haphazard modifications
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Building structure is very solidly constructed despite its age
Appearance	1	6	6	Well renovated for a former warehouse; very nice for "dirty" vocational programs
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	1	6	6	
HVAC	3	8	25	Hot water boilers and AHUs; gas unit heaters; split system heat pumps; good condition
Total weighted score			**252**	*Adequate*

BLDG 17 — Administration (1962) — condition score 222

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	8	Concrete frame; wood frame; steel columns and trusses
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	CMU, stucco soffits, metal fascia; brick; aluminum window walls

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Roofing	2	10	20	Composition shingles; single-ply hypalon-1999
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Carpet; vinyl tile; ceramic tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	12	Gypsum board; CMU; brick; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in and direct-adhered tile; gypsum board
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood doors w wood/HM frames; exterior HM and aluminum doors/frames
Elevators	2	6	12	2 stop for North wing
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel, galvanized and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1500amp, 208/120v; 400amp208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, recessed can and ceiling-mount fluorescent lights
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	2	10	20	
Modifications	1	7	7	1995 and 2010 renovations well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Major interior remodel in 1995; South wing constructed in 1968
Appearance	3	6	18	Building exterior is very utilitarian
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	3	6	18	
HVAC	2	8	16	Hot water boiler, chiller and redundent boiler-2013; Packaged rooftop gas heat pumps in South Wing-2001
Total weighted score			**222**	*Adequate*

BLDG 23 — Student Center (2004) — condition score 207

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	9	Steel-frame; brick
Exterior Closure	2	8	17	Brick; T&G wood siding; aluminum window walls; metal panels; vent-wood soffits
Roofing	3	10	33	Hypalon single-ply; standing seam metal
Floor Finishes	1	6	7	Colored concrete; ceramic tile; carpet; quarry tile

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Wall Finishes	1	6	7	Brick; gypsum board; wood panels; CMU; T&G wood siding; ceramic tile; corrugated metal panels
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	7	Gypsum board; metal deck pan; vent-wood; lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood and HM doors/frames and solid glass doors; exterior aluminum doors/frames, HM doors/frames and coiling metal door
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	9	Copper, cast iron, steel, PVC and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	9	1600amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	9	Lay-in, recessed can, hanging pendant, hanging strip and wall mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	0	7	0	
Maintenance	1	7	8	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Very well constructed; durable materials
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	3	6	20	
Glazing	1	6	6	
HVAC	3	8	26	2 HW boilers; fan-coil units w refrigeration compressors; AHUs; closed circuit cooling tower
Total weighted score			**207**	*Adequate*

BLDG 5 — Residential Construction (1940) — condition score 206

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	2	8	17	Heavy timber columns.& beams w/ clear span wood trusses; wood stud wall framing
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Wood siding covered w/deteriorating stucco
Roofing	1	10	11	BUR w mineral-surfaced capsheet-2009
Floor Finishes	3	6	19	Concrete slab; vinyl tile; carpet

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	OSB panels with exposed wall framing above; gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Exposed roof structure; direct-adhered tile
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior and exterior wood/HM doors and frames; metal OH door
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	8	Galvanized, cast iron and steel piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	600amp 208v and new distribution panels-2011
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Hanging, ceiling-mount and lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	Exterior modifications and addition 2017
Maintenance	1	7	7	Exterior has not been maintained
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Building is designated as historic
Appearance	3	6	19	
Insulation	2	6	13	
Glazing	1	6	6	
HVAC	2	8	17	Gas unit heaters; new dust collection system in 2011
Total weighted score			**206**	*Adequate*

BLDG 3 — Transportation Trades (2001) — condition score 198

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	8	Steel frame; open web steel roof joists, metal deck
Exterior Closure	2	8	17	Exposed structure; metal building panels' corrugated metal siding; steel X bracing; aluminum window walls
Roofing	1	10	11	Standing seam metal; single ply PVC membrane
Floor Finishes	3	6	19	Concrete; linoleum; carpet; ceramic tile; vinyl tile-general surface wear
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; plaster veneer wainscot; corrugated metal panels; ceramic tile

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; lay-in tile, exposed deck pan; wire mesh panels; ceramic tile
Doors & Hardware	2	6	13	Interior HM/wood doors/HM frames/relites; exterior aluminum doors/frames; metal glazed OH doors; coiling fire doors
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron and steel piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	2500amp, 480/277v; 250kW generator set
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Hanging, recessed can, lay-in and ceiling mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	1	7	7	No modifications to date
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	1	6	6	Attractive, dynamic facility for automotive education; very nice exterior design elements
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	3	6	19	
HVAC	1	8	8	2 HW boilers; AHUs and VAVs; air-cooled chiller; radiant ceiling heat in shops
Total weighted score			**198**	*Adequate*

BLDG 20 — Childcare Facility (2005) — condition score 194

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	9	Wood frame
Exterior Closure	3	8	26	Horizontal and vertical tight knot T&G wood; knot bleed through on vertical siding
Roofing	2	10	22	Standing seam metal roof; PVC single ply membrane
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Carpet; sheet vinyl; vinyl tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	13	Gypsum board with vinyl wainscot; interior glazing
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	7	Lay-in tile; exposed ceiling
Doors & Hardware	1	6	7	Interior wood glazed doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	9	Copper, cast iron, steel, PVC and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	9	800amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	9	Hanging, recessed can, lay-in and ceiling mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	0	7	0	No modifications to date
Maintenance	1	7	8	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	1	6	6	Attractive well constructed building with light, secure interior spaces & large play area
Insulation	2	6	13	
Glazing	1	6	6	Operable units
HVAC	1	8	9	Gas furnaces with cooling coils and outside condensers
Total weighted score			**194**	*Adequate*

BLDG 8 — Personal Care Services (1982) — condition score 192

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	9	Concrete columns, open-web steel bar roof joists; CMU
Exterior Closure	1	8	9	Split-face CMU; corrugated and flat metal panels
Roofing	3	10	31	PVC single-ply membrane
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Concrete; carpet; vinyl tile-general surface wear; sheet vinyl; ceramic tile
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; exposed CMU; wood panels; ceramic tile; plastic panels
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	13	Lay-in tile and gypsum board
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior aluminum/HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron and steel piping; porcelain fixtures

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Electrical	1	8	8	2000amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Recessed can, lay-in, wall-mount, hanging circular and hanging strip fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	1	7	7	Complete interior renovation in 2008; well done
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	2008 renovation has extended building life; RUL >20 years
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	2	6	13	
Glazing	3	6	19	
HVAC	1	8	8	Rooftop packaged heat pumps with strip heaters
Total weighted score			**192**	*Adequate*

Pierce Co. Airport Site — South Hill Campus (1999) — condition score 190

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	9	Steel columns & open web steel roof trusses; steel hangar roof girders
Exterior Closure	2	8	17	Metal siding; aluminum window walls; stucco panels
Roofing	1	10	11	Metal roof; shed portion slope too low - allows water infiltration during wind conditions
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Linoleum; carpet; concrete; ceramic tile; vinyl tile; random wear throughout
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Exposed wall structure & metal siding; gypsum board; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Exposed roof structure; lay-in tile; good condition
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior aluminum glazed doors/frames; folding metal hangar doors
Elevators	0	6	0	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	2000amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Hanging, lay-in and recessed can fluorescent lights
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	1	7	7	Only minor modifications evident; well done
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	1	6	6	Very attractive, interesting and well-designed aviation facility
Insulation	2	6	13	
Glazing	3	6	19	
HVAC	3	8	25	2 HW boilers; chiller w 4-pipe AHUs; gas unit heaters; ceiling radiant heaters
Total weighted score			**190**	*Adequate*

BLDG 21 — Health Sciences Facility (2013) — condition score 146

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	9	
Exterior Closure	1	8	9	
Roofing	1	10	11	
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	
Elevators	1	6	6	
Plumbing	1	8	9	
Electrical	1	8	9	
Lights/Power	1	8	8	
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Modifications	0	7	0	
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	1	6	6	
Glazing	1	6	6	
HVAC	1	8	8	
Total weighted score			**146**	*Superior*