COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Washington State Board

LAKE WASHINGTON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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	17 structures · 492,285 GSF; all 17 surveyed (8 active, 9 reported demolished or sold)
Weighted-avg condition	320 (Needs improvement — maintenance) — up from 236 in 2023
2027 preservation request	$6,929,000 (11 projects)
Minor Works — Infrastructure	$140,000 (1 project)
Minor Works — Program	$1,197,000 (1 project)
Unanticipated repair allocation (URF)	$600,000
Total 2027–2029 Minor Works	$8,866,000
Deferred preservation backlog	$4,011,000 (17 projects)

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary 3
2. Portfolio Overview 5
2.1 Building inventory 5
2.2 Age and condition profile 6
3. Capital Planning Roadmap 7
3.1 Immediate priorities (2027–2029) 7
3.2 Mid-term deferred backlog (2029–2033) 7
3.3 Long-term outlook 7
3.4 Cross-cutting themes 7
4. Deficiency Inventory and Findings 9
4.1 Summary table 9
4.2 Findings detail 11
5. Building Profiles 34
6. Infrastructure Systems 36
7. Master Plan Alignment 37
7.1 Master-plan currency 37
7.2 Reported capital priorities 37
7.3 Alignment assessment 37
8. Maintenance Capacity Snapshot 39
8.1 Maintenance staffing 39
8.2 Coverage and cost benchmarks 39
9. Decarbonization and Clean Buildings Compliance 41
9.1 The Clean Buildings Performance Standard 41
9.2 Covered buildings 41
9.3 Aligning capital renewal with compliance 42
9.4 Compliance pathway 42
10. Appendix: Building Condition Detail 44

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2026 Facility Condition Survey identified **29 deficiencies** across Lake Washington Institute of Technology, representing **$10,940,000** of total identified preservation need. The college's 2027–2029 Minor Works Preservation request funds **11 of these projects at $6,929,000**; the remaining **17 scored deficiencies ($4,011,000)** are deferred to future biennia, and one item is excluded.

Capital planning headlines

1. The East Building and campus site work dominate the request. The East Building alone accounts for $4,199,000 — 61% of the preservation request — led by a $2,507,000 partial roof replacement (36% of the request). A campus-wide accessibility and site-drainage program (sidewalk and entry drainage, accessible parking, ramp handrails, and exterior flatwork) adds $1,116,000, or 16%. Together these two threads define the 2027 cycle.

2. The two largest active buildings deteriorated sharply since 2023. The East Building's condition score rose from 288 in 2023 to 418 in 2026, and the West Building's from 190 to 330 — increases of roughly 130 and 140 points in a single cycle. These two buildings hold 62% of the active portfolio's floor area, and their decline explains both the rise in the college's weighted-average score (236 to 320) and why they dominate the 2027 request.

3. Nine of the 17 inventoried structures are reported demolished or sold. The college's pre-survey input reports all eight Child Care buildings as demolished and the Redmond (Marymoor) Campus as sold, though all nine remain in the FPMT inventory and were scored in the 2026 survey. The active portfolio is therefore eight buildings, and the capital plan correctly directs no preservation dollars to the inactive structures.

4. The Clean Buildings deadline for the East Building falls inside this biennium. Four active buildings — East, West, Allied Health, and the Technology Center — are Tier 1 covered facilities under Washington's Clean Buildings Performance Standard. The East Building's June 1, 2027 energy-use-intensity deadline lands within the 2027–2029 period, making the deferred lighting and envelope scope in that building both a repair need and a compliance lever.

Headline numbers

Measure	Value
Deficiencies identified (2025 FCS)	29 (11 included · 17 deferred · 1 excluded)
2027 preservation request	**$6,929,000 (11 projects)**
Deferred preservation backlog	$4,011,000 (17 projects)
Total identified preservation need	$10,940,000
Minor Works — Infrastructure request	$140,000 (1 project)
Minor Works — Program request	$1,197,000 (1 project)
Unanticipated repair allocation (URF)	$600,000
Total 2027–2029 Minor Works request	**$8,866,000**

Measure	Value
Weighted-average condition score	320 (2026) up from 236 (2023)
Active buildings	8 of 17 inventoried structures

Capital outlook

Immediate (2027–2029). The funded request stabilizes the East Building envelope and the campus accessibility/site-drainage network, replaces a failed elevator and two restroom sets, and addresses an aging Technology Center compressor and door operators. The East roof ($2,507,000) is the single largest project and the cycle's priority.

Mid-term (2029–2033). The deferred backlog ($4,011,000) is concentrated in the East Building (shop doors, switchgear, food-service equipment, the instruction yard, and the steam cleaner) and in campus-wide electrical and lighting renewal. The obsolete East switchgear ($814,000) is the most likely deferred item to escalate into an immediate need.

Long-term. The East and West Buildings — both flagged for renovation in the master plan and both deteriorating quickly — are the college's defining long-term capital question. Their 1980s–90s mechanical, electrical, and envelope systems will require sustained reinvestment or major-project intervention beyond what Minor Works can carry.

Clean Buildings. Specifying the deferred lighting conversion and the East and West envelope projects for energy performance converts required repairs into Clean Buildings progress, positioning the four covered buildings for the early-adopter incentive rather than penalty exposure — with the East Building's 2027 deadline as the binding near-term constraint.

2. PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW

Lake Washington Institute of Technology occupies two campuses: the Main Campus in Kirkland, which holds all of the college's instructional and support buildings, and the Marymoor (Redmond) Campus, reported by the college as sold. The 2026 survey scored 17 structures totaling 492,285 gross square feet. Eight are active instructional or support buildings; the remaining nine — all eight Child Care structures and the Redmond Campus — are reported by the college as demolished or sold but remain in the FPMT inventory and are shown here for completeness.

2.1 Building inventory

Building	Campus	GSF	Built	Score	Rating	Predominant use
Allied Health Building	Main	83,700	2011	152	Superior	Classrooms, allied-health labs, instructor offices
Redmond Campus	Marymoor	20,491	2005	178	Adequate	*Sold (per college)*
Technology Center	Main	60,000	2004	204	Adequate	Library, IT, science labs, design classrooms
Greenhouse 1	Main	6,000	2001	241	Adequate	Horticulture
West Building	Main	89,967	1992	330	NI — maintenance	Administrative & student services, classrooms
Greenhouse 2	Main	6,000	1986	375	NI — renovation	Horticulture
Child Care 8	Main	1,130	1987	379	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*
Horticulture (H02)	Main	1,130	1987	405	NI — renovation	Classroom
East Building	Main	214,827	1983	418	NI — renovation	Industrial shops, dental, cafeteria, classrooms, offices
Horticulture (H01)	Main	1,130	1987	420	NI — renovation	Faculty office
Child Care 4	Main	1,130	1987	448	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*
Child Care 5	Main	1,130	1987	448	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*
Child Care 1	Main	1,130	1991	453	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*
Child Care 3	Main	1,130	1987	457	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*

Building	Campus	GSF	Built	Score	Rating	Predominant use
Child Care 6	Main	1,130	1987	457	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*
Child Care 7	Main	1,130	1987	459	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*
Child Care 2	Main	1,130	1987	463	NI — renovation	*Demolished (per college)*
Weighted average — all 17 surveyed		**492,285**		**320**	**NI — maintenance**	

Scores are 2026 FCS building condition scores (lower is better). FPMT records no renovation date for any building, so a renovation column is omitted. A GSF-weighted recomputation of the 17 scores yields approximately 318; the official weighted-average of 320 is used throughout this report. Italicized use entries mark structures the college reports as demolished or sold.

2.2 Age and condition profile

The active portfolio spans roughly three decades of construction. The East Building (1983) is both the oldest and by far the largest active facility at 214,827 GSF, and it carries the highest condition score (418) and the largest share of identified need. The West Building (1992) is the second-largest active building and the second-worst-scoring active facility (330). The newer facilities — the Technology Center (2004), Greenhouse 1 (2001), and the Allied Health Building (2011, the newest and best-scoring at 152) — require comparatively little capital this cycle. The pattern is the familiar one in which the oldest, largest buildings concentrate both deferred maintenance and capital demand, sharpened here by the rapid 2023-to-2026 deterioration of the two keystone buildings.

3. CAPITAL PLANNING ROADMAP

This roadmap sequences the 2026 findings into an immediate funded request, a mid-term deferred backlog, and the long-term capital questions facing the college, then draws out the cross-cutting themes that connect individual deficiencies into coordinated programs.

3.1 Immediate priorities (2027–2029)

The $6,929,000 funded request concentrates on the East Building envelope, the campus accessibility and site-drainage network, and a small set of failed building systems. The **East Building roof (D01, $2,507,000)** is the cycle's priority — a partial replacement of roughly one-third of the low-slope membrane to restore a watertight, properly draining system. Two failed **restroom sets (East D05, $1,641,000; West D06, $167,000)** and the **West Building elevator (D07, $1,321,000)** are the other large building-system projects. The **accessibility and site-drainage program** — sidewalk and entry drainage (D02, D03), exterior flatwork (D09), accessible parking (D10), and a ramp handrail (D11), together $1,116,000 — addresses health-and-safety and code-access deficiencies across the campus. An aging Technology Center compressor (D04) and door operators (D08) round out the request.

3.2 Mid-term deferred backlog (2029–2033)

The 17 deferred deficiencies total $4,011,000 and fall into three clusters. The largest is **campus electrical and lighting renewal**: a fluorescent-to-LED lighting conversion (D23, $752,000) and replacement of the obsolete East Building switchgear (D28, $814,000) — the single most consequential deferred item, which a failure could push into an emergency. The second is the **East Building industrial-shop and food-service program**: shop doors (D25, $368,000), the instruction yard (D18, $315,000), the steam cleaner and oil-water separator (D21, $252,000), the bakery walk-in coolers and freezers (D16, $267,000), and the compressed-air/water separator (D19, $66,000). The third is **envelope and mechanical follow-on work**: the West storefronts (D12/D13, $197,000), the Greenhouse 1 heat pumps (D22, $390,000), hot-water heaters (D17, $151,000), the Technology Center parapet cap (D14) and exhaust hoods (D20), the West air-handling unit (D26), a campus deck (D15), and an exterior stair (D27).

3.3 Long-term outlook

Beyond the deferred list, the dominant long-term question is the trajectory of the East and West Buildings. Both rose roughly 130–140 condition points between 2023 and 2026, both are flagged for renovation in the college's master plan, and together they hold 62% of the active portfolio's floor area. Their 1980s–90s mechanical, electrical, and envelope systems are entering the phase where component-by-component Minor Works repairs give diminishing returns and a major-project renovation becomes the more cost-effective path. The college should begin scoping that intervention now, using the deferred backlog as the inventory of work a renovation would absorb.

3.4 Cross-cutting themes

Accessibility and site drainage. The single largest coordinated thread, at roughly $1,116,000 funded (plus the deferred deck D15 and exterior stair D27), addresses water management and code access campus-wide and should be designed as one program rather than as scattered repairs.

Electrical and lighting. The deferred lighting conversion (D23) and East switchgear (D28) together represent $1,566,000 of electrical renewal; sequencing them with the East Building's Clean Buildings work (Section 9) avoids duplicate mobilizations.

East Building shops and food service. Five deficiencies (D16, D18, D19, D21, D25) reflect the heavy industrial and culinary use of the East Building, where 1980s shop infrastructure has been worn out by trucks, excavators, and production equipment; these are best planned as an instructional-infrastructure package.

Refrigerant transition. The Technology Center compressor (D04) and the Greenhouse 1 heat pumps (D22) both run on phased-out R-22 refrigerant; replacing them removes a regulatory and parts-availability risk that will only grow.

Roofing and envelope. The funded East roof (D01) is the leading edge of a broader envelope program that also includes the Technology Center parapet cap (D14), deferred roofing (D24), the West storefronts (D12/D13), and the East shop doors (D25).

Master-plan alignment. Every building flagged for replacement in the master plan (the two Horticulture buildings and Child Care 1 and 2) receives no preservation funding, while the renovation-flagged buildings (East, West, Technology Center) carry the request — a capital plan well aligned with the college's stated direction (Section 7).

4. DEFICIENCY INVENTORY AND FINDINGS

Section 4.1 is a ranked index of all 29 deficiencies with a condition-rating legend and distribution notes. Section 4.2 is the verbatim problem and repair record — the surveyor's own account of what was identified and recommended, reproduced word-for-word from the 2026 FCS workbook and not paraphrased.

4.1 Summary table

ID	Building	System	Component	DSc	BCS	Budget	Status
D01	East Building	B30 Roofing	Roof	95	418	**$2,507,000**	**Included (2027)**
D02	East Building	G20 Site Improvements	Sidewalk	95	418	**$51,000**	**Included (2027)**
D03	Site	G20 Site Improvements	East entry	91	236	**$63,000**	**Included (2027)**
D04	Technology Center	D30 HVAC	Compressor	86	204	**$88,000**	**Included (2027)**
D05	East Building	F10 Special Construction	Restrooms	85	418	**$1,641,000**	**Included (2027)**
D06	West Building	C30 Interior Finishes	Restrooms	82	330	**$167,000**	**Included (2027)**
D07	West Building	D10 Vertical Transportation	Elevator	82	330	**$1,321,000**	**Included (2027)**
D08	Technology Center	F10 Special Construction	Door operators	81	204	**$89,000**	**Included (2027)**
D09	Multiple	G20 Site Improvements	Exterior flatwork	81	236	**$627,000**	**Included (2027)**
D10	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Accessible parking	81	236	**$294,000**	**Included (2027)**
D11	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Ramp handrail	81	236	**$81,000**	**Included (2027)**
D12	West Building	B20 Exterior Closure	West storefront	76	330	$113,000	Deferred
D13	West Building	B20 Exterior Closure	East storefront	76	330	$84,000	Deferred
D14	Technology Center	B30 Roofing	Parapet cap	75	204	$71,000	Deferred
D15	Multiple	G20 Site Improvements	Deck	75	236	$76,000	Deferred
D16	East Building	E10 Equipment	Walk-in coolers/freezers	75	418	$267,000	Deferred

ID	Building	System	Component	DSc	BCS	Budget	Status
D17	Multiple	D20 Plumbing	Hot water heaters	71	236	$151,000	Deferred
D18	East Building	G20 Site Improvements	Instruction yard	69	418	$315,000	Deferred
D19	East Building	D20 Plumbing	Compressed air/water separator	69	418	$66,000	Deferred
D20	Technology Center	D30 HVAC	Exhaust hoods	66	204	$102,000	Deferred
D21	East Building	F10 Special Construction	Steam cleaner	65	418	$252,000	Deferred
D22	Greenhouse 1	D30 HVAC	Heat pumps	61	241	$390,000	Deferred
D23	Multiple	D50 Electrical	Lighting	61	236	$752,000	Deferred
D24	Multiple	B30 Roofing	Roof	57	236	$0	Deferred
D25	East Building	B20 Exterior Closure	Shop doors	55	418	$368,000	Deferred
D26	West Building	D30 HVAC	Air handling unit	52	330	$59,000	Deferred
D27	Site	B20 Exterior Closure	Exterior stair	49	236	$131,000	Deferred
D28	East Building	D50 Electrical	Switchgear	46	418	$814,000	Deferred
D29	Technology Center	D30 HVAC	TUX cards	41	204	Excluded	Excluded

All deficiencies are on the Main Campus. DSc = deficiency score (higher is more urgent); BCS = building condition score for the building (or 236, the campus weighted-average proxy, for site-wide and multi-building rows). Ranked by deficiency score; ties hold workbook order.

2026 condition-rating bands

Score range	SBCTC condition rating
146 – 175	Superior
176 – 275	Adequate
276 – 350	Needs improvement — additional maintenance
351 – 475	Needs improvement — renovation
476 – 730	Replace or renovate

A lower building condition score indicates better overall condition.

Distribution observations

Deficiency scores range from 95 (the East roof and East sidewalk-drainage items) down to 41 (the excluded Technology Center card-reader item). The East Building carries the heaviest concentration of need — nine

deficiencies and roughly $6.3 million of the $10.94 million identified — followed by a campus-wide site cluster (sidewalks, parking, flatwork, drainage, lighting, and roofing on multi-building rows). By system, G20 Site Improvements is the most frequently cited category, reflecting the accessibility and drainage program that runs through both the funded and deferred lists; D30 HVAC, D50 Electrical, and B-series envelope items make up most of the remainder. The eleven funded projects ($6,929,000) are the highest-scoring and most safety- and access-critical; the seventeen deferred items ($4,011,000) are lower-scoring or, in two cases (the multi-building roof D24 and the East switchgear D28), explicitly marked deferrable.

4.2 Findings detail

Each deficiency below reproduces the problem and repair text verbatim from the 2025 survey workbook. The table for each item provides the deficiency score, the building condition score, the Uniformat system, location, budget estimate, funding status, deferability, and the scored priorities.

D01 — Roof · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	95	**Budget estimate**	**$2,507,000**
Condition score	418	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	B30 Roofing	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Facility Use (50%)

Problem Description

East Building (260-Eas) is a 1983 facility of 214,827 SF. The 2023 facility condition survey identifies the roof as a PVC single-ply system with deterioration in the membrane and flashings, including shredded walking pads that require replacement.

The same survey documents a specific roof deficiency (R01): the east portion of the single-ply roofing has degraded and leaks in several areas near roof transitions and drains. These locations are predictable failure concentrators on low-slope roofs because they combine (1) higher water exposure and residence time, (2) geometric complexity and multiple material interfaces, and (3) reliance on seams/terminations that are sensitive to movement and aging. Once the water-control layer is compromised at transitions/drains, leakage can wet insulation and substrates, propagate laterally, and drive escalating corrective work (repeated patching, localized deck repairs, and interior damage).

The survey frames R01 as “repair and recondition to extend useful life,” with an estimated remaining life of 3 years (vs. 25-year average life expectancy) and a 33,700 SF quantified deficiency area for the degraded portion. This aligns with the college’s observation that repeated repairs are no longer stabilizing performance and that a phased replacement strategy is now the prudent risk-management approach. The college’s current planning basis is a total roof area of approximately 175,000 SF (Google Earth measurement), and budgeting for ~1/3 replacement (~58,000 SF) in the 2027 biennium reduces near-term leak risk while deferring the remaining phases to future biennia.

Skylights and drainage must be treated as integral parts of the water-control system, not add-ons. Roof-to-skylight interfaces routinely fail when termination heights, transitions, and sealant geometries are constrained, and when ponding/wet service conditions persist at perimeters—conditions that can allow

water to bypass base flashings and recur as chronic intrusion points. Similarly, aged/undersized/obstructed roof drainage increases water depth and dwell time, raising the likelihood of leakage at joints and concealed runs; best practice is to size and detail drains/overflow pathways with maintainability and redundancy in mind. For this reason, the proposed phase should include repairs to ~10 skylights and roof drain replacement within the phase limits.

Repair Description

Replace approximately one-third of the East Building low-slope single-ply roof (~58,000 SF of ~175,000 SF total, per Google Earth) including membrane, insulation/tapering as required to restore positive drainage, flashings, roof-to-roof transitions, and protection at service paths; replace roof drains (including strainers/sumps and associated piping tie-ins within the phase area) and provide maintainable, redundant drainage/overflow provisions. Repair or replace approximately 10 skylights within the phase limits, including curb/flashing integration and glazing/seal renewal, to restore durable watertight transitions at roof penetrations.

D02 — Sidewalk · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	95	**Budget estimate**	**$51,000**
Condition score	418	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Next to Dean's offices	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Facility Use (50%)

Problem Description

At the East Building's exterior sidewalk adjacent to the Dean's offices (and a second, similar condition near the fitness center), the wall base drainage/water-control approach relies on mastic at the top/inside face of a concrete curb to resist runoff and splashback. The curb is approximately 10 inches high and is directly adjacent to the pedestrian route. This is a high-risk water-management detail because it depends on a sealant-like material as the primary defense at a horizontal-to-vertical transition where water is routinely present (rain, wet cleaning, snowmelt), and where movement and UV exposure drive loss of adhesion/cohesion over time.

This condition indicates the water-control layer is not continuous at the metal panel wall base and curb interface. When water accumulates along the sidewalk/curb line, it can be driven into small openings by gravity, capillarity, and wind pressure, bypassing the intended exterior surface drainage. Repeated wetting at the wall base can lead to concealed moisture in wall backup materials, corrosion of metal components/fasteners, freeze–thaw distress at concrete interfaces, and progressive deterioration that expands repair scope. The location at an occupied entry/administrative area also elevates operational risk (slip hazards, interior leakage complaints, and accelerated enclosure maintenance cycles).

Repair Description

Repair the sidewalk/wall-base drainage detail at two locations by sawcutting and demolishing concrete to install a new trench drain (~20 LF each; ~40 LF total), sloped to discharge toward the Dean's stair and daylight via a scupper to the adjacent lawn. Repair the metal panel wall base by installing continuous sheet-

metal flashing integrated into the metal wall assembly and extended down over the ~10-inch curb to terminate into the trench drain, forming a durable, maintainable, and continuous water-control path.

D03 — East entry · Site

Image: Link

Deficiency score	91	**Budget estimate**	**$63,000**
Condition score	236	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	East entry	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Facility Use (50%)

Problem Description

At the East Building east entrance, runoff is ponding immediately adjacent to the entry door, then bypassing the intended water-control line and migrating through masticed joints and/or cracks in the concrete paving/threshold interface. This is resulting in bulk water entry and reported flooding in areas below, indicating that water is finding a continuous pathway through the exterior horizontal-to-vertical transition and into interior assemblies.

This is a predictable failure mechanism when a flat or negatively sloped hardscape delivers water to a door line that relies on mastic/sealant as the primary defense. As sealant ages (UV exposure, thermal cycling, movement), adhesion/cohesion declines and the joint opens; once water is present at the joint, gravity and capillarity pull it inward, and repeated wetting increases leakage volume. Persistent ponding at the entry also increases slip hazard, accelerates freeze–thaw deterioration of the slab and joints, and raises the risk of concealed moisture damage (corrosion of embedded metals, degradation of adjacent finishes, and potential microbial growth in wetted cavities). The condition indicates the water-control strategy is not providing positive drainage away from the opening and lacks a robust “drain/relief” path at the most water-exposed location.

Repair Description

Repair the east entrance hardscape drainage by selectively demolishing and replacing the concrete at the door approach to install a trench drain approximately 6 ft long x 8 in wide, set to collect ponded runoff at the threshold line. Repair drainage routing by diverting the trench drain discharge to either side of the walkway (tie-in/daylight as available) with verified slopes/inverts so water is removed from the door line rather than accumulating at the entry.

D04 — Compressor · Technology Center

Image: Link

Deficiency score	86	**Budget estimate**	**$88,000**
Condition score	204	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Facility Use (75%)

Problem Description

HVAC Unit #4 serving the Technology Center is failing with a compressor in distress ("SAC 4"), consistent with the 2023 facility condition survey's determination that the unit has failed and requires replacement. The outdoor condensing unit is identified as a United Technologies/Carrier unit, Model 38HDC048331, using R-22 refrigerant; observed operating pressures were reported at approximately 300 psig high side and 150 psig low side, and the serial is difficult to read but believed to be 0603X55254.

A failing compressor creates an immediate loss-of-service risk (intermittent trips, inability to maintain setpoints, and eventual no-cooling), which can force space shutdowns or operating restrictions depending on the served loads. Compressor failure can also contaminate the refrigerant circuit (oil breakdown/acid/moisture), increasing the scope from a "compressor swap" to full condensing unit replacement and potential line set/coil remediation to prevent repeat failure.

This unit's reliance on R-22 (HCFC-22) materially increases operational risk: in the U.S., production and import of HCFC-22 for new supply ended in 2020, and ongoing service depends on reclaimed/recovered refrigerant and diminishing legacy parts support, which increases downtime exposure and repair costs relative to replacement with a current refrigerant platform.

Repair Description

Replace HVAC Unit #4's R-22 condensing unit/compressor assembly (Carrier 38HDC048331) with a new, code-compliant outdoor unit and matched indoor components as required (coil/metering device/controls), including refrigerant recovery and proper disposal. Repair associated electrical, refrigerant piping/line set, and BAS/control integration as needed, then start up, test, and verify performance under load.

D05 — Restrooms · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	85	**Budget estimate**	**$1,641,000**
Condition score	418	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	F10 Special Construction	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Shop restrooms	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The East shop restroom groups in the East Building (built 1983) consist of two paired men's/women's restroom sets (four restrooms total) that are nearing end of service life. Fixtures are corroded, indicating long-term exposure to moisture, cleaning chemicals, and routine wetting typical of high-use restrooms; corrosion at fixtures, carriers, and trim accelerates functional failures (leaks, unreliable flush/valving, loose mounting, and degraded appearance) and increases maintenance burden and unplanned outages.

All four restrooms are not ADA compliant in their current configuration. In noncompliant toilet rooms, common constraints include inadequate turning/clear floor space, insufficient door maneuvering clearances, inaccessible lavatory approach, and noncompliant grab bar/fixture locations—each of which creates an accessibility barrier and increases the risk of complaints and operational disruption when rooms are taken offline for repeated repairs or partial retrofits.

The existing layout presents a space-planning opportunity: partitions between the men's and women's rooms are reported as movable (while being bounded by walls on either side), allowing reconfiguration into gender-

neutral toilet stalls with a shared sink area. Without modernization, continued corrosion and aging finishes in a wet environment will drive progressive deterioration (persistent leaks, degraded flooring/wall finishes, moisture accumulation at bases and penetrations), elevating risks of slip hazards, concealed moisture damage, and service interruptions.

Repair Description

Repair the East Shop restrooms by demolishing and modernizing two paired restroom areas (four restrooms total) and reconfiguring them into gender-neutral stall rooms with a shared lavatory zone, including new ADA-compliant layout/clearances, partitions/doors/hardware, plumbing fixtures and trim, accessible accessories, lighting, ventilation, and durable wet-area finishes; assume 2,000 SF total of renovation scope (~1,000 SF per pair) to accommodate reconfiguration.

D06 — Restrooms · West Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	82	**Budget estimate**	**$167,000**
Condition score	330	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	C30 Interior Finishes	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The West Building's men's and women's restrooms (six total) exhibit noticeable "pop" and movement underfoot when occupants walk across the small-format tile flooring, indicating loss of floor rigidity and/or loss of bond between finish tile, underlayment, and subfloor structure. In wet-room environments, repeated wetting, cleaning cycles, and localized leaks can drive moisture loading into floor assemblies, which accelerates adhesive failure, underlayment breakdown, and subfloor deterioration; the resulting deflection causes grout cracking, tile debonding, and progressive propagation of loose areas.

This condition is a life-safety and operational risk. Floor movement increases the probability of tile fracture and edge lippage, which creates trip hazards, and can allow water to migrate into concealed layers, elevating risk of microbial growth, corrosion of fasteners/penetrations, and damage to adjacent construction. A prior survey already documented loose tile and concern for worsening delamination in the West Building (noted on the 4th floor)—the reported "pop/movement" is consistent with progression from isolated delamination into broader substrate failure.

Because the affected areas are public restrooms, scope that opens walls/floors and modifies fixture layouts commonly triggers accessibility compliance upgrades (clearances, mounting heights, grab bars, accessories, turning space) during permit and closeout. Treat this as a likely dependency so the floor replacement does not strand the project midstream due to code-required fixture or room-standard changes.

Repair Description

Replace failed restroom floor assemblies by removing tile/underlayment to structure, replacing deteriorated subflooring, and installing new tile with a wet-area-appropriate underlayment/waterproofing system; include base, transitions, and penetrations to maintain watertightness. Replace restroom fixtures as required for ADA compliance, including six toilets, twelve lavatories, and three urinals, prioritizing Level 4 restrooms if funding does not allow full-building execution.

D07 — Elevator · West Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	82	**Budget estimate**	**$1,321,000**
Condition score	330	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D10 Vertical Transportation	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

Elevator #1 in the West Building is original to the facility (1992 vintage) and is the only elevator serving the building (per campus input). While the college has recently replaced the pumps, the elevator is now at the point where a full modernization is required to maintain safe, reliable vertical transportation and to align with current expectations for accessible controls and emergency communications. The requested modernization scope includes two-way communication in the cab, accessibility upgrades to cab controls/fixtures, confirmation of door opening width (reported as likely adequate but requiring verification), and replacement of the electronic control components that manage elevator operation.

The reported oil odor in/near the elevator and control space is a material operational and indoor air quality concern. Persistent oil odor is commonly associated with hydraulic fluid presence and may indicate leakage or chronic vapor exposure in the shaft or equipment room environment, which can create occupant complaints, maintenance burden, and potential slip/soil contamination risks depending on source and pathway. In parallel, the elevator control room environment requires improved conditioning: modernized controls and drives are sensitive to temperature and contaminants; without dedicated cooling (and appropriate exhaust/ventilation to address odor and maintain acceptable air quality), the control components are more likely to experience overheating, nuisance faults, and premature failure, increasing the probability of unplanned outages.

Because this is the only elevator in the building, any extended outage creates an immediate program access and operational continuity risk (vertical circulation, accessibility accommodation, and material movement), with limited redundancy or workaround.

Repair Description

Repair Elevator #1 by performing a full modernization: replace the controller/drive and associated electronic controls, upgrade cab operating panels/controls for accessibility, and provide code-compliant two-way emergency communications; verify and correct door opening clear width as required. Repair the elevator control room support systems by installing dedicated air-conditioning and exhaust/ventilation to manage heat load and address the reported oil odor, including associated electrical and controls integration.

D08 — Door operators · Technology Center

Image: Link

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	**$89,000**
Condition score	204	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	F10 Special Construction	**Deferability**	Immediate

Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The Technology Center has six wave-to-open (hands-free) automatic door operator/actuator assemblies that are failing and no longer performing reliably. These devices include both mechanical operator components (operator body, drive/arm linkage, door interface hardware) and electronic components (activation sensors/switches, control boards, power supplies, wiring, and related low-voltage devices). When operators fail, the doors revert to manual operation or intermittent function, which undermines accessible entry and creates inconsistent door behavior for occupants and visitors.

This is an accessibility and continuity-of-operations risk. Failed automatic operators can limit equitable access and expose the college to ADA/Section 504 compliance risk, while also increasing ongoing maintenance burden and the probability of collateral hardware damage at high-use doors.

Repair Description

Replace the automatic door operators at six Technology Center locations, including all mechanical operator components and all electronics/controls, and recommission each opening for reliable low-energy operation and required accessibility performance. Replace existing small activation devices with durable, ADA-compliant activation hardware (e.g., a larger-format actuator/activation bar at an accessible location to discourage kicking) and coordinate interfaces with existing door hardware, power, and life-safety functions.

D09 — Exterior flatwork · Multiple

Image: Link

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	**$627,000**
Condition score	236	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

Multiple campus pedestrian-route areas—most notably in the vicinity of the greenhouse facilities—have uneven, heaved, settled, or deteriorated asphalt and concrete flatwork that creates trip hazards and accessibility barriers for people using wheelchairs, walkers, canes, or carts. These discontinuities typically develop from differential subgrade settlement, moisture-driven base weakening, freeze–thaw cycling, root heave, and asphalt fatigue/oxidation, which together produce vertical lips at panel joints, localized depressions, and roughened surfaces that are difficult to traverse and that worsen over time under pedestrian/service loading and repeated patching.

This condition increases risk of falls and injuries, exposes the college to accessibility complaints and liability, and elevates operations/maintenance burden as localized failures expand and ponding accelerates material breakdown. A budget-level allowance of $500,000 is recommended to systematically mitigate campus-wide trip hazards and restore safe, barrier-free circulation across prioritized routes.

Repair Description

Repair campus pedestrian-route flatwork by surveying and prioritizing deficient segments, then grinding abrupt vertical offsets, removing and replacing heaved/settled concrete panels, and patching or

reconstructing failed asphalt areas including localized base repair as needed to restore stable, uniform walking/rolling surfaces. Add targeted heated pavement panels at high-risk, recurrent icing locations where justified, and re-establish positive drainage and accessible transitions along repaired routes.

D10 — Accessible parking · Site

Image: Link

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	**$294,000**
Condition score	236	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	West parking lot	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The West parking lot includes approximately 16 designated accessible parking spaces that are not compliant due to undersized access aisles—at ~3 ft wide where ~5 ft is required for standard accessible stalls—and the absence of van-accessible spaces. This condition creates a functional barrier for individuals using mobility devices because the access aisle is the operational “transfer and deployment zone” for ramps, lifts, and wheelchair maneuvering; when it is undersized, users are forced into the drive aisle or adjacent stalls, increasing the risk of conflict with vehicles and preventing safe egress/loading.

In addition, the parking surface reportedly requires rework to ensure slopes are ≤2% in all directions within accessible stalls and access aisles. Excessive cross-slope is a predictable failure mechanism for accessibility because it causes wheelchairs and walkers to drift, increases effort and fall risk, and can make vehicle ramp deployment unsafe. These deficiencies expose the campus to accessibility complaints, operational disruption, and safety/liability risk, and they indicate the need for a grade-corrected paving section rather than striping-only adjustments. (Note: the SBCTC facility condition survey scope explicitly excludes parking lots, which helps explain why this may not appear as a surveyed deficiency.)

Repair Description

Repair the West lot accessible parking area by full-depth or mill-and-overlay repaving and regrading over an estimated ~3600 square foot section to achieve a stable finished surface with ≤2% slopes at accessible stalls and access aisles, and to support compliant drainage without localized ponding. Replace the pavement markings and signage to provide (a) standard accessible stalls with 5-ft access aisles, (b) at least two van-accessible stalls with 8-ft access aisles, and (c) adjusted sign mounting so the bottom of accessible signs is ≥60 in above finished grade.

D11 — Ramp handrail · Site

Image: Link

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	**$81,000**
Condition score	236	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Ramp connecting S parking to East building	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The primary pedestrian access ramp connecting the S Parking Lot to the East Building has a compliant running slope (field-observed < 8.3%, consistent with the ADA maximum 1:12 / 8.33%) but noncompliant handrails on both sides. The existing handrails are approximately 26 in. high (too low) with an oversized grasp radius (not readily graspable), which prevents the ramp from functioning as a fully compliant accessible route.

Ramps require handrails that users can reliably reach and grip to steady themselves during ascent/descent, especially for people with limited balance, strength, or mobility devices. ADA handrail criteria generally require a higher mounting height (typically 34–38 in.) and a graspable profile (e.g., 1.25–2 in. diameter for circular sections, or equivalent graspable geometry for noncircular sections). Architectural detailing guidance aligns with this functional requirement: handrails must be sized so a hand can grip at least three-quarters of the perimeter, with noncircular sections generally limited to 1–2¼ in. thickness and 4–6¼ in. perimeter, and set off the wall by at least 1½ in. to avoid knuckle interference.

Repair Description

Replace the existing noncompliant ramp handrails on both sides of the S Parking Lot–to–East Building ramp (≈200 LF per side; 400 LF total) with ADA-compliant handrails, including compliant mounting height, graspable profile, required wall clearances, continuous/end-return detailing, and structurally engineered posts/anchors. Restore adjacent disturbed finishes and maintain a safe temporary accessible route during construction.

D12 — West storefront · West Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	76	**Budget estimate**	$113,000
Condition score	330	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	West entry	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The West Building's main/host entrance storefront entry assembly is leaking at the exterior enclosure line. The reported storefront opening is approximately 14 ft wide by 10 ft high (≈140 SF) and is described as fully exposed to weather with no protective overhang. Field observations indicate the right-side gasket has fully failed, allowing bulk rainwater to bypass the glazing/frame seals and migrate to the interior, where it is leaking down onto the first floor. Evidence of significant corrosion at the storefront/door assembly indicates chronic wetting and prolonged moisture exposure of metal components and hardware.

This condition is consistent with predictable storefront failure mechanisms: UV exposure, thermal cycling, and joint movement degrade gaskets/sealants; once continuity of the water-control layer is lost at a vertical joint, wind-driven rain and pressure differentials can drive water through the assembly and into adjacent substrates. Corrosion further accelerates loss of section in ferrous components and can compromise anchorage, door operation, and any integrated electrified hardware. These risks are amplified at an entry

that lacks a recess or drip edge strategy, because the assembly sees higher rain deposition and more frequent wetting/drying cycles.

Beyond interior water damage, continued leakage elevates the probability of: (1) deterioration of adjacent wall/floor finishes and concealed substrates, (2) slip hazards at wet interior walking surfaces, (3) reduced enclosure performance from air leakage pathways that often co-occur with failed fenestration seals, and (4) premature failure of door electronics and associated low-voltage components due to moisture intrusion and corrosion. The West Building is a 1992 facility of 89,967 SF; addressing this at the storefront line is necessary to maintain durability and operational continuity at a primary entry.

Repair Description

Replace the leaking main/host entrance storefront system (frames, glazing units, gaskets/sealants, and interfaces) and replace associated entry doors, including all electrified hardware/door electronics and wiring affected by corrosion. Reconfigure the entry by recessing the storefront/door line approximately 18 inches to the interior (accounting for the reported sloped condition) to improve weather protection and reduce future water loading at the enclosure line.

D13 — East storefront · West Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	76	**Budget estimate**	$84,000
Condition score	330	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	East entry	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The east entry storefront at the West Building near the information booth is flush with the exterior wall plane and has minimal rain protection. Reported storefront dimensions are approximately 15 ft wide by 13 ft tall (≈195 SF) with a single door leaf. Field observations indicate failed perimeter sealants with active water intrusion into the building, and heavy corrosion at the storefront/door assembly consistent with chronic wetting.

This failure pattern is consistent with storefront enclosure mechanisms where UV exposure, thermal cycling, and joint movement degrade sealants and break continuity of the water- and air-control layers at the frame-to-wall and frame-to-glazing interfaces. Once the primary seal is breached, wind-driven rain and pressure differentials can drive bulk water into the assembly, where it can bypass drainage paths and wet adjacent substrates; prolonged moisture exposure then accelerates metal corrosion, which can compromise fasteners/anchors, door operation, and long-term durability. These risks are heightened at entries with limited overhang because direct wetting loads are higher and drying potential is reduced.

Repair Description

Replace the east-entry storefront assembly, including frames, glazing units, and the single door leaf, and restore continuity of the air/water barrier with new perimeter flashing/transition membranes, sealants, and positive drainage (weep management/sill detailing) integrated to adjacent wall construction. Repair any

water-damaged adjacent substrates and replace corroded anchorage/hardware as required to return the entry to a durable, weather-resistant condition.

D14 — Parapet cap · Technology Center

Image: Link

Deficiency score	75	**Budget estimate**	$71,000
Condition score	204	**Status**	Deferred
System	B30 Roofing	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The Technology Center roof parapet cap flashing has failed around the full roof perimeter. The existing cap appears to have been installed as a simple lapped joint with sealant as the primary line of defense; that approach is inherently maintenance-sensitive, and once sealant loses adhesion/cohesion from UV exposure, thermal cycling, and joint movement, the laps open and admit wind-driven rain at the parapet top and roof edge. This condition allows bulk water to enter the roof-to-wall interface and parapet assembly, increasing the likelihood of wet insulation, degraded roof membrane terminations, corrosion of concealed metals, freeze–thaw damage in masonry, interior leaks, and mold risk in adjacent wall/ceiling cavities.

In addition, the flashing that diverts water from the wall onto the southwest lower roof is identified as deficient. When diverter/transition flashings are undersized, improperly lapped, or sealant-dependent, runoff concentrates at the wall/roof intersection and can be driven laterally by wind and surface tension into seams—accelerating leakage and deterioration at the lower roof edge and wall base.

Repair Description

Replace the failed parapet cap flashing with a continuous standing-seam parapet cap system (including cleats/continuous anchorage, end dams, corner treatments, and compatible membrane terminations) for approximately 800 LF total perimeter, as verified by field measure. Repair/Replace the southwest wall-to-lower-roof diverter flashing to positively shed wall runoff onto the lower roof and away from wall interfaces, with final quantity and extents verified by aerial takeoff and field conditions.

D15 — Deck · Multiple

Image: Link

Deficiency score	75	**Budget estimate**	$76,000
Condition score	236	**Status**	Deferred
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Between Horticultural workrooms	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The deck connecting Horticultural Work Room 1 and Work Room 2 is reported as structurally compromised: the walking surface appears sound, but the supporting structure below is heavily rotted. This is a high-risk condition because decay in joists, beams, ledgers, posts, and/or connections often progresses out of sight while the deck boards remain serviceable, creating a latent fall-through or partial-collapse hazard under routine foot traffic. With the deck functioning as the circulation link between two occupied program spaces, this condition also creates an accessibility and operational continuity risk (unreliable route, potential closure of one or both rooms for safety).

From a building-science perspective, advanced wood rot indicates sustained elevated moisture content in the structural members. Typical drivers include repeated wetting from precipitation, poor drainage and drying potential at horizontal framing interfaces, water trapping at ledgers and bearing points, and fastener/hardware corrosion that accelerates joint opening and water retention. Even if the original framing was preservative-treated, service life is finite—particularly where field cuts, checks, fastener penetrations, or long-term wetting overcome treatment efficacy. At an estimated age of 30+ years (per site observation), the deck is beyond typical durability expectations for an exposed wood assembly without robust detailing and a consistent drying path.

Repair Description

Replace the entire deck assembly (decking, framing, supports, and connections) between 260-H01 and 260-H02 (≈300 SF) with a code-compliant exterior walking surface designed for durability, including new footings/posts as required, corrosion-resistant connectors/fasteners, and required guards/handrails. Repair adjacent building interfaces as needed (ledger/wall waterproofing and flashing, positive drainage and ventilation clearances) so the reconstructed deck does not trap moisture and re-initiate concealed rot.

D16 — Walk-in coolers/freezers · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	75	**Budget estimate**	$267,000
Condition score	418	**Status**	Deferred
System	E10 Equipment	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Bakery/culinary	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), System Use (75%)

Problem Description

The bakery and culinary programs rely on five walk-in refrigeration units (reported two freezers and three walk-in refrigerators) that are described as near end of service life and “constantly causing issues.” When walk-ins reach this stage, failure modes typically compound: compressors and evaporator components cycle harder to maintain setpoints, defrost performance degrades, controls drift, and door hardware/gaskets lose compression—driving temperature instability and unplanned shutdowns. In instructional food-service settings, this creates direct operational risk: loss of cold chain, product spoilage, disrupted labs, and emergency work that is difficult to schedule around the academic calendar.

From a building-science perspective, walk-in performance is dominated by heat and moisture ingress at openings and interfaces. Excessive warm, moist air infiltration through doors and compromised seals predictably drives ice buildup around doorways, frost, and wet floors, increasing slip hazard and accelerating

equipment distress through repeated freeze/thaw cycling at thresholds and frames. These same mechanisms increase energy intensity; refrigeration is typically a dominant electrical load in cold-storage applications, and poor infiltration control and degraded component performance further amplify consumption and maintenance burden.

Repair Description

Replace the five walk-in units serving the East Building bakery/culinary areas (2 freezers, 3 coolers) with new prefabricated modular walk-in enclosures and complete refrigeration systems (evaporators, condensing units, controls/alarms), including demolition/disposal of existing units, required electrical disconnect/reconnect, condensate management, and refrigerant piping modifications as required. Repair adjacent interfaces needed to restore thermal and air/vapor control continuity at each opening (doors, gaskets/frames, penetrations) and commission the systems to verify temperature performance under operating conditions.

D17 — Hot water heaters · Multiple

Image: Link

Deficiency score	71	**Budget estimate**	$151,000
Condition score	236	**Status**	Deferred
System	D20 Plumbing	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), System Use (75%)

Problem Description

Four domestic hot water heaters across campus have reportedly reached end of service life and are original to their buildings, increasing the likelihood of tank leakage/failure, unplanned outages, and consequential interior damage. End-of-life DHW tanks commonly exhibit internal corrosion, scale accumulation, and fitting/connection deterioration from long-term thermal cycling and water chemistry exposure; once protective linings/coatings are compromised, corrosion progresses to pinhole leaks or larger breaches that can cause rapid bulk water release into occupied or equipment spaces.

A representative unit provided for cost/spec reference is a PVI Industries DURAWATT® electric packaged water heater with a NICKELSHIELD® nickel-plated storage tank, Tank Series 125 gallons, Model 90 N 125A-E, Serial 120-310-9527. Published performance/electrical data for this model indicates 90 gph recovery (40–120°F) and 70 gph recovery (40–140°F) with 18 kW input and substantial electrical demand depending on service configuration (e.g., ~75A at 240V 1Ø or ~22A at 480V 3Ø); physical handling/rigging is nontrivial (published shipping weight ~850 lb), so deferring replacement increases the risk of an uncontrolled leak event and longer downtime due to procurement/installation constraints.

Repair Description

Replace four end-of-life domestic hot water heaters with new commercial-grade units matched to existing storage volume, recovery, and available electrical service, including demolition/disposal, rigging, new isolation valves and service unions, T&P relief piping to code-compliant termination, and reconnection to DHW recirculation as applicable. Test and commission temperature control/tempering (mixing valve where present), verify leak-free operation, and restore any disturbed finishes/access for maintainable clearances.

D18 — Instruction yard · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	69	**Budget estimate**	$315,000
Condition score	418	**Status**	Deferred
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	East shop	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The East Shop lab compound asphalt serves as an active instructional yard that must routinely accommodate heavy vehicle loading (e.g., semi-trucks and excavators) associated with shop/lab coursework. The existing asphalt is described as original to the 1980s and is now heavily degraded, with widespread alligator cracking. Alligator cracking is a classic indicator of structural pavement failure—typically reflecting base/subgrade distress and loss of support under repeated heavy axle loads—rather than a surface-only defect. As cracking interconnects, it allows water intrusion into the pavement structure; repeated wetting and seasonal cycling accelerate pumping, rutting, breakup, potholing, and progressive loss of section, which can rapidly expand the area of failure.

The current condition creates a safety and operations risk in a student-use environment: cracked and deformed surfaces increase the likelihood of trip/fall incidents, vehicle instability during maneuvers, and equipment damage from uneven pavement and emerging potholes. Continued patching is typically ineffective once fatigue cracking is widespread, and deferral increases the probability of unplanned outages of the instructional yard and higher reconstruction costs. For budget planning, the college indicates the compound is approximately 31,000 SF and requires reconstruction with ~6 inches of asphalt, with a rough order-of-magnitude cost of $250,000.

Repair Description

Replace the East Shop lab compound asphalt (~31,000 SF) with a full-depth pavement rebuild suitable for heavy instructional vehicle loading, including removal of failed asphalt, subgrade proof-rolling and localized undercut/repair as required, reconstruction of the aggregate base, and installation of ~6 inches of new hot-mix asphalt (placed in multiple lifts) with proper compaction and testing. Repair pavement drainage/slope as needed to prevent standing water, adjust lids/frames at utility structures within the work limits, and restore markings/striping and edge transitions at all tie-ins.

D19 — Compressed air/water separator · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	69	**Budget estimate**	$66,000
Condition score	418	**Status**	Deferred
System	D20 Plumbing	**Deferability**	Immediate

Location	Shop wing	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The East Building's shop/classroom compressed-air system includes local "air dryer" devices at each classroom air drop (reported ≈15 total), all of which are leaking. These devices are part of compressed-air treatment: they exist because all compressed air starts as ambient air containing water vapor, and when that air is compressed and then cooled, moisture readily condenses and/or remains as water vapor that can later condense downstream when temperatures drop. If moisture is not controlled, the distribution piping and end-use equipment will see ongoing wetting, corrosion, and performance problems.

A compressed-air "dryer" (and moisture separator at a point of use) is intended to prevent liquid water from being delivered to tools and instruction equipment by either (1) removing liquid condensate that has already formed (typical separator/filter bowls with drains) and/or (2) lowering the air's pressure-dew-point so that water vapor won't condense in the piping and at the equipment connection. "Pressure dew point" is the industry metric describing the temperature at which water vapor will begin to condense at line pressure.

In a typical compressed-air system, separators, filters, dryers, and condensate drains are used together to achieve the air quality required at the end use; treatment equipment must be maintained because failures directly degrade air quality and reliability. If the reported devices are "outside each classroom," the most likely configuration is point-of-use air treatment (filter/regulator + moisture separator with an auto drain, and possibly a small membrane/desiccant dryer) located at each drop to protect teaching tools from wet air.

Repair Description

Replace the leaking point-of-use compressed-air treatment assemblies (≈15 locations) with new moisture-separation/drying devices appropriate to the required air quality, including integral filtration/regulation as needed and reliable condensate drains piped to an approved collection/disposal point where required. Repair associated distribution piping/fittings at each drop and verify post-installation air quality (dew point at minimum) to confirm that moisture is controlled at the classroom end uses.

D20 — Exhaust hoods · Technology Center

Image: Link

Deficiency score	66	**Budget estimate**	$102,000
Condition score	204	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), System Use (75%)

Problem Description

Three roof-mounted fume hood exhaust fan/stack assemblies serving the Technology Center science labs are rusted through (perforated). These units exhaust caustic laboratory chemical vapors, which accelerates corrosion of ferrous housings, fasteners, and stack components, especially where protective coatings have failed and condensate and wind-driven rain can wet metal surfaces. Once corrosion progresses to through-

wall section loss, the assemblies lose structural integrity and weather resistance, increasing the probability of fan/motor failure, water intrusion into fan sections, and uncontrolled discharge paths.

This condition creates an immediate operational and safety risk for lab ventilation. If an exhaust fan or stack assembly fails, the associated fume hoods can lose required exhaust flow and room pressure control, which can force lab shutdown to prevent occupant exposure and potential contamination migration. The college has recently replaced similar units at ~$20,000 each; applying that observed unit cost indicates ~$60,000 to replace all three roof units.

Repair Description

Replace the three corroded roof-mounted fume hood exhaust fan/stack assemblies, including Baldor belt-driven exhaust motors, fan housings, curb/attachments, and associated weatherproofing, with corrosion-resistant materials and coatings suitable for laboratory exhaust. Test and balance the affected lab exhaust systems after replacement to verify required airflow and safe discharge performance.

D21 — Steam cleaner · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	65	**Budget estimate**	$252,000
Condition score	418	**Status**	Deferred
System	F10 Special Construction	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Spray booth	**Priorities**	System Use (100%)

Problem Description

The East Building pressure steam cleaner and associated spray booth oil-water separator are reported to have heavy deterioration and are no longer in reliable condition to support instructional use. This equipment is integral to student shop training because it enables cleaning of industrial components while capturing and separating oils and contaminated wash water prior to discharge; when separators and connected piping/valves deteriorate, common failure modes include internal corrosion, failed baffles/coalescing media, leaking tanks and fittings, compromised seals, and bypass conditions that reduce separation performance and increase maintenance burden and unplanned shutdowns.

The risk profile is high because loss of effective separation can result in oily wastewater carryover to downstream plumbing, increased likelihood of blockages and corrosion, and potential noncompliant discharges depending on how the system is connected and managed (sanitary vs. other discharge pathways). Deterioration also increases the likelihood of localized spills and slip hazards, and it can create industrial hygiene exposure concerns if contaminated residues are not effectively contained and removed. From an operational standpoint, failure of this system can force the spray/steam cleaning function offline, disrupting curriculum delivery and driving ad hoc workarounds that typically increase both safety and compliance risk.

The college has provided a cost estimate of $200,000 to replace the unit (used here as the campus-provided ROM reference).

Repair Description

Replace the deteriorated oil-water separator system serving the East Building pressure steam cleaner/spray booth, including separator vessel (or packaged unit), coalescing media, covers, piping/valves,

controls/alarms, and all deteriorated appurtenances, and restore proper containment and safe maintenance access. Repair associated connections as required and commission the system to verify separation function, leak-tightness, and compliant discharge routing per campus EH&S requirements.

D22 — Heat pumps · Greenhouse 1

Image: Link

Deficiency score	61	**Budget estimate**	$390,000
Condition score	241	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Greenhouses	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

Greenhouse 1 (6,000 SF, built 2001) and Greenhouse 2 (6,000 SF, built 1986), for a combined area of 12,000 SF. The project dictation describes the greenhouse area as approximately 20,000 SF, which conflicts with the facility inventory; final equipment sizing should be based on a load calculation and verified floor area rather than rule-of-thumb SF.

The greenhouses are lightweight enclosure systems (e.g., Lexan panels and plastic sheeting are noted in the condition survey), which inherently drive high conductive and infiltration heat loss and increase sensitivity to wind, outdoor temperature swings, and envelope air leakage. In this context, heating is a mission-critical utility: inadequate capacity, poor distribution, or unreliable controls can cause temperature stratification, cold-edge zones, and freeze risk at piping/hoses, plant benches, and perimeter conditions—directly impacting instructional operations and plant health.

The current heat source is reported by campus as four Reznor-type direct-resistance heaters (two per greenhouse) intended to be replaced with one heat pump per greenhouse. Direct-resistance heat is COP ≈ 1, creating a structurally high operating cost and high peak electrical demand for a glazing-dominant space. In addition, the 2023 condition survey lists greenhouse HVAC as “gas unit heaters; ventilation fans; hydronic table heaters,” indicating either mixed systems between the two greenhouses or a change in equipment since the survey; field verification is required to prevent scope gaps (e.g., remaining unit heaters, bench heat, or ventilation interlocks not captured in the replacement).

Repair Description

Replace the existing four Resor-type direct-resistance unit heaters serving the two greenhouses with two appropriately sized air-source heat pump systems (one per greenhouse), including required air distribution, thermostatic zoning, condensate management, structural support/curbs as required, and electrical service modifications. Provide controls integration with existing greenhouse ventilation/fans and include start-up/testing/commissioning to verify stable temperature control across winter design conditions and operating modes.

D23 — Lighting · Multiple

Image: Link

Deficiency score	61	**Budget estimate**	$752,000

Condition score	236	**Status**	Deferred
System	D50 Electrical	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

Across multiple buildings, existing fluorescent lighting (lamps/ballasts and associated fixtures) is reaching end of life and the college is increasingly unable to source replacement fluorescent tubes, resulting in delayed repairs and accumulating dark or intermittently lit areas. As lamps and ballasts age, failures present as no-start, flicker, reduced light output, and nuisance outages, which degrades task lighting and egress illumination reliability, increases maintenance labor, and elevates operational risk in instructional and support spaces where consistent illumination is required for safety and functionality. Campus-wide conversion also reduces reliance on mercury-containing lamps and addresses the maintenance and disposal burden created by repeated fluorescent lamp failures across multiple facilities.

Repair Description

Replace remaining fluorescent lamps/ballasts and incompatible fixtures across multiple buildings with LED retrofit kits or new LED luminaires, including proper recycling/disposal of removed fluorescent lamps and ballasts. Standardize fixture types and color temperature, verify emergency/egress lighting functionality, and complete functional testing to confirm intended illumination and control performance; budget approximately $600,000 for the campus-wide conversion.

D24 — Roof · Multiple

Image: Link

Deficiency score	57	**Budget estimate**	$0
Condition score	236	**Status**	Deferred
System	B30 Roofing	**Deferability**	Deferrable
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Facility Use (50%)

Problem Description

Horticulture Buildings 1 and 2 (260-H01 / 260-H02) — Roofing — Asphalt Shingle Roofs + Gutters

Both buildings have aged asphalt shingle roofs with heavy biological growth (moss buildup) and field-reported advanced degradation. The 2023 survey notes 3-tab composition shingles (1999) for both buildings, which places the roof covering well beyond typical service life in this climate and increases the likelihood of granule loss, shingle edge curling/lifting, and loss of watertightness at laps, penetrations, and flashings.

Moss is not cosmetic here; it functions as a persistent moisture reservoir that keeps the roof surface wet, slows drying, and accelerates shingle deterioration. Once water bypasses the water-shedding layer, it can wet roof sheathing and wood framing, and leaks can remain concealed until staining, odor, or interior damage appears. Given the T1-11 exterior closure, recurring eave overflow or roof-edge leakage also

increases risk of chronic wetting at fascia/trim and panel edges, driving rot and fastener corrosion at the roof-to-wall transition.

Repair Description

Replace the existing asphalt shingle roofing on both Horticulture Buildings 260-H01 and 260-H02 with full tear-off to deck, selective replacement of deteriorated sheathing discovered during demolition, and installation of new underlayment, flashings/drip edge, and new asphalt shingles to restore a continuous water-control layer. Repair or replace gutters and downspouts at both buildings (cleaning, re-hanging, joint/end-cap repair, and verification of positive slope and controlled discharge away from foundations) to prevent eave overflow and repeat wetting of roof-edge and wall-base assemblies.

D25 — Shop doors · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	55	**Budget estimate**	$368,000
Condition score	418	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	East shops	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), Increased Operating Cost (75%)

Problem Description

The east-side exterior door inventory in the East Building includes approximately 13 exterior man doors that are corroded and rusted through at the frames, indicating loss of protective coatings and long-term exposure to repeated wetting at frame perimeters, thresholds, and hardware interfaces. Once corrosion compromises the frame section, door alignment and latch engagement degrade, perimeter gasketing can no longer maintain a tight seal, and the opening becomes a persistent pathway for bulk water entry, wind-driven rain, and air leakage. These mechanisms accelerate deterioration of adjacent substrates (anchors, embeds, sealant joints, and wall base materials) and increase operational risk (unreliable egress function, security vulnerability, and escalating corrective maintenance).

The east building also includes approximately 11 roll-up/coiling doors that are original-vintage and are reported as heavily warped and difficult to close, with spring failures and three door failures in the past year. Warping and repeated mechanical failures are consistent with cumulative fatigue in curtain slats, end locks, guides, and barrel/spring assemblies from decades of cycling, thermal movement, and intermittent binding. As the door curtain and guides deform, closing forces rise, components rack out of plane, and the system becomes prone to roll-off events, unsafe operation, and unplanned outages—particularly problematic in shop/industrial instruction spaces where these doors are used for equipment access and daily logistics.

This deficiency profile aligns with prior facility-condition documentation identifying an overhead door replacement need in the East Building.

Repair Description

Replace the east-side exterior man doors (≈13) with new, corrosion-resistant assemblies (frames, leaves, thresholds, hardware, and continuous perimeter air/water seals), including repair of deteriorated adjacent substrates and reestablishment of continuous flashing/water-control transitions at each opening. Replace the roll-up/coiling doors (≈11) with complete new door systems (curtain, guides, barrel/springs,

operators/controls if present, safety devices, and weather seals), including opening prep, anchorage, and restoration of perimeter water-management detailing.

D26 — Air handling unit · West Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	52	**Budget estimate**	$59,000
Condition score	330	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	System Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

Air Handling Unit (AHU) #3 serving the West Building atrium has associated ductwork that is no longer air-sealed due to complete rust-through of the sheet metal. The duct sections are described as rectangular/square, approximately 3 ft x 3 ft, and the observed deterioration warrants replacement of at least 100 LF of ductwork. In addition, at least three duct/vent caps require replacement to restore weather protection and system integrity.

Through-wall corrosion in large metal ductwork is consistent with chronic moisture exposure (condensation and/or water intrusion at terminations). Once perforated, duct leakage allows fan-driven pressure to dump conditioned air into unconditioned plenums and pull unconditioned air into the airstream, degrading airflow control, ventilation performance, and energy efficiency, and undermining comfort and building durability.

Repair Description

Replace a minimum of 100 LF of AHU-3 atrium ductwork (approx. 36 in x 36 in rectangular), including associated connectors, supports, and air sealing of all joints, seams, and penetrations. Replace at least three deteriorated duct/vent termination caps and restore weathertight terminations to prevent recurrence of moisture exposure and corrosion.

D27 — Exterior stair · Site

Image: Link

Deficiency score	49	**Budget estimate**	$131,000
Condition score	236	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Between West and East buildings	**Priorities**	Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (100%)

Problem Description

The “Submarine Stair” emergency egress stair located between the West and East Buildings exhibits chronic water intrusion associated with failed sealants and lack of weather protection at this exposed exterior

condition. Reported conditions include widespread evidence of leakage at the stair structure and adjacent openings, indicating that the local water-control layer is not continuous and that wind-driven rain is bypassing perimeter joints and interfaces. As sealant joints lose adhesion/cohesion from UV exposure, thermal cycling, and movement, bulk water entry increases and can cascade into more advanced deterioration (e.g., corrosion, concrete distress, hardware failure) as wetting persists.

Specific enclosure failures at this location include a failed circular window on the south side (recommended to be removed and infilled with concrete) and an east-side storefront light opening (~6 ft 5 in x 3 ft) (recommended to be removed and infilled with concrete). The egress door/frame has failed and no longer functions properly, creating a life-safety reliability risk because compromised door operation can delay or obstruct emergency egress, especially under wet/freezing conditions when swelling, corrosion, and misalignment accelerate.

The surrounding stormwater management is also a contributing driver: the storm drain west of the stair structure requires replacement, and the intended corrective approach is to intercept and redirect runoff away from the stair assembly via French drain installation, new flashing/diverter(s), and positive routing to an adjacent storm drain (~12 ft away).

Finally, the proposed removal of two aggregate panels (~5 ft x 6 ft each) and replacement with stone/planting is a pragmatic way to reduce splashback and concentrated wetting at the structure base while creating a maintainable drainage zone.

Repair Description

Repair the Submarine Stair area by replacing the storm drain west of the structure, installing a French drain adjacent to the stair, and adding flashings/diverters to redirect runoff away from the stair and discharge to the adjacent storm drain (~12 ft away). Replace the failed egress door and frame, remove the failed south circular window and east storefront light (~6 ft 5 in x 3 ft) and infill both openings with concrete, and demo two aggregate panels (~5 ft x 6 ft each) for a stone/planting drainage buffer that reduces splashback and chronic wetting.

D28 — Switchgear · East Building

Image: Link

Deficiency score	46	**Budget estimate**	$814,000
Condition score	418	**Status**	Deferred
System	D50 Electrical	**Deferability**	Deferrable
Location	Electrical room	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), System Use (75%)

Problem Description

The East Building (≈214,827 GSF, 1983) relies on campus electrical infrastructure as its sole energy source (no natural gas). The main distribution switchboard/switchgear serving the East Building is original to the building and identified as an ITE switchboard, Type FC-2, Series 6, with the first targeted section being Column G.

Original-era switchboards present compounding operational risk because their reliability is dominated by aging mechanisms at the exact points that carry the highest consequences: bolted bus and lug connections

(thermal cycling loosening/creep, oxidation), breaker wear/declining trip performance, and insulation/arc containment limitations relative to modern lineups. These conditions tend to manifest as hot spots, nuisance trips, inability to maintain selective coordination, and—in worst cases—catastrophic failure requiring an extended outage while parts are sourced and a lineup is rebuilt. For an all-electric campus, a major distribution failure is a single-point-of-failure event that can disrupt instruction, lab operations, life-safety systems dependent on normal power, and building environmental control.

This equipment class is also exposed to parts and serviceability risk. Legacy ITE/Siemens-era switchboard families often require retrofit strap kits/blank plates and aftermarket components to keep configurations serviceable, and even when kits exist, they are constrained by compatibility, section geometry, and field condition. As a result, a phased strategy that begins with the identified Column G is appropriate to retire the highest-risk section first while developing a controlled pathway to replace additional columns (or the full lineup) without an all-at-once campus disruption.

Repair Description

Replace the ITE Type FC-2, Series 6 switchboard Column G (including associated breakers, internal bus/straps as required, and all terminations to existing feeders) as Phase 1 of a sequenced switchboard modernization, using planned outages and temporary power provisions as needed to maintain critical operations. Replace/update associated documentation and safety deliverables, including as-built one-line updates, labeling, acceptance testing/commissioning, and any required protective-setting/coordination and arc-flash labeling updates tied to the new section.

D29 — TUX cards · Technology Center

Image: Link

Deficiency score	41	**Budget estimate**	Excluded
Condition score	204	**Status**	Excluded
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Increased Operating Cost (100%)

Problem Description

The Technology Center has TUX card-related failures (“Tux cards” reported as failed). The college has been replacing these items incrementally under maintenance, indicating an ongoing reliability issue rather than a single isolated failure. This creates inconsistent access for authorized users and increases staff time spent troubleshooting, issuing replacements, and responding to access disruptions.

When credential media and/or associated access-control components fail, the result is typically unreliable door access (denied entry for authorized users) and/or workarounds (propped doors, bypassed controls), which degrades building security and can disrupt normal operations during peak occupancy periods. Because replacements have been handled ad hoc, the current condition likely reflects deferred standardization (mixed vintages/models, inconsistent programming) and a growing risk of cascading failures as remaining components age.

The college to confirm: (1) quantity affected (cards and/or readers—confirm what “Tux cards” refers to on campus), (2) unit costs paid for recent replacements, (3) programming/enrollment labor, and (4) whether replacements require system reconfiguration or are true like-for-like swaps.

Repair Description

Replace failed TUX card-related components at the Technology Center, including all necessary credential media and/or associated access-control hardware required to restore reliable access control. Verify the quantity and unit cost with the college using recent purchase history to set a defensible budget and finalize scope.

5. BUILDING PROFILES

Profiles below cover the active buildings with capital activity in the 2027 request or a material concentration of deferred work, ordered worst score first. Each profile pairs the building's 2026 condition score and its three heaviest-weighted components with its funded and deferred deficiencies and a prior-cycle comparison. Identifiers refer to the deficiency record in Section 4.

East Building — condition score 418

Building	GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
East Building	214,827	1983	—	Industrial shops, dental, cafeteria, classrooms, offices

Condition. 2026 condition score 418 (Needs improvement — renovation), up sharply from 288 in 2023 (a 130-point increase in one cycle). The three components contributing most to the building's weighted score are Roofing (50), Life/Safety (40), Exterior Closure (32).

Current biennium (2027 request). D01 roof ($2,507,000), D02 sidewalk ($51,000), D05 restrooms ($1,641,000) — $4,199,000 total.

Deferred and emerging. D16 walk-in coolers/freezers ($267,000), D18 instruction yard ($315,000), D19 compressed air/water separator ($66,000), D21 steam cleaner ($252,000), D25 shop doors ($368,000), D28 switchgear ($814,000) — $2,082,000 total.

Long-term outlook. The portfolio keystone — 214,827 GSF (46% of the active portfolio) and the largest concentration of both funded and deferred work. The 2027 roof and restroom projects address the envelope and interior; the building's electrical service (the deferred switchgear) and its industrial-shop and food-service equipment are the defining long-term questions and should be planned as a coordinated renovation. A Clean Buildings Tier 1 building with a June 1, 2027 compliance deadline inside this biennium.

West Building — condition score 330

Building	GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
West Building	89,967	1992	—	Administrative & student services, classrooms

Condition. 2026 condition score 330 (Needs improvement — maintenance), up sharply from 190 in 2023 (a 140-point increase in one cycle). The three components contributing most to the building's weighted score are Exterior Closure (40), Roofing (30), Structure (24).

Current biennium (2027 request). D06 restrooms ($167,000), D07 elevator ($1,321,000) — $1,488,000 total.

Deferred and emerging. D12 west storefront ($113,000), D13 east storefront ($84,000), D26 air handling unit ($59,000) — $256,000 total.

Long-term outlook. The second-largest active building and the second-worst active score, and the fastest-deteriorating in the portfolio. Its elevator is funded this cycle; its 1992-vintage envelope (storefronts) and mechanical systems (air-handling unit) are early signals of the systems renewal that will define the next two cycles. A Clean Buildings Tier 1 building with a June 1, 2028 deadline.

Greenhouse 1 — condition score 241

Building	GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
Greenhouse 1	6,000	2001	—	Horticulture

Condition. 2026 condition score 241 (Adequate), essentially unchanged from 241 in 2023. The three components contributing most to the building's weighted score are HVAC (32), Roofing (27), Floor Finishes (24).

Current biennium (2027 request). No projects in this building are in the 2027 funded request.

Deferred and emerging. D22 heat pumps ($390,000) — $390,000 total.

Long-term outlook. A small but specialized horticulture facility whose R-22 heat pumps (deferred, $390,000) are the only identified deficiency. The refrigerant phase-out makes this a when-not-if replacement, best timed with the broader HVAC and refrigerant-transition work in the East and Technology Center buildings.

Technology Center — condition score 204

Building	GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
Technology Center	60,000	2004	—	Library, IT, science labs, design classrooms

Condition. 2026 condition score 204 (Adequate), essentially unchanged from 204 in 2023. The three components contributing most to the building's weighted score are Roofing (30), Exterior Closure (16), Floor Finishes (12).

Current biennium (2027 request). D04 compressor ($88,000), D08 door operators ($89,000) — $177,000 total.

Deferred and emerging. D14 parapet cap ($71,000), D20 exhaust hoods ($102,000) — $173,000 total.

Long-term outlook. A relatively sound 2004 building (score 204, 'Adequate') carrying modest mechanical and envelope items. Its funded compressor and door operators and its deferred parapet cap and exhaust hoods are routine system renewals; the excluded card-reader item (D29) is below the Minor Works threshold. No major intervention is anticipated this cycle.

Buildings not profiled. *The Allied Health Building (152, 'Superior') and Greenhouse 2 (375) carry no identified deficiencies this cycle and need no individual profile. The Redmond Campus (178) is reported sold, and the eight 1987-era Child Care structures (scores 379–463) are reported demolished; the master plan additionally flags the two Horticulture buildings (405/420) and Child Care 1 and 2 for replacement rather than repair. None of these structures receives capital in the 2027 request or the deferred backlog.*

6. INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS

Infrastructure requests — campus utilities, distribution, and site systems — are budgeted separately from building preservation. For 2027–2029 the college's infrastructure request is **$140,000**: a single electrical-line project (asset 1815) running from the East Building site perimeter to a point southeast of the Allied Health Building. It is the smallest of the four Minor Works categories this cycle.

System	Component	Asset	Budget	Location
Electrical	Electric line	1815	$140,000	East site perimeter to southeast of Allied Health

2027–2029 recommended infrastructure project.

This request continues a multi-biennium program of utility-distribution renewal documented in the college's 2019 Infrastructure Survey. The prior 2025–2027 biennium funded $381,000 of infrastructure across four aging assets:

Component	Asset(s)	Budget	Source
Gas Meter	1909	$25,000	2019 Infrastructure Survey
Potable Water Meter	1842	$25,000	2019 Infrastructure Survey
Storm Lines	1925 & 1930	$292,000	2019 Infrastructure Survey
Emergency generator	1900	$39,000	2019 Infrastructure Survey
Prior infrastructure total		**$381,000**	

Prior 2025–2027 funded infrastructure, for multi-biennium context.

Read together, the prior gas, water, storm, and generator replacements and the current electrical line indicate a campus steadily retiring end-of-life utility components identified in the 2019 survey rather than undertaking a single large infrastructure project. Because any future electrification of the Clean Buildings covered facilities (Section 9) would raise electrical-service demand, the $140,000 electrical line should be scoped with that longer-term load growth in mind. For context, the prior biennium also funded $2,048,000 of building preservation (the East roof recondition and Technology Center and West Building projects), for a total prior Minor Works program of **$4,234,000.**

7. MASTER PLAN ALIGNMENT

This section compares the 2027 capital-repair recommendations with the college's campus master plan — its currency, its reported renovation, replacement, and demolition priorities, and whether preservation dollars are being directed into buildings the plan flags for removal.

7.1 Master-plan currency

Campus	Most recent full plan	Most recent update
Main Campus	2005	2014

Per the 2025 pre-survey input. The full plan is two decades old and the last update is more than a decade old; a refresh would strengthen the basis for the renovation-versus-replacement decisions discussed below.

7.2 Reported capital priorities

The college identified the following renovation and replacement priorities in its pre-survey input:

Building flagged for renovation	Largest program deficiency or need
East Building	Modernize — improve instructional infrastructure
West Building	Change — instructional areas expand or contract
Technology Center	Future growth — new programs planned in building

Renovation priorities.

Building flagged for replacement	Largest program deficiency or need
Horticulture (H01)	Poor configuration — inefficient space use
Horticulture (H02)	Poor configuration — inefficient space use
Child Care 1	Poor configuration — programs cannot function in space
Child Care 2	Poor configuration — programs cannot function in space

Replacement priorities. No buildings are flagged for planned demolition.

7.3 Alignment assessment

The 2027 capital plan aligns well with the master plan's stated direction. All three renovation-flagged buildings — East, West, and the Technology Center — carry the funded and deferred preservation work, which is appropriate: these buildings are being preserved and reconfigured, not removed, so repairing their envelopes, mechanical systems, and accessibility is consistent with their planned future. Conversely, none of the four replacement-flagged buildings (the two Horticulture buildings and Child Care 1 and 2) receives any preservation funding, which correctly avoids investing in structures the plan intends to replace. That alignment is reinforced by the college's reported demolition of all eight Child Care buildings: the structures the plan flagged for replacement are, in the Child Care case, already gone. The principal caveat is the age of the plan itself — a 2005 plan last updated in 2014 — which means the renovation-versus-replacement

judgments for the East and West Buildings, now deteriorating rapidly, would benefit from being revisited in an updated master plan.

8. MAINTENANCE CAPACITY SNAPSHOT

This section reports the college's maintenance staffing, the derived coverage and cost-per-GSF metrics benchmarked against statewide and industry figures, and the capital-reinvestment context for the identified need.

8.1 Maintenance staffing

Position (DOP classification)	Hrs/week	Est. annual cost
Facilities Operations Maintenance Specialist	40	$96,180
Maintenance Mechanic 2	40	$89,508
Maintenance Mechanic 2	40	$89,508
Maintenance Mechanic 2	40	$76,032
Maintenance Custodian	10	$15,027
Maintenance Custodian	5	$7,505
Total — 4.4 FTE	**175**	**$373,760**

In-house maintenance roster per the 2025 pre-survey input (salary plus benefits). The college is awaiting confirmation that this roster remains current.

8.2 Coverage and cost benchmarks

Metric	Lake Washington	Benchmark / comparison
In-house maintenance FTE	4.4	—
Equivalent contract FTE	1.9	—
Combined total FTE	6.3	State avg 10.1 · IFMA 8.7 · ASU 8
GSF per combined FTE	78,140	State avg 74,279 · IFMA 57,471 · ASU 79,293
Total maintenance cost	$609,760	—
Maintenance cost per GSF	$1.24	State avg $1.48
APPA self-rating	Managed Care	Level 3 of 5

Total maintenance cost combines the 2025 in-house staff cost ($373,760) with the outside-contract ($163,000) and materials ($73,000) figures carried forward from the 2023 cycle. GSF/FTE and cost/GSF use the full surveyed area (492,285 GSF). State, IFMA, and ASU benchmarks are from the 2023 report.

Lake Washington runs a lean maintenance organization. Its combined effort of 6.3 FTEs is well below the statewide weighted average of 10.1, yet it covers about 78,140 GSF per combined FTE — more area per worker than the statewide average (74,279) and the IFMA benchmark (57,471), and close to the ASU figure (79,293). Total maintenance cost works out to $1.24 per square foot, below the statewide average of $1.48, and the organization rates itself at the APPA 'Managed Care' level (3 of 5). One adjustment sharpens the

picture: the coverage ratio is computed on the full 492,285 GSF, which includes the nine structures the college reports as demolished or sold. Measured against the active portfolio (roughly 462,754 GSF), coverage is closer to 73,500 GSF per combined FTE — nearer the statewide average and a more accurate reflection of the area being maintained.

9. DECARBONIZATION AND CLEAN BUILDINGS COMPLIANCE

Washington's Clean Buildings Performance Standard (CBPS), administered by the Department of Commerce under RCW 19.27A, is a binding constraint on how the college's larger buildings are operated and re-equipped — a set of deadlines attached to specific buildings, backed by penalties, and overlapping the lighting, electrical, and envelope work already in this report's deferred backlog. This section maps which buildings are covered, when each must comply, and how the deferred renewal can be sequenced so required repairs and required decarbonization are funded as one effort.

9.1 The Clean Buildings Performance Standard

The standard applies in two tiers by gross floor area. Tier 1 covers nonresidential buildings of 50,000 GSF and larger and imposes a measured energy-use-intensity (EUI) target plus 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 phase, requires benchmarking, an energy-management plan, and an operations-and-maintenance program. Compliance dates are staggered by building size:

Tier	Building size (GSF)	First compliance date	First-phase obligation
Tier 1	Over 220,000	June 1, 2026	EUI target + benchmarking + EMP + O&M
Tier 1	90,001 – 220,000	**June 1, 2027**	EUI target + benchmarking + EMP + O&M
Tier 1	50,001 – 90,000	**June 1, 2028**	EUI target + benchmarking + EMP + O&M
Tier 2	20,001 – 50,000	**July 1, 2027**	Benchmarking + EMP + O&M (EUI target later)

Bold rows are the deadlines that fall on Lake Washington. No building exceeds 220,000 GSF, so no June 1, 2026 deadline has elapsed; the East Building (214,827 GSF) is the only building in the 90,001–220,000 band, with a June 1, 2027 deadline inside the immediate biennium. Non-compliance penalties run up to $5,000 plus $1.50 per square foot annually until conformance; Commerce has offered early-adopter incentives on the order of $0.85 per square foot (Tier 1) and $0.30 per square foot (Tier 2).

9.2 Covered buildings

Five inventoried buildings exceed the 20,000 GSF coverage floor — four active Tier 1 buildings and the Tier 2 Redmond Campus, which the college reports as sold. The table pairs each with the building-specific deferred backlog identified in Section 4.

Building	GSF	Tier	Compliance date	Deferred backlog in building
East Building	214,827	1	June 1, 2027	**$2,082,000**
West Building	89,967	1	June 1, 2028	**$256,000**
Allied Health Building	83,700	1	June 1, 2028	—

Building	GSF	Tier	Compliance date	Deferred backlog in building
Technology Center	60,000	1	June 1, 2028	**$173,000**
Redmond Campus (sold)	20,491	2	July 1, 2027	—
Active covered total (4 Tier 1)	**448,494**			**$2,511,000**

Deferred figures are building-specific items from Section 4.1. Allied Health carries no deferred deficiency; the Redmond Campus is reported sold and is excluded from the active total. The campus-wide lighting conversion (D23, $752,000) is not allocated to individual buildings here but falls largely within these covered buildings — additional EUI opportunity beyond the $2,511,000 shown.

9.3 Aligning capital renewal with compliance

The central observation is that the college's deferred backlog and its Clean Buildings obligations are largely the same scope of work seen from two directions. The four active covered buildings carry $2,511,000 of building-specific deferred deficiencies, and the items that most directly move the EUI needle are the deferred ones:

Lighting and controls — the campus-wide fluorescent-to-LED conversion (D23, $752,000) is the lowest-cost, highest-certainty EUI reduction in the portfolio and the measure an energy-management plan typically identifies first. Because it spans the covered buildings, specifying it as LED-with-controls advances compliance across the whole covered set rather than in a single building.

Envelope renewal with added insulation — the East Building roof (funded, $2,507,000) and the deferred West storefronts (D12/D13, $197,000) are envelope projects; specifying improved insulation and high-performance glazing at the point of replacement contributes to the EUI target at no capital event beyond the work already required.

Electrical service at the East Building — the East Building is the keystone of the covered set: a Tier 1 building with the earliest deadline (June 1, 2027) carrying a $2,507,000 funded roof plus $2,082,000 of deferred work led by the obsolete switchgear (D28, $814,000). The switchgear replacement is a reliability project rather than an EUI measure, but doing it alongside the building's benchmarking and energy-management work avoids a second mobilization and positions any future electrification.

Because lighting obsolescence, equipment age, and envelope condition force these projects within the same window as the compliance deadlines, the efficient path is to specify the deferred lighting as LED-with-controls and the re-roofs and storefronts for improved thermal performance, rather than as like-for-like work. This converts spending the college must make anyway into Clean Buildings progress and positions the covered buildings for the early-adopter incentive instead of penalty exposure — particularly the East Building, whose deadline arrives first.

9.4 Compliance pathway

Washington offers a distinct route, under HB 1390 and RCW 19.27A.260, for campuses that heat and cool their buildings from a central plant through a shared thermal loop — a district energy system — substituting a phased central-plant decarbonization plan for building-by-building EUI compliance. The 2026 condition record shows that Lake Washington does *not* operate such a system: each covered building has its own distributed equipment — rooftop packaged units at the East, West, and Technology Center buildings, variable-refrigerant heat recovery at Allied Health, and boilers with VAV at the (sold) Redmond Campus — with no campus-wide thermal loop. The district-energy pathway is therefore unavailable, and the covered

buildings comply individually on the schedule in Section 9.2. The East Building's June 1, 2027 deadline is the binding near-term constraint, and the lighting and envelope sequencing in Section 9.3 is the practical route to meeting it.

10. APPENDIX: BUILDING CONDITION DETAIL

This appendix gives the 20-component condition breakdown for each surveyed building — component, rating (0–5), base weight, weighted score, and surveyor comment — ordered worst overall score first. Each table is reference data with no narrative.

Child Care 2 — condition score 463

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	25	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	42	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	3	8	25	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	2	10	21	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	3	6	19	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	5	10	52	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	5	10	52	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	31	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
Building condition score (total)			**463**	

Child Care 7 — condition score 459

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	2	8	17	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	42	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	3	8	25	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	3	10	31	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	13	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	5	10	52	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	5	10	52	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	31	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
Building condition score (total)			**459**	

Child Care 3 — condition score 457

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	4	8	33	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	42	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	4	8	33	T1-11 plywood

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Roofing	1	10	10	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	5	10	52	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	5	10	52	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	31	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
Building condition score (total)			**457**	

Child Care 6 — condition score 457

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	25	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	42	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	3	8	25	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	2	10	21	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	Gypsum board

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	5	10	52	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	5	10	52	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	31	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
Building condition score (total)			**457**	

Child Care 1 — condition score 453

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	25	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	42	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	3	8	25	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	1	10	10	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	3	6	19	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	5	10	52	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	5	10	52	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	31	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
Building condition score (total)			**453**	

Child Care 4 — condition score 448

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	2	8	17	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	42	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	3	8	25	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	2	10	21	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in fluorescent lighting

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Life/Safety	5	10	52	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	5	10	52	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	31	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
Building condition score (total)			**448**	

Child Care 5 — condition score 448

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	2	8	17	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	42	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	3	8	25	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	2	10	21	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	3	6	19	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	25	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	5	10	52	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	5	10	52	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Maintenance	3	7	22	
Remaining Life	5	6	31	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	31	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	5	6	31	
Building condition score (total)			**448**	

Horticulture (H01) — condition score 420

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	27	Univent heat pump
Structure	3	8	27	Wood frame
Exterior Closure	3	8	27	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	3	10	34	3-tab composition shingle-1999
Floor Finishes	1	6	7	Carpet
Wall Finishes	2	6	14	Wood and gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	14	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	20	Exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	0	8	0	
Electrical	2	8	18	200amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	3	8	27	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	3	10	34	
Fire Safety	4	10	45	No alarm or sprinklers
Modifications	0	7	0	None evident
Maintenance	3	7	24	
Remaining Life	5	6	34	Constructed as temporary structure
Appearance	4	6	27	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Insulation	3	6	20	
Glazing	3	6	20	
Building condition score (total)			**420**	

East Building — condition score 418

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	Rooftop HVAC units w electric reheat VAV; new VAV units in 06; rooftop units failing-funded in 2011, 2015 & 2019; all main units funded 2019 & 2021
Structure	2	8	16	Concrete
Exterior Closure	4	8	32	Concrete; minor cracking throughout exterior
Roofing	5	10	50	PVC single-ply; walking pads are shredded and need replacement
Floor Finishes	3	6	18	Concrete; carpet and carpet tile; sheet vinyl; hardwood; quarry tile; ceramic tile; vinyl tile
Wall Finishes	3	6	18	Concrete; gypsum board; ceramic tile; plastic panels; CMU
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Concrete; gypsum board; lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	2	6	12	Interior wood doors w HM frames and HM doors/frames; exterior HM doors/frames; coiling doors
Elevators	3	6	18	2 stop
Plumbing	3	8	24	Copper, cast iron, steel, ABS and galvanized piping; porcelain fixtures; deteriorating steel pipe compressed air loop
Electrical	3	8	24	2500amp 480/277v - 4ea.
Lights/Power	4	8	32	Hanging, lay-in, recessed can, and strip fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	4	10	40	Some bathrooms not accessible
Fire Safety	1	10	10	Fire alarm panel new in 2011
Modifications	1	7	7	A series of interior renovations since 2005 have been well constructed

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	4	6	24	Building is structurally very sound; interior upgrades made on continuing basis
Appearance	5	6	30	
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	4	6	24	Operable transom units
Building condition score (total)			**418**	

Horticulture (H02) — condition score 405

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	9	Univent heat pump
Structure	3	8	27	Wood frame
Exterior Closure	3	8	27	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	2	10	23	3-tab composition shingle-1999
Floor Finishes	1	6	7	carpet; sheet vinyl
Wall Finishes	2	6	14	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	14	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	20	Interior wood doors/frames; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	None
Plumbing	1	8	9	Copper, cast iron and galvanized piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	2	8	18	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	3	8	27	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	3	10	34	
Fire Safety	4	10	45	
Modifications	0	7	0	None evident
Maintenance	2	7	16	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Remaining Life	5	6	34	Designed as temporary structure; limited life expectancy
Appearance	4	6	27	
Insulation	3	6	20	
Glazing	5	6	34	
Building condition score (total)			**405**	

Child Care 8 — condition score 379

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	9	Electric heat univents with ventilation
Structure	5	8	44	Wood frame; pier block foundations
Exterior Closure	3	8	27	T1-11 plywood
Roofing	2	10	22	3-tab composition shingles-1999
Floor Finishes	1	6	7	Vinyl flooring
Wall Finishes	1	6	7	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	3	6	20	Lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	1	6	7	Exterior HM door/frame
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	0	8	0	Copper, cast iron, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	9	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	9	Lay-in fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	4	10	44	City has identified code violations in building
Fire Safety	3	10	33	
Modifications	1	7	8	None evident
Maintenance	2	7	15	
Remaining Life	5	6	33	Constructed as temporary structures
Appearance	5	6	33	
Insulation	3	6	20	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Glazing	5	6	33	
Building condition score (total)			**379**	

Greenhouse 2 — condition score 375

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	32	Forced air gas heaters
Structure	2	8	21	Metal framing
Exterior Closure	4	8	43	Lexan panels
Roofing	4	10	54	Plastic sheeting
Floor Finishes	3	6	24	Asphalt paving
Wall Finishes	0	6	0	Lexan panels
Ceiling Finishes	0	6	0	Plastic sheeting
Doors & Hardware	3	6	24	Wood exterior doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	1 story
Plumbing	3	8	32	Copper piping and PVC; no fixtures
Electrical	2	8	21	100amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	2	8	21	Ceiling-mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	13	
Fire Safety	1	10	13	Served from adjacent greenhouse
Modifications	0	7	0	None evident
Maintenance	2	7	19	
Remaining Life	4	6	32	Largely rebuilt in 2000; at least 25 years of remaining life
Appearance	3	6	24	
Insulation	0	6	0	No insulation
Glazing	0	6	0	No glazing

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Building condition score (total)			375	

West Building — condition score 330

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	Rooftop packaged HVAC units w electric VAV boxes; overhauled system 19-21
Structure	3	8	24	Concrete
Exterior Closure	5	8	40	EIFS cladding system; metal panels; minor cracking throughout EIFS
Roofing	3	10	30	Single-ply PVC; recondition oldest portion funded for reconditioning 21-23
Floor Finishes	2	6	12	Carpet-wear in number of classrooms; vinyl tile; ceramic tile; carpet tile; concrete
Wall Finishes	3	6	18	Gypsum board; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	12	Lay-in tile; gypsum board; direct adhered tile; wood strips
Doors & Hardware	2	6	12	Interior HM doors/frames and wood doors w HM frames-some sidelites; exterior HM doors/frames; metal coiling doors
Elevators	4	6	24	4 stop; pump replacement funded 21-23
Plumbing	3	8	24	Copper, cast iron, steel, galvanized, and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	3	8	24	3000amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, recessed can, wall-mount, ceiling-mount and hanging strip fluorescent lighting; HPS wall-mount lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	All interior room modifications are well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	3	6	18	
Appearance	1	6	6	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Insulation	2	6	12	
Glazing	4	6	24	
Building condition score (total)			**330**	

Greenhouse 1 — condition score 241

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	32	Gas unit heaters; ventilation fans; hydronic table heaters
Structure	1	8	11	Metal framing
Exterior Closure	2	8	21	Lexan panels
Roofing	2	10	27	Lexan panels
Floor Finishes	3	6	24	Asphalt paving
Wall Finishes	0	6	0	Lexan panels
Ceiling Finishes	0	6	0	Lexan panels
Doors & Hardware	2	6	16	Exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	1 story
Plumbing	1	8	11	Copper piping; no fixtures
Electrical	1	8	11	200amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	11	Ceiling-mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	13	
Fire Safety	1	10	13	
Modifications	0	7	0	No modifications since construction
Maintenance	2	7	19	
Remaining Life	2	6	16	
Appearance	2	6	16	
Insulation	0	6	0	No insulation
Glazing	0	6	0	No glazing

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Building condition score (total)			**241**	

Technology Center — condition score 204

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	Rooftop packaged A/C units w electric VAV heating; reconditioning and replacements 2021-23
Structure	1	8	8	Concrete; steel frame; concrete slab
Exterior Closure	2	8	16	Metal panels; stucco; glass block; soffit tile; very problematic; enclosure improvements & repairs funded 2019 & 2021
Roofing	3	10	30	Single-ply PVC; standing seam metal panels; glass skylights
Floor Finishes	2	6	12	Carpet; slate tile; ceramic tile; bare concrete
Wall Finishes	2	6	12	Gypsum board; ceramic tile; glass block
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile; gypsum board; direct adhered tile
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior HM doors w glass inserts/HM frames; exterior HM and aluminum doors/frames
Elevators	2	6	12	4 stop; doors sometimes bind
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel, ABS and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	300amp 480/277v; emergency generator
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, hanging strip and recessed can fluorescent lights
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	Problematic "dry sprinkler system"
Modifications	1	7	7	All interior room modifications are well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	2	6	12	
Glazing	2	6	12	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Building condition score (total)			**204**	

Redmond Campus — condition score 178

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	2 HW boilers; VAV w heat coils; DX rooftop packaged A/C units
Structure	1	8	8	Steel; brick; concrete slab
Exterior Closure	2	8	16	Brick; metal architectural panels; stucco; window walls
Roofing	1	10	10	PVC single-ply membrane; standing seam metal panels
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Slate tile; carpet-some wear; bare concrete
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in ceiling tile; steel deck pan; gypsum board
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood, laminate and HM doors w HM frames; exterior aluminum doors/frames and HM doors/frames
Elevators	1	6	6	2 stop
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel, ABS and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1000amp 480/208v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, wall mount, hanging and recessed can fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	None evident
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Very well constructed; should have 40+ yr. Life
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	3	6	18	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Building condition score (total)			**178**	

Allied Health Building — condition score 152

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	Variable refrigerant heat pump split system; AHU w heat recovery; 100% outside air
Structure	1	8	8	Steel frame
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Brick; aluminum window walls
Roofing	1	10	11	TPO single-ply
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Terrazzo - some cracking; ceramic tile; carpet tile; rolled rubber sheet flooring
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; ceramic tile; wood strips; wood panels; tackable wall cover; acoustic panels
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile; gypsum board; wood strips
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood doors w sidelites and HM frames, and HM doors/frames; exterior aluminum and HM doors/frames; coiling door
Elevators	1	6	6	3 stop
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel, ABS and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures; air blade dryers; medical air system
Electrical	1	8	8	2500amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Hanging strip; recessed can and wall-mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	0	7	0	None
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Well constructed building; good quality, wearable materials
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	1	6	6	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. score	Comment
Glazing	1	6	6	
Building condition score (total)			**152**	