COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Washington State Board

WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

2026 Capital Planning Facility Report

State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Facility Condition Survey — 2025 Cycle
Minor Works Preservation — 2027–2029 Biennium Capital Request

Portfolio	16 structures · 476,911 GSF; 12 surveyed — 322,218 GSF
Weighted-avg condition	215 (Adequate)
2027 preservation request	$1,400,000
Total 2027–2029 Minor Works	$3,300,000
Deferred preservation backlog	$4,345,000

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary 4
   Capital planning headlines 4
   Headline Numbers 5
   Capital Outlook 5
2. College Portfolio Overview 7
   Building inventory 7
   Unscored Structures 7
3. Capital Planning Roadmap 9
   3.1 Immediate biennium (2027–2029 request) 9
   3.2 Mid-term (next biennium plus one, 2029–2033) 9
   3.3 Long-term (7–10+ years, 2033 and beyond) 9
   3.4 Cross-cutting system themes 10
4. Deficiency Inventory and Findings 12
   4.1 Summary table 12
      Distribution Observations 13
   4.2 Findings detail 13
      D01 — Elevator, Kelly Hall (Main Campus) 13
      D02 — Fire alarm panel, Multiple (Main Campus) 14
      D03 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus) 14
      D04 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus) 15
      D05 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus) 15
      D06 — Elevator, Laidlaw Center (Main Campus) 16
      D07 — Site pavers, Site (Main Campus) 16
      D08 — Roof, Roe Studio (Main Campus) 17
      D09 — Fire sprinkler riser, Laidlaw Center (Main Campus) 17
      D10 — Lighting controls, Multiple (Main Campus) 18
      D11 — Envelope, Cascade Hall (Main Campus) 18
      D12 — Envelope, Heiner Center (Main Campus) 19
      D13 — Security access controls, Multiple (Main Campus) 19
      D14 — Boiler, Syre Student Center (Main Campus) 20
      D15 — Boilers, Heiner Center (Main Campus) 20
      D16 — Air handling unit, Heiner Center (Main Campus) 21
      D17 — Rooftop units, Cascade Hall (Main Campus) 21
      D18 — Envelope, Kelly Hall (Main Campus) 22

D19 — Condensing unit, Syre Student Center (Main Campus) 22
D20 — Stormwater detention pond, Site (Main Campus) 23
D21 — Stormwater detention pond, Site (Main Campus) 23
D22 — Stormwater detention pond, Site (Main Campus) 24
D23 — Envelope, Baker Hall (Main Campus) 24
D24 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus) 25
D25 — Shading system, Syre Student Center (Main Campus) 25
5. Building Profiles 27
Baker Hall (210-888) — condition score 273 27
Cascade Hall (210-777) — condition score 254 27
Laidlaw Center (210-999) — condition score 254 28
Heiner Center (210-666) — condition score 232 28
Syre Student Center (210-333) — condition score 228 28
Kelly Hall (210-444) — condition score 206 29
Roe Studio (210-111) — condition score 170 29
6. Infrastructure Systems 31
7. Master Plan Alignment 32
Master planning currency 32
Reported capital priorities 32
8. Maintenance Capacity Snapshot 33
9. Decarbonization and Clean Buildings Compliance 34
9.1 The Clean Buildings Performance Standard 34
9.2 Whatcom's Included Buildings 34
9.3 Aligning capital renewal with compliance 35
9.4 Compliance pathway 35
10. Appendix: Building Condition Detail 37

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report covers Whatcom Community College for the 2025 SBCTC Facility Condition Survey cycle, which informs the college's Minor Works Preservation capital budget request for the 2027–2029 biennium. The 2025 survey identified **25 capital deficiencies**. Of the 23 carrying capital cost estimates (**$5,745,000 in total**), **$1,400,000 across 6 projects** is included in the 2027 preservation request and **$4,345,000 across 17 projects** is deferred to future cycles; 2 further deficiencies were excluded from capital funding. Whatcom's 2027–2029 Minor Works request comprises preservation ($1,400,000), infrastructure ($342,000), program ($1,063,000), and Unanticipated Repair Fund ($495,000), together totaling **$3,300,000**.

Capital planning headlines

1. The 2027 preservation request is an obsolescence-and-access package, told in three system stories.

Elevators are $746,000 — 53% of the $1,400,000 request: the Kelly Hall elevator ($373,000) and the Laidlaw Center elevator ($373,000) both run controllers no longer supported by their manufacturers. The obsolete EST3 fire alarm platform is another $366,000 (26%), replacing panels, annunciators, and discontinued detection devices campus-wide in a phased program. The remaining $288,000 (21%) is three accessible-parking corrections — at Cascade Hall, the Pavilion, and the Syre Student Center — all driven by the college's Voluntary Compliance Plan under Title II of the ADA. All six included projects scored 81 in the survey.

2. The deferred backlog is 3.1 times the funded request, and it is envelope-led.

The 17 deferred projects total $4,345,000 — every one deferred for the same reason, below the budget threshold cutoff, and 16 of the 17 are designated Immediate in the survey. Envelope and roofing dominate at $1,879,000 across five buildings: the Cascade Hall envelope ($710,000), the Roe Studio roof ($663,000), the Kelly Hall envelope ($411,000), and smaller Heiner ($39,000) and Baker ($56,000) items, with the Cascade and Kelly scopes documented by 2025 Garland Company assessments. A late-1990s mechanical cohort adds $1,080,000: the Heiner boilers and air handler ($372,000), the Syre boiler and walk-in condensing unit ($449,000), and the first phased tranche of Cascade rooftop units ($259,000). These two blocks define the 2029–2031 ask.

3. Three unsupported control platforms span the campus.

The survey found obsolescence at the platform level, not just the equipment level: the EST3 fire alarm system ($366,000, included in the 2027 request), the Niagara AX lighting-control platform ($311,000, deferred — unsupported since July 1, 2021, with JACE controllers that cannot be upgraded), and the Transact security access-control system (excluded from capital funding; the survey defers it to the college). The 2025–2027 biennium already replaced three failing lighting control panels (Heiner, Kulshan, Laidlaw); platform-level replacement is the remaining work.

4. The portfolio is in strong condition — the planning question is trajectory, not triage.

All 12 surveyed buildings rate Superior or Adequate; the GSF-weighted average is 215, and no building falls below Adequate — a position most SBCTC campuses do not hold. But scores are essentially flat since 2023 (11 of 12 buildings unchanged), and the 1985–1991 trio — Cascade Hall (254), Laidlaw Center (254), and Baker Hall (273) — sits in the upper Adequate band. Baker is 3 points below the Needs Improvement

threshold. The deferred envelope and mechanical work is concentrated in exactly these aging buildings plus the late-1990s cohort behind them.

Headline Numbers

Metric	Value
Total structures (FPMT inventory)	16
Total portfolio GSF	476,911
Buildings surveyed (condition rating)	12 (4 unscored)
Weighted-average condition score (surveyed)	215 (Adequate)
Buildings rated below “Adequate”	0 of 12
Total deficiencies identified (2025 FCS)	25
2027 preservation request	$1,400,000 (6 projects)
Deferred preservation backlog	$4,345,000 (17 projects)
Excluded deficiencies	2
2027 infrastructure request	$342,000
2027 program request	$1,063,000
2027 URF request	$495,000
Total 2027–2029 Minor Works request	$3,300,000
Prior biennium funded (2025–2027, all categories)	$4,075,000
Buildings under Clean Buildings Standard (within horizon)	9 (filed as one Tier 1 campus; compliant)

Capital Outlook

Immediate biennium (2027–2029). A Minor Works request of $3,300,000: preservation of $1,400,000 across 6 projects (every project scored 81 — two obsolete elevators, the EST3 fire alarm platform, and three ADA parking corrections), infrastructure of $342,000 (one storm line at Kulshan Hall), program of $1,063,000 (classroom upgrades in Kelly, Baker, and Cascade — the second phase of a program begun in 2025–2027), and URF of $495,000. The preservation request is modest by system standards: $1,400,000 against a system-wide college average of $2,840,941, with 6 projects against an average of 6.6 (2025 FCS budget summary).

Mid-term (4–6 years, 2029–2033). The $4,345,000 deferred backlog defines the next ask. Envelope and roofing lead at $1,879,000 across five buildings, followed by the late-1990s mechanical cohort ($1,080,000 — Heiner and Syre boilers, the Heiner air handler, and phased Cascade rooftop units), campus site pavers ($596,000), the Niagara AX lighting-controls platform ($311,000), stormwater pond reconditioning ($196,000), and smaller items. Because 16 of 17 deferred items are designated Immediate and were deferred only on budget threshold, most of this backlog should be expected to escalate into the 2029–2031 request.

Long-term (7–10+ years, 2033 and beyond). The master plan’s three renovation candidates are the long-horizon anchors: Cascade Hall (1985, flagged for modernization — and carrying the largest deferred envelope item plus a roughly 30-unit rooftop HVAC fleet on a phased replacement track), and Laidlaw Center and Heiner Center (both flagged for program change). The IMP envisioned project 9 as an expansion of Kelly Hall. The college now has that project in design as the Technology & Engineering Center (TEC), a stand-alone

building next to Kelly. The 2027 program request will address some of Kelly Hall's renovation needs. Underground infrastructure carries roughly $1,478,000 of future-cycle items — storm and sewer lines and vaults, fire-system water lines, a retention pond, and the Laidlaw primary switchgear, which is already past its expected life.

Clean Buildings compliance. Nine buildings exceed the 20,000 GSF coverage floor of the Clean Buildings Performance Standard. The college filed all nine as one campus under a single Tier 1 application and reports that it is compliant and current. A separate Tier 2 application seeks incentive dollars and is redundant for compliance. The deferred Heiner and Syre boiler replacements are the portfolio's clearest electrification decision points. The Niagara AX controls replacement is the energy-management infrastructure behind the campus filing. Section 9 develops the mapping.

2. COLLEGE PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW

Whatcom Community College operates a single main campus on a 73-acre site in the Cordata area of northeast Bellingham, in operation since the first owned facility — Laidlaw Center — was completed in 1987 (2023 FCS report). The campus holds 16 structures totaling 476,911 GSF. The core is a ring of mid-sized instructional buildings of 23,000–54,000 GSF each: the 1985–1991 group (Cascade Hall, Laidlaw Center, Baker Hall), the 1995–2001 group (Pavilion, Heiner Center, Kelly Hall, Syre Student Center), and the 2005 pair (Kulshan Hall, Roe Studio). Two large 2020 buildings — Cedar Hall, an 89,023 GSF residence hall, and the 65,328 GSF Learning Commons — are the newest additions and were not condition-rated this cycle. The college shares identical geographic boundaries with Bellingham Technical College.

Building inventory

Building	State ID	GSF	Built	Reno.	Score	Rating	Predominant use
Baker Hall	210-888	14,603	1991	—	**273**	Adequate	Instructional
Kelly, Cooling Tower	210-444(A)	396	1998	1998	**268**	Adequate	Operations — mechanical
Cascade Hall	210-777	41,520	1985	1994	**254**	Adequate	Instructional
Laidlaw Center	210-999	53,511	1987	2001	**254**	Adequate	Instructional / administrative
Heiner Center	210-666	43,210	1997	—	**232**	Adequate	Instructional / enrollment services
Syre Student Center	210-333	36,696	2001	—	**228**	Adequate	Instructional / student support
Kelly Hall	210-444	23,250	1998	—	**206**	Adequate	Instructional / childcare
Pavilion	210-555	41,974	1995	2015	**173**	Superior	Instructional / student recreation
Roe Studio	210-111	8,813	2005	—	**170**	Superior	Instructional
Kulshan Hall	210-222	43,299	2005	—	**160**	Superior	Instructional
Auxiliary Services Building	210-ASB	13,946	2013	—	**146**	Superior	Campus operations
Auxiliary Services Building-Storage	210-ASB(A)	1,000	2013	—	**146**	Superior	Operations shop — grounds
Portfolio (surveyed, GSF-weighted)		**322,218**			**215**	**Adequate (avg)**	

Score = 2025 canonical building condition score (BCS), computed from the CONDITION worksheet of the FCS workbook (lower is better). Rating bands follow the SBCTC scale in Section 4.1. Sorted worst to best. Single campus (Main Campus, 210A); campus column omitted. UFIs are listed in the FPMT inventory.

Unscored Structures

Four structures appear in the FPMT inventory but were not condition-rated this cycle. Cedar Hall is a 2020 residence hall — an enterprise activity with its own revenue source and therefore outside the capital-repair program. The Learning Commons is 2020 new construction that does not yet warrant a condition survey. The other two are minor support sheds. None carries a deficiency this cycle.

Structure	GSF	Built	Use / status
Cedar Hall	89,023	2020	Student residence hall — dormitory (enterprise)
Learning Commons	65,328	2020	Instructional / student support (new construction)
Kelly, Child Care Storage	173	1998	Program storage
Cedar Hall - Grounds Shed	169	2020	Operations shop — grounds

Age Profile

The portfolio falls into clear cohorts, and the cohorts map directly onto this cycle's deficiency list. The 1985–1991 group — Cascade Hall (1985, remodeled 1994), Laidlaw Center (1987, renovated 2001), and Baker Hall (1991) — holds the three weakest scores among the surveyed set (254, 254, 273) and carries most of the deferred envelope work. The 1995–2001 group — Pavilion (1995, renovated 2015), Heiner Center (1997), Kelly Hall (1998), and the Syre Student Center (2001) — is now 25–31 years old, and its original mechanical plant is aging out as a cohort: the Heiner and Syre boilers, the Heiner air handler, and both 2027-requested elevators sit in these buildings. The 2005 pair (Kulshan Hall, Roe Studio) scores Superior but Roe's roof is already rated Poor and deferred at $663,000. The 2013 Auxiliary Services buildings and the two 2020 buildings anchor the new end.

3. CAPITAL PLANNING ROADMAP

3.1 Immediate biennium (2027–2029 request)

The 2027 preservation ask of **$1,400,000 across 6 projects** is a package of obsolescence and access corrections rather than big-ticket renewal. Elevators lead: the Kelly Hall elevator and the Laidlaw Center elevator ($373,000 each — $746,000, 53% of the request), both original to their buildings with controllers no longer supported by their manufacturers. The phased replacement of the campus-wide EST3 fire alarm platform is $366,000 (26%). Three accessible-parking corrections — west of Cascade Hall ($90,000), the west Pavilion lot ($102,000), and at the Syre Student Center ($96,000) — complete the request at $288,000 (21%); all three are scheduled corrections under the college's Voluntary Compliance Plan. Every project included scored 81, and the request's average score of 81.0 sits well above the deferred set's 56.1. Beyond preservation, the 2027–2029 Minor Works request carries infrastructure of $342,000 (a storm-line replacement at Kulshan Hall), program of $1,063,000 (classroom upgrades in Kelly, Baker, and Cascade), and a $495,000 Unanticipated Repair Fund line, for a College Minor Works total of **$3,300,000**. Whatcom's preservation request is about half the system-wide college average ($1,400,000 against $2,840,941).

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

The **$4,345,000 deferred backlog across 17 projects** defines the mid-term ask. Every deferral was budget-threshold-driven, and 16 of the 17 items are designated Immediate in the survey, so escalation into the 2029–2031 request should be the planning assumption. By system:

Envelope and roofing — $1,879,000 in five buildings. The Cascade Hall tilt-up envelope (D11, $710,000) and the Kelly Hall masonry envelope (D18, $411,000) were both documented by 2025 Garland assessments as fair-to-poor with active moisture intrusion; the Roe Studio roof (D08, $663,000) is rated Poor with active leaks and code-deficient insulation. Smaller Heiner (D12, $39,000) and Baker (D23, $56,000) items round out the set. Baker is the only deficiency in the survey designated Deferrable — the surveyor benchmarks it for 2029–2031.

Late-1990s mechanical — $1,080,000. The Heiner boilers (D15, $262,000 — 25 to 27 years old by funding), the Heiner air handler (D16, $110,000, R-22), the Syre boiler package (D14, $433,000, leaking hydronic seals forcing year-round operation), the Syre walk-in condensing unit (D19, $16,000, R-22), and the first 13-unit tranche of Cascade rooftop units (D17, $259,000). These buildings' elevators and lighting panels have already been addressed across 2023–2027; the hydronic plant is next.

Site and controls. Campus site pavers (D07, $596,000 — roughly 20,000 SF of heaved surface, a trip-hazard and ADA item), the Niagara AX lighting-controls platform (D10, $311,000), the Laidlaw fire sprinkler riser (D09, $34,000), reconditioning of two detention ponds and one treatment wet pool (D20–D22, $196,000), and the Syre auditorium shading system (D25, $249,000).

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

Three long-horizon themes warrant attention now. First, **Cascade Hall** (1985) is the oldest building on campus and the master plan's modernization candidate. It carries the largest single deferred item (its $710,000 envelope), a fleet of roughly 30 rooftop HVAC units of which only the first 13 are in the deferred program, and this cycle's included ADA parking correction. Its envelope, mechanical fleet, and instructional-infrastructure modernization should be planned as one sequence rather than piecemeal. Second, **Kelly Hall**

no longer has a planned expansion. The IMP envisioned project 9 as an extension of Kelly Hall. The college now has that project in design as the TEC, a stand-alone building next to Kelly. The 2027 program request upgrades Kelly classrooms and supports the plan to backfill space that programs vacate when the TEC opens (2027–2029 program request). Kelly's deferred envelope (D18, $411,000) sits outside both projects, so it should compete in the 2029–2031 preservation request on its own merits. Third, **underground infrastructure renewal** — roughly $1,478,000 of future-cycle items in the infrastructure survey: storm lines and vaults ($520,000), the sewer line and vault ($351,000), the north retention pond ($183,000), fire-system water lines ($371,000), and the Laidlaw primary switchgear ($53,000), which is already past its expected life. The 2027 storm-line request is the first tranche of this program.

3.4 Cross-cutting system themes

Vertical transportation — a multi-biennium modernization program nearing completion. The 2023–2025 biennium funded elevator equipment in the Heiner Center and the Syre Student Center ($213,000 each); 2025–2027 funded the Syre elevator controls ($416,000); and the 2027 request carries the Kelly Hall and Laidlaw Center elevators ($746,000 combined) — the last two unsupported units in the pre-2005 buildings. Funding both completes the elevator renewal cycle for the older campus core.

ADA barrier removal under the Voluntary Compliance Plan. The three included parking corrections ($288,000) all cite the college's Voluntary Compliance Plan and Title II (28 CFR §35.150) and are scheduled for 2027–29 funding. The deferred site-paver reset (D07, $596,000) is the same accessibility-and-safety story at larger scale. One further parking finding, near the Health Professions Education Center, is recommended for undue-hardship documentation rather than construction (D24, excluded).

Platform obsolescence — fire alarm, lighting controls, security access. Three campus-wide control platforms are unsupported: EST3 fire alarm (D02, $366,000, included), Niagara AX lighting controls (D10, $311,000, deferred — the platform lost support July 1, 2021 and the JACE 600E controllers cannot be upgraded), and the Transact security access system (D13, excluded; the survey defers it to the college). The college's pre-survey input also flags the HB 1185 fluorescent-lamp phase-out, which will interact with any lighting-controls replacement. The 2025–2027 biennium replaced three failing lighting control panels (Heiner, Kulshan, Laidlaw); the remaining exposure is platform-level.

The late-1990s hydronic cohort. Heiner Center (1997) and the Syre Student Center (2001) carry original boiler plants now at or past end of life — $805,000 of deferred boiler, air-separator, expansion-tank, and air-handler work. Kelly Hall's heat exchangers and heat pumps were already funded in 2023–2025. By 2029–2031 the Heiner boilers will be 27–29 years old; this cohort is the core of the next preservation request and, as Section 9 notes, the natural electrification decision point.

R-22 refrigerant phase-out. Three deficiencies carry R-22 exposure: the Heiner air handler (D16 — the recommended refurbishment replaces all R-22 components), the Syre walk-in condensing unit (D19), and the Cascade rooftop fleet (D17 — the verbatim notes the units "likely use obsolete refrigerants"). This is a distributed, moderate exposure rather than a single-building crisis, and it resolves through the same phased replacements the deferred list already contains.

Envelope program. Five envelope or roof deficiencies totaling $1,879,000, concentrated in the 1985–1998 buildings and documented by 2025 Garland assessments at Cascade and Kelly. The 2025–2027 biennium funded the Laidlaw dryvit repair ($388,000) and multi-building glazing ($93,000); the deferred set is the remainder of a coherent campus envelope program.

Stormwater. Three stormwater pond deficiencies ($196,000, deferred) cover two detention ponds and one treatment wet pool. They sit alongside the 2027 infrastructure request (a $342,000 storm line at Kulshan

Hall) and roughly $703,000 of future-cycle storm lines, vaults, and pond work in the infrastructure survey. Stormwater is a coherent multi-cycle site program; the ponds trace to the college's 2012 comprehensive stormwater report and have been deferred since.

4. DEFICIENCY INVENTORY AND FINDINGS

Section 4.1 is a ranked navigation index with a rating-band legend and distribution notes. Section 4.2 reproduces the problem and repair descriptions verbatim from the 2025 survey — these are the authoritative record of what was identified and recommended and are not paraphrased.

4.1 Summary table

ID	Building	System	Component	DSc	BCS	Budget	Status
D01	Kelly Hall	D10 Vertical Transportation	Elevator	**81**	206	$373,000	**Included (2027)**
D02	Multiple	D40 Fire Protection	Fire alarm panel	**81**	215	$366,000	**Included (2027)**
D03	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Accessible parking	**81**	215	$96,000	**Included (2027)**
D04	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Accessible parking	**81**	215	$102,000	**Included (2027)**
D05	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Accessible parking	**81**	215	$90,000	**Included (2027)**
D06	Laidlaw Center	D10 Vertical Transportation	Elevator	**81**	254	$373,000	**Included (2027)**
D07	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Site pavers	**75**	215	$596,000	Deferred
D08	Roe Studio	B20 Exterior Closure	Roof	**72**	170	$663,000	Deferred
D09	Laidlaw Center	D40 Fire Protection	Fire sprinkler riser	**71**	254	$34,000	Deferred
D10	Multiple	D50 Electrical	Lighting controls	**71**	215	$311,000	Deferred
D11	Cascade Hall	B20 Exterior Closure	Envelope	**65**	254	$710,000	Deferred
D12	Heiner Center	B20 Exterior Closure	Envelope	**62**	232	$39,000	Deferred
D13	Multiple	F10 Special Construction	Security access controls	**61**	215	—	Excluded
D14	Syre Student Center	D30 HVAC	Boiler	**61**	228	$433,000	Deferred
D15	Heiner Center	D30 HVAC	Boilers	**61**	232	$262,000	Deferred
D16	Heiner Center	D30 HVAC	Air handling unit	**61**	232	$110,000	Deferred
D17	Cascade Hall	D30 HVAC	Rooftop units	**61**	254	$259,000	Deferred
D18	Kelly Hall	B20 Exterior Closure	Envelope	**57**	206	$411,000	Deferred
D19	Syre Student Center	D30 HVAC	Condensing unit	**51**	228	$16,000	Deferred
D20	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Stormwater detention pond	**41**	215	$88,000	Deferred
D21	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Stormwater detention pond	**41**	215	$88,000	Deferred

ID	Building	System	Component	DSc	BCS	Budget	Status
D22	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Stormwater detention pond	**41**	215	$20,000	Deferred
D23	Baker Hall	B20 Exterior Closure	Envelope	**41**	273	$56,000	Deferred
D24	Site	G20 Site Improvements	Accessible parking	**21**	215	—	Excluded
D25	Syre Student Center	F10 Special Construction	Shading system	**21**	228	$249,000	Deferred

DSc = deficiency score. BCS = 2025 canonical building condition score (Site/Multiple rows carry the portfolio weighted average, 215). Budget = MACC + soft costs. Status: "Included (2027)" = funded in the 2027 preservation request; "Deferred" = below this biennium's budget threshold cutoff; "Excluded" = not carried as a capital request (D13 is deferred to the college; D24 is recommended for undue-hardship documentation). All deferred items except D23 (Deferrable) and D24 (Future) are designated Immediate in the survey.

SBCTC condition-rating bands

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

Distribution Observations

Site records carry the most deficiencies — 9 of 25, spanning four accessible-parking findings, three stormwater ponds, the site pavers, and no single building. By dollars, B20 Exterior Closure dominates the deferred backlog at $1,879,000 across five buildings, followed by D30 HVAC at $1,080,000 concentrated in the Heiner Center, the Syre Student Center, and Cascade Hall. Among buildings, Cascade Hall holds the largest single deferred item (its $710,000 envelope) and $969,000 of deferred work in total; the Syre Student Center holds the most deferred deficiencies of any building (four, $698,000 with its adjacent parking correction funded). Of the 25 deficiencies, 6 are included in the 2027 request, 17 are deferred — all below the budget threshold cutoff — and 2 are excluded: the Transact security access system (D13, deferred to the college) and a minor parking-slope finding recommended for undue-hardship documentation (D24).

4.2 Findings detail

D01 — Elevator, Kelly Hall (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	$373,000
Bldg condition score	206	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D10 Vertical Transportation	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The elevator and its controls in Kelly Hall are outdated and in need of replacement. According to campus documentation, these components are no longer functioning reliably and are contributing to operational issues. The elevator system is original to the building and has exceeded its expected service life. Modernization is required to improve safety, accessibility, and compliance with current code. There is only one elevator in the building.

Repair Description

Replace the elevator and its controls in Kelly Hall to restore reliable and compliant elevator service.

D02 — Fire alarm panel, Multiple (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	$366,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D40 Fire Protection	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), System Use (50%)

Problem Description

The EST3 fire alarm control panels in multiple buildings at Whatcom Community College are approaching end-of-life status. While manufacturer Edwards continues to offer limited support, production of many EST3 components has ceased, and replacement parts are increasingly difficult to source. Several field devices and detectors in use are also part of discontinued product lines, including the third-generation Signature Series detectors, which have been officially phased out. This presents a growing risk to life safety system reliability across campus.

At the time of assessment, panels were identified in multiple buildings, including Cascade Hall and Kelly Hall, both constructed prior to 2000. These panels control fire detection devices campus-wide, including main control panels, remote annunciators, and field detection heads. Due to the age of these systems and the phased discontinuation of their components, the college cannot ensure timely repair or expansion of its fire alarm infrastructure in the event of partial failure. A phased replacement approach is recommended based on building priority, enrollment, and system condition. Headcount assumptions for detection devices are estimated based on building square footage and use type.

Repair Description

Replace obsolete EST3 fire alarm panels, annunciators, and detection devices in a phased approach. Prioritize buildings with the most critical system components or the highest occupancy.

D03 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus)

Image: See VCP

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	$96,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

At the Syre Student Center, the existing accessible parking and passenger loading zones do not meet slope requirements set by the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design, sections 502.1–502.4. The measured

slope in this location exceeds 4%, which exceeds the maximum 2% slope permitted for accessible parking spaces and access aisles. Additionally, there is no striped path connecting the parking area to an accessible building entrance, violating accessible route requirements under section 502.3 and section 206.4. The Voluntary Compliance Plan identifies this as a Title II non-compliance issue under 28 CFR §35.150, requiring correction to ensure equal program access. A new curb cut should be added to align with the relocated accessible stalls and crosswalk striping. The flatter grade near the corner offers a compliant location for the curb ramp, but an existing tree in that area may need to be removed to ensure proper construction and turning clearance. These modifications are scheduled for correction using 2027–29 capital funding.

Repair Description

Overlay the asphalt to reduce the parking slope to 2% or less. Add a new curb cut aligned with the relocated accessible aisle and crosswalk, removing the tree near the corner if necessary to ensure compliant access to the Syre Center entrance.

D04 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus)

Image: See VCP

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	$102,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The accessible parking spaces located on the west side of the Pavilion parking lot exceed the maximum slope requirements outlined in the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design, sections 502.1–502.4. Specifically, two accessible spaces have measured slopes exceeding 3%, which violates section 502.4 requiring surface slopes in accessible parking areas to not exceed 2% in any direction. The Voluntary Compliance Plan identifies this as a Title II non-compliance issue (28 CFR §35.150), scheduled for corrective action during the 2027–29 capital funding cycle. Although only two stalls are explicitly out of compliance, regrading those stalls in isolation would negatively impact drainage and adjacent stall slopes. To ensure proper grading, stormwater flow, and long-term ADA compliance, it is recommended that all six accessible spaces in this zone be regraded as a complete unit.

Repair Description

Overlay and regrade the entire accessible parking bay on the west side of the Pavilion lot to achieve compliant slopes of 2% or less. Adjust striping and drainage to ensure ADA compliance across all six stalls and maintain proper stormwater flow.

D05 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus)

Image: See VCP

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	$90,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The accessible parking and passenger loading zones on the west side of Cascade Hall do not comply with slope requirements outlined in the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design, sections 502.1–502.4. The slope exceeds 3% in four of the eight accessible stalls, violating section 502.4, which requires surface slopes in accessible parking spaces and aisles to be no more than 2% in any direction. Although only three accessible spaces are required in this lot, eight are currently designated, and four are noncompliant. To achieve compliance, all four noncompliant stalls require regrading. Additionally, access aisles should be reconfigured by converting adjacent 24-foot drive aisles into an 18-foot-wide access aisle aligned directly with the centerline of the building entrance doors. Existing signage is noncompliant with mounting height and location requirements under section 502.6. The old signage locations will require patching, and new signs must be installed with a minimum 60-inch clear height to ensure visibility over parked vehicles. This project is required under Title II of the ADA (28 CFR §35.150).

Repair Description

Regrade four noncompliant accessible stalls on the west side of Cascade Hall to achieve compliant slopes. Relocate and widen the access aisle, remove and patch old signage areas, and install new signs at 60 inches above grade in accordance with ADA section 502.6.

D06 — Elevator, Laidlaw Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	81	**Budget estimate**	$373,000
Bldg condition score	254	**Status**	Included in 2027 request
System	D10 Vertical Transportation	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The elevator in the LDC building is at the end of its useful life and requires full modernization. Based on vendor correspondence from the elevator manufacturer, the system's controls are outdated, and the elevator experiences frequent operational failures. The elevator controller and related drive components are no longer supported by the manufacturer and cannot be repaired or sourced. The system’s age, declining reliability, and parts obsolescence pose operational risks and accessibility issues for building occupants. A complete modernization is necessary to bring the elevator up to current code and performance standards.

Repair Description

Modernize the LDC elevator, including complete replacement of the controller, drive components, and all obsolete parts.

D07 — Site pavers, Site (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	75	**Budget estimate**	$596,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Deferred
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

Site pavers across the College's campus have heaved and become uneven, creating significant trip hazards and obstructing accessible pathways. The settlement and displacement of pavers affect approximately 20,000 square feet of hardscaped surfaces. These conditions compromise pedestrian safety and limit accessibility to key areas throughout the campus. Uneven surfaces can be particularly hazardous in high-traffic zones and during inclement weather. The 2023 facility condition survey identifies this as a priority safety concern. Addressing this issue is essential to maintain ADA compliance and reduce liability risks associated with campus walkways.

Repair Description

Reset or replace approximately 20,000 square feet of site pavers to restore a safe and accessible walking surface across campus.

D08 — Roof, Roe Studio (Main Campus)

Image: None

Deficiency score	72	**Budget estimate**	$663,000
Bldg condition score	170	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Facility Use (75%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (25%)

Problem Description

The roof on the Roe Building at the College is in poor condition and requires full replacement. The building has a 14,056-square-foot single-ply TPO roof system, installed in 2002, making it over 20 years old. Although the roof assembly was believed to be newer, multiple components—such as pipe boots—were manufactured before 1999, indicating some materials are more than 25 years old. The Garland assessment rated the roof's condition as "Poor" and documented widespread deficiencies. These include deteriorated detailing at perimeter flashings and scuppers, poor workmanship at counterflashings, and multiple areas where the membrane has worn through to the scrim, leaving the roof vulnerable to weather intrusion. Ponding water is present, particularly in roof valleys and lower sections, accelerating degradation at seams and flashings. Repairs have been attempted but are failing, and active water intrusion has resumed in multiple locations. The insulation below the membrane is 3.5-inch polyiso over a concrete deck, with an estimated R-value of 21—well below current Washington State Energy Code requirements of R-38.

Repair Description

Replace the 14,056-square-foot single-ply roofing system, including damaged insulation and flashings. Upgrade to a code-compliant roofing assembly that meets current energy and drainage standards.

> ***Note:*** *The finding describes a 14,056-square-foot roof installed in 2002. The college reports the actual roof area is about 9,000 square feet and will reconcile the Garland report. The FPMT inventory records Roe Studio at 8,813 GSF with a primary construction date of 2005. Recheck the $663,000 estimate and the installation date against the reconciled Garland report before design. The finding text is reproduced as written.*

D09 — Fire sprinkler riser, Laidlaw Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	71	**Budget estimate**	$34,000
Bldg condition score	254	**Status**	Deferred
System	D40 Fire Protection	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The fire sprinkler riser and backflow system in the LDC Building is obsolete and no longer compliant with current code. Specifically, some 90-degree pipe fittings violate code requirements that now prohibit abrupt directional changes in confined spaces. The riser assembly is outdated and not aligned with current seismic or accessibility standards. The mechanical room housing this equipment is approximately 6 ft. by 20 ft., with limited clearance, making reconfiguration and replacement complex. Engineering design will be required to accommodate code-compliant routing and clearances within the tight footprint.

Repair Description

Replace the obsolete fire sprinkler riser and backflow system with a code-compliant assembly. Include engineering to reconfigure pipe routing within the confined mechanical room.

D10 — Lighting controls, Multiple (Main Campus)

Image: None

Deficiency score	71	**Budget estimate**	$311,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Deferred
System	D50 Electrical	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), System Use (50%)

Problem Description

Lighting control systems across multiple campus buildings rely on the outdated Niagara AX platform, which is no longer supported as of July 1, 2021. The existing JACE controllers (primarily JACE 600E) and AX supervisor systems cannot be upgraded, modified, or expanded without full system replacement. License downgrades, driver updates, and AX-compatible replacement parts are no longer available. Continued use of AX-based systems creates risk for system failure, limits integration with newer energy management systems, and presents cybersecurity vulnerabilities. The college received a cost estimate from MacDonald-Miller for $250,000 to upgrade lighting controls and associated infrastructure to Niagara N4, which supports modern IP-based controls and ongoing vendor support.

Repair Description

Replace legacy Niagara AX-based lighting controls with Niagara N4 controllers and supervisor systems in multiple buildings.

D11 — Envelope, Cascade Hall (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	65	**Budget estimate**	$710,000
Bldg condition score	254	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate

Location	Exterior envelope	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The exterior envelope of the Cascade Building (constructed c.1994) consists of tilt-up concrete wall panels totaling approximately 22,000 sq. ft. According to a 2025 condition assessment, the wall system is in fair to poor condition. Multiple areas exhibit cracking and concrete spalling. Expansion and control joints are failing, with sealants peeling and separating from the wall system. These failures are allowing moisture to penetrate the building envelope, leading to blistering paint and potential water entrapment behind the coating. Aged sealants around the windows and at the parapet cap are also deteriorated. These deficiencies compromise moisture resistance and thermal performance and could lead to further damage if not addressed.

Repair Description

Repair and reseal all window perimeters, panel-to-panel joints, and parapet cap transitions. Repaint the entire envelope with a vapor-permeable coating to restore moisture protection.

> ***Note:*** *The verbatim finding states the Cascade Building was "constructed c.1994". The college reports that Cascade Hall was built in 1985, bought by the college in 1993, and significantly remodeled in 1994. The FPMT inventory matches the 1985 construction and 1993 purchase dates. The finding text is reproduced as written.*

D12 — Envelope, Heiner Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	62	**Budget estimate**	$39,000
Bldg condition score	232	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	South exterior elevation	**Priorities**	Health/Safety (25%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (75%)

Problem Description

At the Heiner Building, the south elevation of the exterior brick façade has a continuous void between the brick veneer and the interior structural wall. This cavity lacks drainage or weep vents, trapping moisture and exposing plumbing located within the wall cavity to freezing temperatures in winter. As a result, pipes are vulnerable to freeze damage, and the wall assembly lacks adequate thermal performance. The existing condition compromises the envelope's water tightness and energy efficiency. The south elevation is approximately 200 feet long and requires a full envelope evaluation to determine the extent of repair and protection needed.

Repair Description

Repair the south elevation brick veneer by adding weeps and drainage, installing insulation, and applying a new water-resistive barrier to protect piping and improve thermal performance.

D13 — Security access controls, Multiple (Main Campus)

Image: None

Deficiency score	61	**Budget estimate**	—
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Excluded
System	F10 Special Construction	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	System Use (100%)

Problem Description

The campus-wide security access control system is obsolete. The existing Transact-based door control hardware and software are no longer supported by the manufacturer. As a result, replacement components are not available, and system failures cannot be repaired. This poses a significant risk to building security, daily operations, and emergency response. The system has exceeded its useful life and must be replaced to maintain secure and reliable access control across all buildings and entry points.

Repair Description

Replace the obsolete Transact-based security access control system campus-wide with a supported, modern access control platform. Include new control hardware, door strikes, and centralized software.

D14 — Boiler, Syre Student Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	61	**Budget estimate**	$433,000
Bldg condition score	228	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Mechanical	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The boiler, air separator, expansion tank, and hydronic seals in the Syre Building are at the end of their service life and require full replacement. The existing system relies on Victaulic-style hydronic seals, which begin leaking when the system is cooled down. This forces the college to operate the boiler year-round, including during warmer months, leading to significant energy waste. The current configuration no longer functions reliably or efficiently and contributes to system leaks and ongoing operational challenges.

Repair Description

Replace the boiler, air separator, expansion tank, and all associated hydronic seals in the Syre Building.

D15 — Boilers, Heiner Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	61	**Budget estimate**	$262,000
Bldg condition score	232	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Mechanical	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The Heiner Building contains two Weil-McLain boilers that are 23 years old as of 2025. By the time funding is available, they will be 25 to 27 years old—well beyond typical service life for commercial hot water boilers. The equipment is considered obsolete and should be replaced. The system also includes an expansion tank that is difficult to access for maintenance. The college has expressed interest in relocating the tank to improve serviceability. The replacement scope should include both boilers, the air separator, and the expansion tank. An engineering evaluation will be required to support system redesign within the existing tight mechanical room footprint.

Repair Description

Replace both Weil-McLain boilers, air separator, and expansion tank. Relocate the expansion tank to improve access, including engineering support for redesign.

D16 — Air handling unit, Heiner Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	61	**Budget estimate**	$110,000
Bldg condition score	232	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Mechanical	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The air handling unit (AHU) serving the Heiner Building is nearing the end of its expected service life. The unit includes components that use R-22 refrigerant, which is now obsolete and no longer supported due to environmental regulations. Continued operation with R-22 is not viable, and many of the AHU's internal components are outdated or inefficient. Rather than full system replacement, a targeted refurbishment is recommended to extend the useful life of the AHU. This includes replacement of all R-22 components and associated condenser and coil elements. The goal is to restore functional performance while deferring major capital replacement.

Repair Description

Refurbish the air handling unit by replacing all components using R-22 refrigerant, including the condenser and coils.

D17 — Rooftop units, Cascade Hall (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	61	**Budget estimate**	$259,000
Bldg condition score	254	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The Cascade Building, constructed in the early 2000s, is served by nearly 30 rooftop HVAC units. Many of these units are between 20 and 30 years old and are reaching or have exceeded their expected service life. The oldest units are located on the south end of the building and show signs of age-related inefficiency and

wear. These units likely use obsolete refrigerants and do not meet current energy or environmental standards. A phased replacement approach is recommended to address the aging equipment while minimizing disruption to building operations. Refer to the air handling unit spreadsheet for details on unit capacities, locations, and refrigerant types.

Repair Description

Replace 13 of the oldest rooftop units on the south end of the Cascade Building as part of a phased replacement strategy during the 2027–2029 biennium.

> ***Note:*** *The finding states the Cascade Building was "constructed in the early 2000s". The college confirms the FPMT construction date of 1985 is correct. The college bought the building in 1993 and remodeled it in 1994. The college's pre-survey input separately reported 25 rooftop units at end of useful life. The finding text is reproduced as written.*

D18 — Envelope, Kelly Hall (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	57	**Budget estimate**	$411,000
Bldg condition score	206	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Exterior envelope	**Priorities**	Facility Use (25%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (75%)

Problem Description

Kelly Hall was assessed in August 2025 by The Garland Company. The exterior envelope is a combination of terra cotta masonry and EIFS/stucco. The envelope is in fair to poor condition and requires masonry restoration. Expansion and control joints, as well as sealant at window casings, are peeling and separating from the wall system, allowing moisture intrusion and vegetation growth. The original coating is failing in several locations. A previously applied masonry sealer or anti-graffiti coating at the base of the building has fogged, creating a white film over the lower 10 feet of façade. Vegetation is visible at multiple locations along the masonry, indicating long-term water infiltration and breakdown of the envelope system. Several large moisture pockets have formed behind the coating, causing visible peeling and decay.

Repair Description

Repair deteriorated areas of the masonry and stucco wall system at Kelly Hall. Reseal all expansion joints and window casings to restore the integrity of the building envelope.

D19 — Condensing unit, Syre Student Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	51	**Budget estimate**	$16,000
Bldg condition score	228	**Status**	Deferred
System	D30 HVAC	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	System Use (50%), Increased Operating Cost (50%)

Problem Description
The condensing unit serving the walk-in cooler in the Syre Building has reached the end of its useful life. The unit operates using R-22 refrigerant, which is now obsolete and no longer manufactured under EPA phaseout regulations. As a result, refrigerant availability is limited and expensive. Replacement is necessary to maintain food service operations and ensure energy efficiency and compliance with current refrigerant standards.

Repair Description
Replace the condensing unit for the walk-in cooler with a new unit that uses a compliant refrigerant.

D20 — Stormwater detention pond, Site (Main Campus)
Image: Link

Deficiency score	41	**Budget estimate**	$88,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Deferred
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	North parking lot	**Priorities**	Increased Operating Cost (100%)

Problem Description
The stormwater detention pond located in the north parking lot (Detention Pond One) has become overgrown with vegetation, retains excessive water, and has accumulated too much silt to function as designed. As a result, it cannot adequately convey and treat stormwater, which increases the risk of downstream water quality impacts. According to the campus-wide comprehensive stormwater report for Whatcom Community College (2012), this area is referred to as the “north parking extension, wet pool.” The report identifies the need for vegetation removal, sediment removal, and regrading at both the banks and pond bottom. The most recent facility condition survey (2023) lists stormwater system maintenance as an ongoing site concern and notes deferred maintenance due to resource constraints. The estimated cost for full reconditioning of the pond was $40,000 in 2013 dollars.

Repair Description
Repair the north parking lot stormwater detention pond by removing excess vegetation and sediment and regrading the pond banks and bottom to restore original function.

> ***Note:*** *The college reports that Detention Pond One sits just west of Cascade Hall, not in the north parking lot. The college also reports that the 2012 stormwater report’s “north parking extension, wet pool” description belongs to D22. The finding text is reproduced as written.*

D21 — Stormwater detention pond, Site (Main Campus)
Image: Link

Deficiency score	41	**Budget estimate**	$88,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Deferred
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Site	**Priorities**	Increased Operating Cost (100%)

Problem Description

Detention Pond Number Two is no longer functioning as designed. The pond is retaining excessive water and has accumulated silt, which compromises its ability to manage stormwater effectively. These conditions reduce the pond's treatment capacity and increase the risk of downstream impacts. The pond measures approximately 10,000 square feet and requires full reconditioning to restore performance and extend its useful life. This recommendation aligns with the campus-wide stormwater infrastructure assessment and supports continued environmental compliance.

Repair Description

Recondition Detention Pond Number Two by removing excess silt, regrading the pond bottom and side slopes, and restoring vegetation to support stormwater management.

> ***Note:*** *The college reports that Detention Pond Number Two sits between Cascade Hall and Kulshan Hall, central to the north side of campus. The finding text is reproduced as written.*

D22 — Stormwater detention pond, Site (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	41	**Budget estimate**	$20,000
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Deferred
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Site	**Priorities**	Increased Operating Cost (100%)

Problem Description

Detention Pond One is no longer functioning as designed. The pond retains excessive water due to accumulated silt and overgrown vegetation, which impedes flow and filtration. The system's reduced capacity and poor drainage threaten stormwater quality downstream. The original 2012 comprehensive stormwater report identifies this area as the "North Parking Extension Wet Pool" and recommends sediment removal, vegetation clearing, and regrading of the pond bottom and side banks to restore full detention functionality.

Repair Description

Recondition Detention Pond One by removing silt and vegetation, and regrade the pond to restore proper drainage and stormwater function.

> ***Note:*** *The college reports that this record describes Wetpool (treatment pond) 01, the "North Parking Extension Wet Pool" of the 2012 stormwater report, not Detention Pond One. D20 and D22 therefore cover two separate facilities, with separate estimates of $88,000 and $20,000. The finding text is reproduced as written.*

D23 — Envelope, Baker Hall (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	41	**Budget estimate**	$56,000
Bldg condition score	273	**Status**	Deferred
System	B20 Exterior Closure	**Deferability**	Deferrable

Location	Exterior envelope	**Priorities**	Facility Use (50%), Increased Repair/Replacement Cost (50%)

Problem Description

The exterior envelope of the Baker Building is showing signs of mild weathering and deferred maintenance. Organic growth is visible in multiple areas, particularly where water is not being properly diverted away from the façade. There are cracks present in the panel system, which may allow moisture infiltration and lead to long-term degradation of the building envelope. Algae growth and water streaking indicate surface runoff is not being managed effectively. While this is not currently a critical issue, benchmarking for the 2029–2031 biennium is recommended to address these early signs of deterioration and prevent future envelope failure.

Repair Description

Repair cracks in the wall panel system and clean areas of organic growth. Improve water diversion at identified locations.

D24 — Accessible parking, Site (Main Campus)

Image: See VCP

Deficiency score	21	**Budget estimate**	—
Bldg condition score	215	**Status**	Excluded
System	G20 Site Improvements	**Deferability**	Future
Location	Multiple	**Priorities**	Facility Use (100%)

Problem Description

The accessible parking spaces near the Health Professions Center do not meet the slope requirements in sections 502.1–502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design. Two accessible stalls in this area have a measured slope exceeding 3%, which is above the maximum 2% slope allowed under section 502.4. However, the excess slope is relatively minor—approximately 1%—and regrading the area would require substantial cost for limited functional gain. Under Title II of the ADA (28 CFR §35.150(a)(3)), public entities are not required to take actions that would result in a fundamental alteration of a service, program, or activity, or in undue financial and administrative burdens. The College should pursue documentation of this finding as an undue hardship, supported by an accessibility impact analysis showing that correction would not result in a meaningful or perceivable improvement. Funds should be reallocated to higher-priority ADA barrier removals elsewhere on campus.

Repair Description

Document this finding as an undue hardship under 28 CFR §35.150. Reallocate funds to other accessibility improvements that provide measurable benefit. Defer to future biennium if determined necessary.

> ***Note:*** *The finding references the "Health Professions Center". The college reports that FPMT names this building the Health Professions Education Center. The 2026 FPMT extract used for this report lists no owned Whatcom structure by that name, so the building does not appear in Section 2. The finding text is reproduced as written.*

D25 — Shading system, Syre Student Center (Main Campus)

Image: Link

Deficiency score	21	**Budget estimate**	$249,000
Bldg condition score	228	**Status**	Deferred
System	F10 Special Construction	**Deferability**	Immediate
Location	Roof	**Priorities**	Quality of Use (100%)

Problem Description

The interior shading system in the Syre Building auditorium has failed and no longer provides functional daylight control. The original system relied on interior blinds, which are no longer operable or repairable. A new exterior shading system has been partially constructed. Structural components are in place, but the blinds themselves have not yet been installed. Completion of the exterior shading system is necessary to restore daylight control and improve visual comfort and energy performance in the auditorium space.

Repair Description

Replace blinds to complete the daylighting system in the Syre Building auditorium.

5. BUILDING PROFILES

Profiles below cover buildings with capital activity in the 2027 request, a condition score above 275, or a material concentration of deferred deficiencies, ordered worst-first. Five surveyed structures are not profiled: Kulshan Hall (160) and the Pavilion (173) rate Superior with no deficiencies this cycle, as do the two 2013 Auxiliary Services buildings (146); the Kelly Cooling Tower (268) is a 396 GSF mechanical structure with no deficiency. The four unscored structures (Section 2) also carry no deficiencies. ID references point to the verbatim descriptions in Section 4.2.

Baker Hall (210-888) — condition score 273

GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
14,603	1991	—	Instructional

Condition. 2025 condition score 273 (Adequate), unchanged from 2023. Top weighted contributors: Roofing (31), Life/Safety (31), Electrical (25). The weakest score in the portfolio, 3 points below the Needs Improvement threshold.

Current biennium (2027 request). None building-specific; the campus-wide fire alarm program (D02) includes its detection devices.

Deferred and emerging. Deferred: D23 ($56,000) — the only deficiency in the survey designated Deferrable; the surveyor benchmarks it for the 2029–2031 biennium.

Long-term outlook. A 1991 building drifting toward the Needs Improvement band on roofing, life-safety, and electrical weighting rather than any single failure. Its classrooms are in the 2027 program request (classroom upgrades with Kelly and Cascade), which addresses interior condition; the envelope item is early-stage and low-cost if taken before moisture damage compounds. Baker should be watched as the portfolio's first candidate to fall below Adequate.

Cascade Hall (210-777) — condition score 254

GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
41,520	1985	1994	Instructional

Condition. 2025 condition score 254 (Adequate), unchanged from 2023. Top weighted contributors: Elevators (30), Life/Safety (30), Appearance (18).

Current biennium (2027 request). None building-specific. The included ADA parking correction on its west side (D05, $90,000) is a Site record, and the campus fire alarm program (D02) explicitly names Cascade's EST3 panel. A server-room HVAC unit was funded in 2025–2027 ($68,000).

Deferred and emerging. Deferred: D11 ($710,000, envelope) and D17 ($259,000, the first 13 of roughly 30 rooftop units) — $969,000, the largest deferred concentration in any building.

Long-term outlook. The oldest building on campus (built 1985, bought by the college in 1993, remodeled 1994) and the master plan's modernization candidate ("Modernize — improve instructional infrastructure"). Its tilt-up envelope is failing at joints and sealants, and its rooftop HVAC fleet needs a multi-biennium phased replacement of which D17 is only the first tranche. The envelope, the RTU program, and the planned modernization should be sequenced as one strategy: envelope repair protects the structure now, while the RTU phasing and any instructional reconfiguration decide how much mechanical capital to commit before modernization. Covered by the college's campus Clean Buildings filing (Section 9).

Laidlaw Center (210-999) — condition score 254

GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
53,511	1987	2001	Instructional / administrative

Condition. 2025 condition score 254 (Adequate), unchanged from 2023. Top weighted contributors: HVAC (24), Exterior Closure (24), Life/Safety (20).

Current biennium (2027 request). D06 — elevator modernization, $373,000. The building's Dover elevator controller is unsupported and failing.

Deferred and emerging. Deferred: D09 ($34,000, fire sprinkler riser). The 2025–2027 biennium funded its lighting control panel ($46,000), door crashbar hardware ($143,000), and dryvit repair ($388,000). The primary switchgear inside the building (infrastructure asset 3000) is past its expected life and sits on the future infrastructure list ($53,000).

Long-term outlook. The first building on campus (1987, renovated 2001) and a master-plan change candidate ("Change — new program(s) in building"). Recent biennia have steadily renewed its components; the elevator completes the near-term set, leaving the small sprinkler-riser item and the aging switchgear as the residual exposure. Laidlaw sits within the college's campus Clean Buildings filing (Section 9). The college should plan any program change against the campus energy management plan.

Heiner Center (210-666) — condition score 232

GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
43,210	1997	—	Instructional / enrollment services

Condition. 2025 condition score 232 (Adequate), unchanged from 2023 (and improved from 250 in the prior cycle). Top weighted contributors: Roofing (30), HVAC (24), Insulation (18).

Current biennium (2027 request). None building-specific; the campus fire alarm program (D02) covers its devices. Its lighting control panel was funded in 2025–2027 ($69,000), and 2023–2025 funded its storefront repair ($967,000), elevator equipment ($213,000), and cooling coils ($50,000).

Deferred and emerging. Deferred: D15 ($262,000, both Weil-McLain boilers plus air separator and expansion tank), D16 ($110,000, R-22 air-handler refurbishment), and D12 ($39,000, south-elevation brick cavity). $411,000 total.

Long-term outlook. A 1997 building whose original hydronic plant is aging out as a set: by 2029–2031 the boilers will be 27–29 years old. The boiler replacement is the building's — and arguably the campus's — clearest electrification decision point under the Clean Buildings standard (covered by the college's campus Tier 1 filing); a like-for-like gas boiler swap in 2029 would lock in combustion for another 25 years. The master plan flags the building for program change, which reinforces planning the mechanical renewal and the program decision together.

Syre Student Center (210-333) — condition score 228

GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
36,696	2001	—	Instructional / student support

Condition. 2025 condition score 228 (Adequate), unchanged from 2023. Top weighted contributors: Roofing (32), HVAC (25), Insulation (19).

Current biennium (2027 request). None building-specific. The included ADA parking correction at the center (D03, $96,000) is a Site record. The 2025–2027 biennium funded its cooling coils ($333,000), dimmable light fixtures ($52,000), and elevator controls ($416,000).

Deferred and emerging. Deferred: D14 ($433,000, boiler, air separator, expansion tank, and hydronic seals — the leaking Victaulic seals force year-round boiler operation), D25 ($249,000, completion of the auditorium exterior shading system), and D19 ($16,000, the R-22 walk-in cooler condensing unit). $698,000 total — the most deferred deficiencies of any building.

Long-term outlook. A 2001 building carrying the same hydronic-cohort story as Heiner, with an operational twist: the failed seals waste energy every month the boiler runs through summer, so D14 has an operating-cost payback in addition to its condition case. Together with Heiner's boilers it forms an $805,000 hydronic package that is the natural core of the 2029–2031 request and the campus's main electrification decision. Covered by the college's campus Clean Buildings filing (Section 9).

Kelly Hall (210-444) — condition score 206

GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
23,250	1998	—	Instructional / childcare

Condition. 2025 condition score 206 (Adequate), unchanged from 2023. Top weighted contributors: Doors & Hardware (18), Glazing (18), HVAC (16).

Current biennium (2027 request). D01 — elevator replacement, $373,000. The building's single Otis elevator is original, unsupported, and unreliable; it is the only elevator in the building.

Deferred and emerging. Deferred: D18 ($411,000, masonry and stucco envelope restoration — 2025 Garland assessment, fair to poor with active moisture intrusion). 2023–2025 funded its heat exchangers ($131,000) and heat pumps ($112,000).

Long-term outlook. Kelly houses instruction and the childcare program, which raises the consequence of its single-elevator failure and supports the 2027 elevator priority. The IMP envisioned project 9 as an extension of Kelly Hall. The college now has that project in design as the TEC, a stand-alone building next to Kelly. The 2027 classroom-upgrade program request will address some of Kelly's renovation needs. The deferred envelope repair sits outside both projects and should move up before moisture damage compounds. Covered by the college's campus Clean Buildings filing (Section 9).

Roe Studio (210-111) — condition score 170

GSF	Built	Reno.	Predominant use
8,813	2005	—	Instructional

Condition. 2025 condition score 170 (Superior), unchanged from 2023. Top weighted contributors: Roofing (21), Maintenance (15), Insulation (13).

Current biennium (2027 request). None. Its hot water heaters were funded in 2025–2027 ($74,000).

Deferred and emerging. Deferred: D08 ($663,000, full roof replacement — rated Poor by Garland, with active leaks, failing repairs, and insulation at R-21 against a current code requirement of R-38). The college's pre-survey lists this as a carryover item. The college reports the roof area is about 9,000 square feet, not the 14,056 square feet in the finding, and will reconcile the Garland report.

Long-term outlook. A Superior-rated building with one large, well-documented exposure: the roof. Deferral carries real risk here — active water intrusion in an otherwise sound 2005 building is the classic case where a deferred roof converts into interior and structural damage. The re-roof is also the building's energy-code moment (R-21 to R-38). It should lead the 2029–2031 roof program, or move up on URF/emergent funding if leakage accelerates. Below the 20,000 GSF Clean Buildings coverage floor.

6. INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS

Infrastructure requests (campus utilities, distribution, and site systems) are budgeted separately from building preservation. For the 2027–2029 cycle, Whatcom's infrastructure request is **$342,000**: replacement of the storm line running from southeast to northeast of Kulshan Hall (asset 2971 — 400 LF of 12-inch PVC). The prior biennium's infrastructure funding was small — $50,000, replacing four exceeded-life utility meters (gas meters 2967 and 3020, potable water meters 2962 and 3022) identified in the agency's 2019 Infrastructure Survey.

Campus utility services are provided by Puget Sound Energy (electrical, fully underground), Cascade Natural Gas (three gas lines with capacity beyond future demand), and the City of Bellingham (water, with excellent fire flow, and sanitary sewer); stormwater detention relies primarily on a regional facility northeast of campus (2023 FCS report). No service-capacity concerns were identified. The renewal exposure is in campus-owned distribution, and the infrastructure survey carries roughly **$1,478,000** of future-cycle items that should be on the radar for 2029–2031 and beyond: additional storm lines and vaults near Kulshan and Heiner ($520,000), a sewer line and vault at Laidlaw ($351,000), reconditioning of the north retention pond ($183,000), three fire-system water lines of 1990s-vintage ductile iron ($371,000), and the **Laidlaw primary switchgear** (asset 3000, 1600-amp, $53,000) — the one item already past its expected life. The three deferred pond deficiencies in the preservation list (D20–D22, $196,000) are part of the same stormwater program and should be sequenced with the storm-line work rather than funded piecemeal. The college places D20 just west of Cascade Hall and D21 between Cascade Hall and Kulshan Hall. The infrastructure survey records ponds at both locations (assets 2924 and 2925), so the college should confirm that the preservation and infrastructure scopes do not overlap.

7. MASTER PLAN ALIGNMENT

Whatcom Community College's Institutional Master Plan (IMP) was adopted by the City of Bellingham in November 2017; the pre-survey records no later full update. The college reported the following capital priorities; there are no replacement or demolition priorities this cycle.

Master planning currency

Campus	Most recent full plan	Most recent update
Main Campus (210A)	2017	11/2017

Reported capital priorities

Category	Building	Master plan note
Renovation	Cascade Hall (210-777)	Modernize — improve instructional infrastructure
	Heiner Center (210-666)	Change — new program(s) in building
	Laidlaw Center (210-999)	Change — new program(s) in building
Replacement	None	—
Demolition	None	—

The 2027 capital-repair recommendations align with these priorities. No building is slated for replacement or demolition, so no preservation dollar risks stranding. The three renovation candidates are flagged for modernization or program change — not envelope or structural replacement — so the 2027 investments in them (the Laidlaw elevator, and fire-alarm and ADA work touching Cascade) preserve access and life safety through any future reconfiguration and are suitable uses of preservation funds. The deficiencies identified this cycle sit in buildings the college expects to use for at least the next fifteen years (2023 FCS report).

Two alignment items to track. First, Cascade Hall's deferred envelope ($710,000) and phased rooftop-unit program ($259,000 first tranche) should be sequenced against the modernization timeline — if instructional reconfiguration advances, the mechanical phasing belongs inside it. Second, IMP project 9 has changed since adoption. The IMP envisioned it as an extension of Kelly Hall. The college now has it in design as the TEC, a stand-alone building next to Kelly. Kelly's deferred envelope ($411,000) therefore carries no risk of stranding inside a larger Kelly project. The 2027 classroom-upgrade program request addresses some of Kelly's renovation needs and the backfill of space that programs vacate when the TEC opens. The IMP is now nine years old. A refresh would record the project 9 change and firm up the Cascade, Heiner, and Laidlaw timelines that govern how the deferred backlog should be packaged.

8. MAINTENANCE CAPACITY SNAPSHOT

The in-house staffing roster below is from the 2025 pre-survey input document. Contract-maintenance and materials figures were not refreshed in the pre-survey and are carried forward from the 2023 FCS cycle as noted. Ratios use the surveyed building area (322,218 GSF).

In-house maintenance staffing (2025 pre-survey)

Position	Hours per week	Estimated annual cost
Maintenance Mechanic 4	10	$27,619
Maintenance Mechanic 3	30	$78,863
Maintenance Mechanic 3	25	$64,124
Maintenance Mechanic 2	30	$71,392
Maintenance Mechanic 1	35	$77,484
Maintenance Mechanic 1	35	$75,514
Total (6 positions)	**165**	**$394,996**

Derived metrics

In-house maintenance FTEs (165 hrs/wk ÷ 40)	**4.1**
Estimated equivalent contract FTEs (2023 cycle)	**1.0**
Combined total FTEs	**5.2**
GSF per combined FTE (322,218 GSF surveyed)	**61,965**
State average (weighted, 2023 cycle)	**74,279 GSF / FTE**
Total maintenance cost (staff + contract + material)	**$614,689**
Maintenance cost per GSF	**$1.91**
State average (weighted, 2023 cycle)	**$1.48 / GSF**
APPA self-rating (2023 cycle)	**Comprehensive Stewardship (level 2 of 5)**

Contract cost ($89,118) and materials ($130,575) carried forward from the 2023 FCS cycle; staff costs are the 2025 pre-survey figures. Contract FTE equivalency follows the 2023 report's method.

Whatcom staffs its maintenance more densely than the state average — 61,965 GSF per combined FTE against 74,279 — and spends more per square foot ($1.91 against $1.48), consistent with its self-rating of Comprehensive Stewardship, the second-highest APPA level. That posture shows in the portfolio: every surveyed building rates Adequate or better, and the deferred backlog is dominated by capital-scale envelope and plant renewal rather than deferred upkeep. The two 2020 buildings (Cedar Hall and the Learning Commons, 154,351 GSF combined) fall outside the surveyed-area ratio; as they age into the maintenance workload, per-FTE coverage will effectively rise unless staffing follows. Note that a capital reinvestment rate against the APPA/NACUBO guideline of 2–4% of current replacement value cannot be computed for this portfolio: the FPMT inventory records estimated replacement cost as "Unknown" for 14 of 16 structures.

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 Whatcom's larger buildings are operated and re-equipped. It is not an abstract sustainability goal — it is a compliance deadline attached to specific buildings, backed by penalties, and overlapping the boiler, controls, and envelope work already in this report's deferred backlog. No college-specific decarbonization or district-energy plan was provided for this report; this section maps the statutory coverage and the capital-planning overlap.

9.1 The Clean Buildings Performance Standard

The standard applies in two tiers by gross floor area. Tier 1 covers buildings of more than 50,000 GSF (nonresidential, hotel, motel, and dormitory floor area) 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 (an enforceable EUI target is expected later in the rollout). 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)

Highlighted rows show the building-by-building schedule that would apply to Whatcom's nine covered buildings by size: three in the Tier 1 50,001–90,000 band and six in Tier 2. The college filed them instead as one campus under a single Tier 1 application (Section 9.2). Non-compliance penalties run up to $5,000 plus $1.50 per square foot of floor area, assessed annually until the building conforms. Commerce has offered early-adopter incentives of about $0.85 per square foot (Tier 1) and $0.30 per square foot (Tier 2). The college reports that Commerce currently offers incentives only for Tier 2 compliance.

9.2 Whatcom's Included Buildings

Nine of Whatcom's structures exceed the 20,000 GSF coverage floor. By size, three fall in Tier 1 and six in Tier 2. Dormitory floor area counts toward Tier 1 coverage, so Cedar Hall is covered even though it sits outside the capital-repair program. The college filed all nine buildings as one campus under a single Tier 1 application. The college reports that this filing makes it compliant and current with the standard. Filing under Tier 1 brings the six Tier 2-sized buildings under Tier 1 requirements, which include the EUI target described in Section 9.1. The college filed a separate Tier 2 application to capture incentive dollars that Commerce offers only for Tier 2 compliance at this time. For compliance, the Tier 2 application is a redundancy. The table pairs each building with the deferred capital backlog identified for it in Section 4.

Building	GSF	Size tier	Filing	Deferred backlog in building
Cedar Hall	89,023	1	Campus Tier 1	—
Learning Commons	65,328	1	Campus Tier 1	—

Laidlaw Center	53,511	1	Campus Tier 1	**$34,000**
Kulshan Hall	43,299	2	Campus Tier 1	—
Heiner Center	43,210	2	Campus Tier 1	**$411,000**
Pavilion	41,974	2	Campus Tier 1	—
Cascade Hall	41,520	2	Campus Tier 1	**$969,000**
Syre Student Center	36,696	2	Campus Tier 1	**$698,000**
Kelly Hall	23,250	2	Campus Tier 1	**$411,000**
Covered total (9 buildings)	**437,811**			**$2,523,000**

Building-specific deferred items only. The campus-wide Niagara AX lighting-controls replacement (D10, $311,000) and the deferred site work are not attributed to individual buildings but the controls platform serves several covered buildings. The two 2020 buildings carry no deficiencies, so they add no capital need to the campus filing this cycle.

9.3 Aligning capital renewal with compliance

The covered buildings carry $2,523,000 of building-specific deferred deficiencies, and the items that most directly move energy performance are exactly the deferred ones:

Boiler replacements at Heiner and Syre — the $805,000 hydronic package (D14, D15, plus the D16 air-handler refurbishment) is the campus's clearest electrification decision. Both buildings are Tier 2 by size and sit inside the college's campus Tier 1 filing. The college will specify both boiler plants in the 2029–2031 window. A like-for-like gas replacement locks in combustion for another 25 years; a heat-pump or hybrid specification converts a required repair into decarbonization progress. The Syre case is reinforced by its operating profile — the failed hydronic seals currently force year-round boiler operation, so the energy baseline is inflated and the savings case is stronger than normal.

Controls — the Niagara AX-to-N4 replacement (D10, $311,000) is the enabling infrastructure for the benchmarking, energy-management-plan, and O&M obligations that the campus filing carries for every covered building. An unsupported controls platform cannot reliably deliver the trend data and scheduling the standard requires. The college's pre-survey also flags the HB 1185 fluorescent phase-out; specifying lighting-controls work as LED-with-controls where fixtures are touched compounds the EUI benefit.

Envelope at re-roof and repair — the Cascade and Kelly envelope repairs restore moisture integrity and thermal performance in two Tier 2-sized buildings within the campus filing, and the Roe Studio re-roof (below the coverage floor but code-bound) moves insulation from R-21 to the R-38 the energy code now requires. Specifying insulation improvement at the point of envelope work costs one capital event instead of two.

9.4 Compliance pathway

Washington offers a distinct route under HB 1390 and RCW 19.27A.260 for campuses that heat and cool through a shared thermal loop — a district energy system — substituting a phased central-plant decarbonization plan for building-by-building EUI compliance. Whatcom's configuration does not fit that route: the campus runs building-by-building plant — individual boilers at Heiner and Syre, rooftop units at Cascade, VRF and radiant systems in the newer buildings — with no campus thermal loop in the survey record. The college instead filed its covered buildings together as one campus under a single Tier 1 application. The college reports that it is compliant and current under that filing. Each building's energy use feeds the campus filing, so the building-level equipment choices in the 2029–2031 request decide the campus result. No college-specific decarbonization plan (McKinstry, ATS, or DES-contracted) was provided

for this report; if one is completed, its phasing should be integrated with the deferred-backlog sequencing described here.

10. APPENDIX: BUILDING CONDITION DETAIL

The 20-component condition-score breakdown for each of the twelve surveyed buildings, ordered worst to best overall score. Each table is reference data; there is no narrative. The Weighted Score column reflects the survey's component weighting, so rounded rows may not sum exactly to the building's canonical condition score shown in the total row.

Baker Hall (210-888) — condition score 273

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	Rooftop packaged HVAC units-2005
Structure	1	8	8	Structural steel
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	EIFS
Roofing	3	10	31	Single-ply Carlisle membrane w gravel ballast; skylights
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Ceramic tile, carpet tile-random wear, vinyl tile
Wall Finishes	2	6	13	Gypsum board and ceramic tile; interior hallway windows
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile; gypsum board
Doors & Hardware	3	6	19	Interior wood doors w HM frames-deteriorating finishes; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	3	8	25	1000amp 208/120v-distribution panels maxed-out
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Ceiling mount, wall-mount; recessed can and lay-in fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	3	10	31	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to date well executed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	2	6	13	Building appears to have been low first-cost construction
Appearance	3	6	19	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	3	6	19	Double glazed hollow metal framed windows
Total weighted score			**273**	**Adequate**

Kelly, Cooling Tower (210-444(A)) — condition score 268

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Structure	1	8	11	
Exterior Closure	1	8	11	
Roofing	3	10	41	
Floor Finishes	0	6	0	Gravel
Wall Finishes	3	6	24	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Ceiling Finishes	null	6	0	
Doors & Hardware	1	6	8	
Elevators	null	6	0	
Plumbing	3	8	32	
Electrical	3	8	32	
Lights/Power	1	8	11	
Life/Safety	1	10	14	
Fire Safety	1	10	14	
Modifications	1	7	9	
Maintenance	3	7	28	
Remaining Life	1	6	8	
Appearance	3	6	24	
Insulation	null	6	0	
Glazing	null	6	0	
HVAC	null	8	0	
Total weighted score			**268**	**Adequate**

Cascade Hall (210-777) — condition score 254

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	2	8	16	Rooftop split units 2003 - 2008; 2021; campus data center cooling units 2000 & 2008
Structure	1	8	8	Tilt-up concrete, steel and glu-lam beams; wood interior framing
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Concrete frame and tilt-up panels
Roofing	1	10	10	Single-ply over old BUR 2016; new parapet cap flashing in 2008; skylights
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Ceramic tile; carpet tile; carpet; vinyl tile; sheet vinyl; concrete
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	12	Lay-in tile; gypsum board
Doors & Hardware	2	6	12	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior aluminum doors/frames; OH metal doors
Elevators	5	6	30	Split-level building; accessibility route between levels is outdoors
Plumbing	2	8	16	Copper, cast iron, steel, PVC and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1600amp 208/120v; campus data center UPS
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Recessed can, lay-in, studio spots and wall mount fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	3	10	30	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Fire Safety	1	10	10	New fire alarm in 2010
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to date well executed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Solid concrete construction-low maintenance shell
Appearance	3	6	18	
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	3	6	18	Many windows have failed seals- funded in 2011
Total weighted score			**254**	**Adequate**

Laidlaw Center (210-999) — condition score 254

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	24	Hot water boiler and VAVs; DX cooling-new condensers in 2008; radiant wall heat; rooftop packaged HVAC units
Structure	1	8	8	Structural steel; CMU
Exterior Closure	3	8	24	EIFS; re-caulked and painted 2003
Roofing	1	10	10	Single-ply TPO membrane-2008; large skylight-2008
Floor Finishes	2	6	12	Ceramic tile; carpet tile; carpet-general wear throughout upper floor; concrete; vinyl tile
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board and ceramic tile; sheet vinyl
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; lay-in tile
Doors & Hardware	3	6	18	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	2	6	12	2 stop
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, Cat iron, Steel and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1200amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, wall mount, ceiling-mount and recessed can fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	2	10	20	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	New system 2013
Modifications	1	7	7	Science remodeled 2005 to nursing classrooms; well executed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	3	6	18	Average construction; average first cost
Appearance	3	6	18	
Insulation	2	6	12	
Glazing	3	6	18	Some operable units
Total weighted score			**254**	**Adequate**

Heiner Center (210-666) — condition score 232

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	24	2 HW boilers; AHU; rooftop packaged DX cooling
Structure	1	8	8	steel; concrete; structural brick
Exterior Closure	2	8	16	Brick, concrete, metal horizontal window screens; aluminum window walls
Roofing	3	10	30	Single-ply hypalon membrane
Floor Finishes	2	6	12	Ceramic tile; carpet tile; vinyl tile; concrete
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Brick; gypsum board; wood panels; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Lay-in tile; gypsum board
Doors & Hardware	2	6	12	Interior wood and HM doors w HM frames; exterior aluminum doors/frames
Elevators	2	6	12	3 stop
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel, PVC and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1200amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Recessed can, lay-in and ceiling mount fluorescent lighting
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	Fire alarm upgrade 2013
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to date well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Well constructed building; well-designed systems
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	3	6	18	
Glazing	3	6	18	
Total weighted score			**232**	**Adequate**

Syre Student Center (210-333) — condition score 228

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	3	8	25	
Structure	1	8	8	
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	
Roofing	3	10	32	
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	
Doors & Hardware	2	6	13	
Elevators	2	6	13	Controls are no longer supported in 2024
Plumbing	1	8	8	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Electrical	1	8	8	
Lights/Power	1	8	8	
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	0	7	0	
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	3	6	19	
Glazing	3	6	19	
Total weighted score			**228**	**Adequate**

Kelly Hall (210-444) — condition score 206

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	2	8	16	Closed loop heat pumps; boiler; cooling tower
Structure	1	8	8	Structural steel
Exterior Closure	2	8	16	Brick; metal fascia
Roofing	1	10	10	Single-ply 2020; metal roof panels
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Ceramic tile; carpet; linoleum
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; ceramic tile; wood trim
Ceiling Finishes	2	6	12	Lay-in tile; wood trim; wood T&G ceilings
Doors & Hardware	3	6	18	Interior wood doors w HM frames-general surface marring; exterior aluminum doors/frames
Elevators	1	6	6	2 stop
Plumbing	2	8	16	Copper, cast iron, steel and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures
Electrical	1	8	8	1200amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Recessed can, lay-in and ceiling mount fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to date; well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Solidly constructed building
Appearance	1	6	6	Interior spaces are somewhat plain but look nice
Insulation	2	6	12	
Glazing	3	6	18	Some operable units
Total weighted score			**206**	**Adequate**

Pavilion (210-555) — condition score 173

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	2	8	17	Split-system rooftop heating units w DX cooling-heating units new in 2011; split-system rooftop HVAC units
Structure	1	8	8	Structural steel frame and open web steel roof joists
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Brick; stucco
Roofing	1	10	10	Single-ply TPO membrane-2010
Floor Finishes	2	6	13	Ceramic tile; vinyl tile-general surface wear; rubberized tile; hardwood
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; brick; ceramic tile; concrete; interior windows w metal frames
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; wood, roof deck pan; plaster
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood doors w HM frames; exterior HM doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel, ABS and galvanized piping; porcelain fixtures; new hot water tanks in 2010
Electrical	1	8	8	1200amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Wall mount, ceiling-mount, recessed can, hanging and lay- fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	Minor modifications to date; well constructed
Maintenance	1	7	7	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Well constructed building; condition does not reflect age
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	1	6	6	
Glazing	3	6	19	Some operable units
Total weighted score			**173**	**Superior**

Roe Studio (210-111) — condition score 170

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	2 HW boilers; AHU; radiant floor heat; make-up air w heat reclaim; unit heaters; paddle fans
Structure	1	8	8	Poured-in-place concrete frame and load bearing walls
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Concrete walls; precast concrete panels; brick veneer; aluminum window walls
Roofing	2	10	21	Single-ply Carlisle TPO membrane
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Concrete; ceramic tile; resilient flooring
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Concrete; brick; gypsum board; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Concrete; gypsum board; exposed metal deck pan; lay-in tiles

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior HM doors/frames-some sidelites; exterior aluminum doors/frames
Elevators	0	6	0	One-story and mechanical lofts
Plumbing	1	8	8	Copper, cast iron, steel and ABS piping; porcelain fixtures; locker room with showers
Electrical	1	8	8	800amp 208/120v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Lay-in, recessed can, wall mount and ceiling mount fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	No modifications to date
Maintenance	2	7	15	
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Well constructed building
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	2	6	13	
Glazing	1	6	6	Some operable units
Total weighted score			**170**	**Superior**

Kulshan Hall (210-222) — condition score 160

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	8	2 HW boilers; rooftop air cooled chiller; AHUs and VAVs; 4 pipe system
Structure	1	8	8	Steel frame; CMU; load bearing metal stud walls
Exterior Closure	1	8	8	Brick veneer; precast concrete panels; clearstory windows; solar shades; metal panels; aluminum window walls
Roofing	1	10	10	Single-ply Carlisle TPO membrane; standing seam metal
Floor Finishes	1	6	6	Terrazzo; carpet tiles; resilient sheet flooring
Wall Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; wood panels; brick; ceramic tile
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	6	Gypsum board; lay-in tile; exposed structure
Doors & Hardware	1	6	6	Interior wood doors w HM frames-some sidelites, and HM doors/frames; exterior aluminum and HM doors/frames
Elevators	1	6	6	2 stop
Plumbing	2	8	16	Copper, cast iron, steel, ABS and PVC piping; porcelain fixtures; leaking fittings in heating loop
Electrical	1	8	8	1600amp 480/277v
Lights/Power	1	8	8	Recessed can, lay-in and wall washer fluorescent fixtures
Life/Safety	1	10	10	
Fire Safety	1	10	10	
Modifications	1	7	7	No modifications to date
Maintenance	1	7	7	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Remaining Life	1	6	6	Solidly constructed building; long-wear materials
Appearance	1	6	6	
Insulation	2	6	12	
Glazing	1	6	6	Some operable units
Total weighted score			**160**	**Superior**

Auxiliary Services Building (210-ASB) — condition score 146

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	9	Radiant floor, Variable refrigerant flow, 1 rooftop unit
Structure	1	8	9	
Exterior Closure	1	8	9	
Roofing	1	10	11	
Floor Finishes	1	6	7	
Wall Finishes	1	6	7	
Ceiling Finishes	1	6	7	
Doors & Hardware	1	6	7	
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	1	8	9	No Comments
Electrical	1	8	9	solar array, 800 Amp main panel
Lights/Power	1	8	9	
Life/Safety	1	10	11	
Fire Safety	1	10	11	
Modifications	0	7	0	
Maintenance	1	7	8	
Remaining Life	1	6	7	
Appearance	1	6	7	
Insulation	1	6	7	
Glazing	1	6	7	
Total weighted score			**146**	**Superior**

Auxiliary Services Building-Storage (210-ASB(A)) — condition score 146

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
HVAC	1	8	10	Exhaust fan only
Structure	1	8	10	
Exterior Closure	1	8	10	
Roofing	1	10	12	
Floor Finishes	1	6	7	

Component	Rating	Wt.	Wt. Score	Comment
Wall Finishes	1	6	7	
Ceiling Finishes	0	6	0	
Doors & Hardware	1	6	7	
Elevators	0	6	0	
Plumbing	0	8	0	
Electrical	1	8	10	
Lights/Power	1	8	10	
Life/Safety	1	10	12	
Fire Safety	1	10	12	
Modifications	0	7	0	
Maintenance	1	7	9	
Remaining Life	1	6	7	
Appearance	1	6	7	
Insulation	1	6	7	
Glazing	1	6	7	
Total weighted score			**146**	**Superior**