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INTRODUCTION

In mid-2001 the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) directed that a facility condition survey be performed on all state-owned community and technical college facilities at 34 campuses statewide, as well as at the Seattle Vocational Institute and the Center for Information Services. The intent of the survey is to provide a current determination of the physical condition of the community and technical college facilities and to identify capital repair project candidates for funding consideration in the 2003-2005 bi-annual state budget cycle.

This survey is a continuation of a process begun by the SBCTC in 1989 as a method of identifying and budgeting capital repair needs by applying a uniform process to all colleges system-wide. The capital repair candidate identification process uses a condition survey protocol and deficiency prioritization methodology applied in a consistent manner at each community college campus. The process was initiated in 1989 with a detailed baseline condition survey conducted at each college. Less detailed surveys were conducted in 1991 and 1993 to update the 1989 data and identify new emerging deficiencies.

In 1995 the SBCTC selected the joint venture of Tonkin/Hoyne/Lokan-Pack & Associates, Inc. to conduct the second baseline condition survey of 32 colleges. The components of this joint venture, Tonkin/Hoyne/Lokan and Pack & Associates, Inc. are two of the three firms selected by the SBCTC in 1989 to perform the first baseline survey of the community colleges, as well as the 1991 and 1993 updates. Survey updates were conducted in 1997, in 1999, and again this year to update the 1999 data and identify new emerging deficiencies.

For each college the survey focus includes:

- Reviewing deficiencies documented in the 1999 survey that have either not been funded or only partially funded to evaluate the current condition of those deficiencies.

- Updating the relative severity/priority of those deficiencies to result in a deficiency score to be used as a guide for repair request timing.

- Modifying the recommended corrective action for those deficiencies if necessary and estimating the current repair costs to guide a college in developing its capital repair project requests.

- Reviewing, verifying, prioritizing, and estimating corrective costs for “emerging” deficiencies identified by a college as potential capital repairs.

This survey is intended to assist the SBCTC in establishing the relative severity of each capital repair deficiency to allow system-wide prioritizing of each college repair request. The SBCTC will also be able to estimate in advance the probable level of magnitude of the cost of the projects likely to be requested by each college for inclusion into its 2003-2005 capital repair requests.
The scope of the 2001 survey, as developed by the SBCTC, includes site and utility systems as well as all building components. It does not include dormitories, parking lots, asbestos hazard identification, ADA compliance, new construction, or construction under warranty.
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SBCTC- FACILITY CONDITION SURVEY
2001 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COLLEGE OVERVIEW

Peninsula College strives to meet the needs of a diverse community by providing liberal arts instruction for college transfer, professional/technical workforce instruction, basic and developmental education, and continuing education. According to the Peninsula College 2001-03 Capital Program Narrative in the SBCTC 2001-2003 Capital Budget Request and 2001-2011 Capital Program, during the 1998-99 academic year, the college served 8,053 headcount students (2,317 FTEs) and employed 798 faculty and staff.

The college struggles to meet the needs of a depressed local economy due to changing employment status and technological advancement. To better serve the population, it is required to make available a more diverse offering to give residents the opportunity for new employment. These new programs are created to meet remaining industry needs, demanding 2001 technological expectations from 1960’s era facilities.

Peninsula College has two locations: its 75-acre main campus located in Port Angeles, and extension sites in Port Townsend and Forks. The sites in Port Townsend and Forks are both leased spaces. Classes are also offered in Sequim, Clallam Bay Corrections Center and in different tribal centers throughout the district.

The physical attributes of the campus and extension sites are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main Campus</th>
<th>Port Townsend</th>
<th>Forks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Buildings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>178,921</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>1,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peninsula College, for the most part, is a 40-year-old campus. The buildings, which were constructed in the early 1960’s, were not designed for today’s technology. Energy efficiency was not a major concern in their design. Poor ventilation—as well as antiquated systems—makes these buildings unable to cope with the increasing need to move higher technology into their rooms. Structurally and aesthetically these buildings remain a pleasing part of the campus. With continued maintenance and necessary upgrades, the college will continue to benefit from their use.
Upcoming Projects:

Peninsula College is funded for a renovation project to centralize student services, which are currently housed in four different buildings. The deteriorating buildings require costly maintenance to extend their lives. The buildings do not have appropriate HVAC systems or infrastructure to support college program needs. The project will renovate two buildings into one large space to provide accessible services in a central location. It will also provide an infrastructure for computerized testing.

The college is also funded to build a 9,600 gross square feet field house, which will provide large and open space for multi-purposes such as graduation, career fairs, college fairs, dances, cultural activities, and community activities. Additional instructional space will be provided as well.

Peninsula College has received state matching funds to construct a single building to house all Childcare/Family Life programs. Currently, classes and faculty are scattered throughout campus, and all of the related programs are not in a centralized location.

THE ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING FACILITY CONDITION SURVEY

Each biennium (every two years), a Facility Condition Survey of the State’s Community and Technical Colleges is conducted by a consulting architectural/engineering team provided on behalf of the State. The focus of the survey, at the direction of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, is to identify and document deficiencies that would qualify as capital repair projects for the 2003-2005, as well as deficiencies that would be backlogged for funding after 2005.

The Tonkin/Hoyne/Lukan Facility Condition Survey team began their site visit of Peninsula College on July 30, 2001. The two-person A/E team worked directly with Wayne Rush, Director of Institutional Support Services, and members of the College’s administration and maintenance staff.

The survey had a dual focus. First, deficiencies identified during the 1999 survey, which had not been funded for repairs, or only partially funded, were reviewed to determine changes in these deficiencies since the 1999 survey. Changes were recorded and cost estimates for correcting the deficiencies updated. Each deficiency was also re-prioritized using the prioritizing system that was modified in 1999. Secondly, a review and documentation of emergent deficiencies identified by the college was conducted. Emerging deficiencies that qualified as capital repairs were also prioritized and cost estimates for corrective action developed. Campus areas not owned or managed by the State, dormitories, parking lots, potential asbestos problems covered by the OFM asbestos abatement pool, deficiencies covered under existing warranties, and new construction project deficiencies were not addressed as part of this effort.
DEFICIENCY SUMMARY & CAPITAL REPAIR OVERVIEW

The 2001 facility condition survey identified a total of eleven (11) capital repair deficiencies with an estimated 2001 MACC repair cost of $5,808,500 for the college. Of the eleven deficiencies, seven (7), with a 2001 MACC repair cost of $4,723,500 are carryover deficiencies identified during the 1999 condition survey that were not funded for the current biennium. For some of these seven the scope of the deficiencies has been expanded. Four (4) deficiencies, with a 2001 MACC repair cost of $1,085,000 are new deficiencies. The eleven capital repair deficiencies identified through the facility condition survey break down as follows:

Ten (10) facility deficiencies were observed with an estimated repair cost of $4,808,500. These deficiencies include: F01) Kitchen waste from the floor drains and pot sinks do not have a grease separator to discharge through in accord with plumbing codes. Also, there is a water line beneath the floor slab that has a continuous leak. Kitchen appliances, most notably the four steam tables, are worn out. Exhaust fans are worn out and noisy. F02) The outdoor childcare play area is protected from adjacent baseball and soccer fields. The safety netting has been deteriorated over the course of time. F03) At the Auto/Diesel Mechanics building, there is no heated make-up air system for the welding shop exhaust. There is no exhaust system for running vehicles in the building during testing, unless the door is left open. F04) The old, worn roll-up doors in the Auto/Diesel Mechanics building were poorly installed, and they fail in their open position several times per year, creating a significant maintenance cost. F05) The college's domestic water piping in the 12 buildings on campus have severe electrolysis problems to the extent that none of the piping is reliable. The exterior water piping has been replaced.

F06) Nesbitt brand unit ventilators are obsolete and repair parts are no longer available. Their heating performance is unsatisfactory. Also, at Building N (at rooftop mechanical rooms) is an old, worn, obsolete electro-hydraulic, 9-stage cam switching heating control on the air handler. F07) The Port Angeles Fire Marshall and Fire Marshall office are requiring some additional fire sprinkler systems and improvements. F08) The campus computer-controlled EMC system has been pieced together without a cohesive approach. The results have been less than satisfactory. The fire alarm and security systems have been upgraded to a fiber optic system. F09) Campus-wide, the vertical cedar siding is cupping and buckling. This leads to damage of the substrate. F10) The Forks Branch Campus building does not have any ventilation or cooling system.

One (1) site deficiency exists with an estimated initial Phase I repair cost of $1,000,000. S01) The college has performed various studies indicating poor soil conditions, which creates a problem for both parking/paved areas and underground utility systems.
PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The college appears to be performing a reasonable job with respect to most routine maintenance. A Preventive Maintenance (PM) program for HVAC equipment is in place, but it is an informal program that focuses on major pieces of equipment on a rotating time cycle as time allows. In general, maintenance on campus attempts to blend preventive maintenance with routine breakdown maintenance. However, the emphasis appears to be primarily reactive to breakdowns due to resource constraints. At times, there appear to be some conflicting demand between maintenance and non-maintenance activities placed on the maintenance staff.

Some fundamental initial construction problems increase repair needs beyond what would normally be anticipated. The college is built on poor soils, which quickly deteriorate pipe and pave surfaces. Secondly, initial low cost construction included the design/installation of lower end building systems, e.g., Nesbitt brand unit ventilators are commonly used for HVAC. Finally, the extensive use of cedar siding has lead to cupping, which is hard to repair without extensive replacement.

LONG-TERM FACILITY UTILIZATION/REPLACEMENT CONSIDERATION

The overall condition of the facilities at Peninsula College varies considerably, as is evidenced by the building condition analysis summary presented on the following page. The rating scores presented in this summary were generated by the condition analysis update conducted as part of the 1999 condition survey. As can be seen, the rating scores for campus facilities range from a low of 166 for the Conference Center to a high of 372 for the Basic Skills (Developmental) building, with a lower score indicating a better overall condition rating. In general, the better scores were received by the newer facilities, as well as by the facilities that have undergone remodeling in recent years.

Six original campus buildings were constructed in 1965, including the Business building, which was remodeled in 1984, and the Library, which, at 11,829 GSF, is one of six buildings on campus with more than 10,000 GSF. The other large structures on campus are the 1966 Gymnasium (16,896 GSF), the 1966 Theatre/Student Union building (24,011 GSF), the 1969 Auto/Diesel Mechanics building (18,002 GSF), the 1970 Dormitory/Faculty Offices building (21,590 GSF), and the 1976 Nursing/Engineering building (10,776 GSF). Constructed in September 2000, the 8,000 GSF Forks Branch Campus building is the newest college building.

Going forward, the challenge for the college will be to maintain, repair and upgrade its existing facilities while planning for some eventual facility replacements and perhaps some larger facilities. The initial repair/renovation focus should begin with the site and the 1965 original college buildings and then move to the 1970’s facilities. Site conditions
and soils are poor with extensive deterioration of pipes and paving occurring. Major work will eventually be required to correct existing conditions.

Unlike many of the State’s Community and Technical Colleges, Peninsula College does not have any main buildings. The only buildings over 15,000 GSF are the Theatre/Student Union (24,011 GSF) and the Dormitory/Faculty Offices (21,590 GSF). Small buildings are generally much more difficult to maintain than large buildings simply because there are more exterior surfaces and more individual building systems for the same spatial area.

Peninsula College has entered into the mature phase of its existence in terms of overall facility age. A key issue that will face the campus going forward is how to best spend capital repair and remodeling/renovation dollars, often in increasing amounts, on old facilities. The fundamental cost-effectiveness of this strategy, versus a strategy of programmed facility replacement needs to be adequately addressed, both by the college and by the State. While repair/renovation may be less expensive from the standpoint of first-cost, total life-cycle costs are often much greater for renovation than for replacement, especially for facilities that have significant design constraints that would limit their adaptability and re-use potential.