



# Statewide State of Condition of Academic Facilities

*For the Governor, the House Committee on  
Education, the Senate Committee on  
Education, and the Academic Facilities  
Oversight Committee*

October 1, 2009

## 2009 Report on condition of academic facilities statewide

*Preamble* “...to ensure that adequate facilities and substantially equal facilities are, and will continue to be provided for Arkansas’ school children.” -----Act 1181 of 2003

The Division of Public School Academic Facilities and Transportation (Division) submits this annual report pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 6-21-112. This report conveys the progress of actions undertaken by the Arkansas public school districts to construct new public school facilities, renovate and convert existing public school facilities, and correct significant deficiencies to state school facilities toward the goal of providing equitable and adequate surroundings to support the state’s educational program.

The units of measure to track the improvement of the condition of the states public school system are the 12 general building and design systems of major facility structures as outlined in the referenced statute. These are:

- A) **Site:** Site improvements relate to deficiencies that include lands and all improvements to the site such as grading, drainage, drives, parking areas, walks, landscaping and playgrounds.
- B) **Roofing:** Roofing improvements relate to deficiencies that include all types of roofing system replacements.
- C) **Exterior:** Exterior improvements relate to deficiencies that include window systems, exterior painting, exterior doors and other wall systems.
- D) **Structure:** Structural improvements relate to deficiencies that include systems necessary to maintain the structural integrity of the facility and include structural walls, foundations and structural building members.
- E) **Interior:** Interior improvements relate to deficiencies primarily concerned with interior finishes, walls, flooring materials, ceilings and interior door systems.
- F) **Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC):** HVAC improvements relate to deficiencies that include air cooling systems, controls, storage tanks and

towers, ductwork, fresh air systems and heating systems.

- G) **Plumbing and Water Supply:** Plumbing improvements relate to deficiencies that include domestic water piping, sanitary sewer piping, fixtures, water heaters, and backflow preventers.
- H) **Electrical:** Electrical improvements relate to deficiencies that include electrical main service, electrical distribution systems, lighting fixtures, emergency lighting and emergency generators.
- I) **Technology:** Technology improvements relate to deficiencies that include public address systems, intercom systems, telephones and computer infrastructure.
- J) **Fire and Safety:** Fire and safety improvements relate to deficiencies that include fire protection systems, emergency lighting, fire alarm panels, fire sprinkler systems and security wiring infrastructure.
- K) **Specialty Items:** Specialty improvements relate to deficiencies that include elevators, fixed cabinetry, movable partitions, stage equipment and lockers.
- L) **Space Utilization:** Space utilization improvements relate to deficiencies that include lack of space and disproportionate space to support the academic environment.

The major building systems identified in this report were derived from the primary areas of inspection conducted during the 2004 statewide facility assessment. The intent of the assessment was to identify the condition of school facilities in Arkansas and to determine their adequacy to serve their intended purpose. The assessment should not be confused with a building repair or renovation program, as the focus of the assessment was to determine the current condition of school facilities. The assessment provided basic information regarding building inventories, existing deficiencies and lifecycle data that could be used to compare the relative condition from one school to another. The assessment can additionally be used for:

- A) Developing and maintaining an inventory of facility information that can be used for planning purposes.
- B) Identifying needs that could impact the continued and ongoing operation of the facility.
- C) Classifying short and long-term needs across a range of facility types and building systems.

- D) Determining major renovations and in some cases building replacements.
- E) Determining lifecycle or replacement needs for building systems that are projected to reach the end of their useful life in the next ten years.
- F) Identifying growing districts and their potential facility impacts.
- G) Comparing the educational suitability of school facilities.

**FINANCIAL PROGRAMS:**

When the assessment is coupled with financial programs it can be used to give an indication of improvement and progress of correcting the original assessment deficiencies, identifying new deficiencies and the relative cost applied each year in these twelve areas. In comparing relative costs of the initial assessment to funds expended in these twelve areas we must be cautious for three reasons:

(1) Buildings were initially evaluated for compliance with an unofficial set of proposed educational facilities standards developed in 2004,

(2) The condition of every public school academic facility was measured by the most current building code as of the date of the assessment. In other words the assessment measured every current building not on standards and building codes required by law for existing buildings but rather on building codes as applicable to new construction and proposed unofficial standards. (The status of the unofficial standards was changed in November, 2005 when the Commission for Public School Academic Facilities and Transportation adopted the Arkansas Public School Academic Facilities manual),

(3) Not all deficiency corrections completed by the school districts were able to be tracked by the state until 2009. The state can classify those projects under programs for which it is providing state financial assistance. Prior to 2009 many deficiencies have been suspended by the school districts as not being warranted or as having been corrected under the 9% floor of maintenance funding required by law.

Act 1473 passed by the legislature in 2009 established that all school districts, which were required to establish

maintenance and preventative maintenance programs in 2005, would now participate in a state wide computerized maintenance management system. This system under direction of the Division allows for a consistent data base to be developed incorporating all school districts. School deficiencies are now place in the system, prioritized by the school district and scheduled for correction. The tabulated work orders then provides information to the state to monitor school programs and inspect school facilities in an attempt to determine the progress of school improvement toward suitable and adequate facilities.

The correction of deficient areas, identified in this report has been enhanced by legislative measures that have created three programs:

- A) **Academic Facilities Immediate Repair Program.** State financial participation was made available for eligible projects designed to address the correction of deficiencies in academic facilities that presented an immediate hazard to health or safety of students and staff, meeting minimum health and safety building standards, or the extraordinary deterioration of the academic facility. This program ended January 1, 2008.
  
- B) **The Transitional Academic Facilities Program.** State financial participation was made available to the school districts in the form of a reimbursement to continue the forward progress of projects begun by the school districts prior to the initiation of the Partnership Program. This program ended June 30, 2009.
  
- C) **Academic Facilities Partnership Program.** This is the long term state program for assisting school districts with new construction needs to meet the facility requirements as determined necessary for an adequate education. State financial participation is made available in the form of cash payments to school districts for eligible new construction projects. A new construction project includes any improvement to an academic facility and, if necessary, related areas such as the physical plant and grounds that bring the state of condition or efficiency of the academic facility to a state of condition or efficiency better than the facility's original condition of completeness or efficiency. New construction includes additions to existing academic facilities and new academic

facilities. The program does not assist school district with those maintenance efforts classified as repairs.

The financial programs described are functionally different in their application yet related and must be viewed as a three part continuum. The Academic Facilities Immediate Repair Program was to provide immediate state financial support for existing school facility deficiencies as determined through the assessment. It served as a one time opportunity for school districts to apply for funding to make needed improvements to certain facilities in advance of full implementation of the Statewide Planning Process under the Academic Facilities Master Plan Program.

The second part of the continuum links the provisions of financial support with planned facility projects begun prior to the Partnership Program. This program titled, Transitional Academic Facilities Program provided reimbursement to school districts for new facilities or renovations for which the debt incurred or the expenses were made to support this construction process after January 1, 2005 and on or before June 30, 2006. The projects for consideration in this program were required to be new construction projects and were allowed to meet the Arkansas Schoolhouse Construction Standards or the new Arkansas Academic Facilities Manual Standards. Repair projects were not considered under this program unless the corrective action resulted in an improvement to the existing condition as per facility manual standards.

The Transitional Program ended June 30, 2009. 212 projects were completed under this program.

The third part of the continuum is the Academic Facilities Partnership Program. This program is designed to be the major vehicle for state participation in local school facilities projects over the long term. The Partnership Program began with project applications submitted in February 2006, November 2006 and May 2008. These are designated as Partnership 2006-2007 and Partnership 2007-2009 and Partnership 2009-2011.

The partnership program to date consists of 1,343 approved projects with an estimated total program amount of \$1,555,800,000.00. The estimated state share is

\$601,700,000.00. The state has appropriated \$614,000,000.00 to cover this program.

The enclosed tabular form indicates deficient areas that have been addressed through projects approved and funded under each of the three programs outlined above. It is compared to the 2004 Statewide Assessment of School Facilities so as to indicate the approximate amount of funding necessary to complete the state's goal of adequate and suitable facilities. The 2004 assessment is shown in FY 04 dollars. The funding programs are shown in current year dollars as of the FY of the program. It is critical to understand the inflation of costs that have occurred since the original determination of the deficiencies in the Arkansas Public School Systems as compared to the appropriated amounts necessary to correct these deficiencies, continue the ongoing program initiated by the school districts in 2005, and to successfully continue the program of renovation and new facilities to meet the most current suitability and adequacy standards. To date the state facility program equals \$1,691,246,441 of which approximately 43.5% or \$727,235,969 is the state financial participation.

The Partnership Program listings for 2006-2011 indicates projects that support school district master plans and cover the full range of deficiencies indicated in the 2004 assessment plus the planned additions and new facilities to meet more current growth projections. The figures shown indicate the approximate value, in current year dollars, of the projects currently in the program, both completed and ongoing, for the categories identified in the 2004 assessment. The total value of the partnership program changes as the program proceeds. Inflation of construction cost, withdrawal of projects, combining projects for efficiencies, projects deleted due to millage failures, re-scoping of projects due to changes in need are all attributable to the fluctuating total dollar value of this program.

When you examine the financial information by program, correlated to the assessment areas, it is extremely difficult to draw a parallel between the deficiencies identified in the 2004 assessment and the progress made in these areas under all of these programs for the three reasons indicated on page three. In addition many of these deficiencies have been combined together into one project

under either the Transitional or Partnership program and a number of these have been completed by the school districts within the 9% maintenance floor of foundation funding. As of 2009 the state is beginning to track the district funds expended against these twelve deficient areas, in total not by specific areas. The financial accounting system totals the maintenance and operation expenditures reported within the 9% but not delineated by deficient area. The state computerized maintenance system tracks to deficient areas but not the associated costs to correct. Therefore in looking at the progress as measured by dollars to correct deficiencies originally identified in the assessment we must consider two factors; (1) that deficiencies are continuing to be identified by the school districts and corrected and (2) that a portion of the maintenance and operation 9% funding going toward correcting these deficiencies is not shown. It should be noted that the allowable expenses under the maintenance codes used to track the 9% foundation funding extends beyond the definition of deficiencies as listed in the assessment. As an example the school districts recorded \$368,637,096 in maintenance related expenditures for the time period July 2008 to June 2009.

Beginning with the 2008 master plan submittal, a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) was initiated by the state to standardized maintenance information collection. The state computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) was implemented as a means of complying with Ark. Code Ann. § 6-21-112 (f)(5). It will be used to identify the preventive maintenance measures being taken to counter the reoccurrence and hopefully curtail the deficient areas and track the school district effort in maintaining their facilities.

On July 1, 2009, school districts were required to submit the first annual report on the number of corrective maintenance work orders and preventative maintenance work orders. This first report was a combination of submissions using varying tracking measures. It was not until the legislative act of 2009 that the state system became mandatory. Initially school districts had the option of using the state CMMS or remaining with their current systems. At the beginning of the reporting year, July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009, approximately 30 districts were enrolled and utilizing the state CMMS. Throughout the course of the reporting year more districts enrolled. By April of

2009, approximately 90% of the districts were enrolled when the legislature made it mandatory for all districts through Act 1473.

The initial report was disappointing and brought to the surface numerous issues regarding the conduct of the state school district maintenance programs. The report showed a lack of a sense of urgency on the part of many school districts to implement the law put into place in 2006 that required school districts to better track their maintenance effort. This was derived from incomplete reports and school districts that did not reply to the report requirement. These failures were in part contributed to by;

(1) Mandatory use was not made until 2009,

(2) Many school districts did not follow the instructions given them,

(3) Personnel completing the reports did not have maintenance experience or were not trained on computers,

(4) There was an apparent lack of concern regarding the importance of the report,

(5) There was and still is resistance to state mandates regarding school district daily responsibilities. The last issue is perhaps the most serious and difficult to correct.

Commensurate with the state wide implementation of the CMMS was the initiation of the ability for the Division to monitor the system electronically, if necessary, and remotely assist school districts in tracking their maintenance effort. This will provide a more constant stream of communication between the school districts and the Division and allow for early identification of school districts that are having difficulty with their maintenance programs.

Presently and the best analysis that we can give is that school districts are progressing towards more suitable and adequate facilities in comparison to the 2004 assessment. The Academic Facility Total Project Cost Chart shows the relative percentage of the original assessment in the various system areas. When you compare this to the total

expenditures in each of the system areas we can see where the districts are placing their greatest efforts.

## ANALYSIS

The data on the enclosed Academic Facility Total Project Costs chart shows promising trends with regard to the correction of deficiencies identified in the 2004 assessment. In analyzing the % of total assessment activity identified in 2004 we see that the four highest areas based on activity completion, in order, are interior work, HVAC, roofing, and site work. When compared to the funds expended in the immediate repair program we see that the school districts continued correcting deficiencies in HVAC and roofing but their third priority shifted to fire and safety deficiencies. We see that trend extended through the other two programs, fire and safety deficiencies clearly take the lead as being the highest priority in the school district's, based on number of system deficiencies with interior and HVAC activities close behind. Clearly this area is being addressed in a very positive manner across the state.

Roofing, site projects and HVAC dominated the Transitional Program both in numbers of projects and in total project cost. Perhaps because when the Transitional projects were first conceived by the school district's the anticipated level of funding was bonded debt assistance which relied more heavily on the district's ability to raise a greater share of the project cost. Therefore I believe we see many more projects based on want as opposed to identified need. We also see, for the first time, the amount of funds expended for facility additions and new facilities due to growth. It must also be pointed out that these new additions and new facilities corrected the largest number of deficiencies on existing buildings as those buildings were replaced in total. The increase in the number of activities and cost in the site area was largely attributed to correcting deficiencies as new schools and additions were constructed.

As we analyze the partnership program we begin to see a rise in electrical and plumbing projects but a continued effort in HVAC and roofing projects. Since many of these projects are interrelated and it is possible to eliminate a deficiency in one area while correcting a deficiency in

another we do not get a true picture of the total effort without examining every project. But we certainly can see a trend toward correcting the most serious safe, dry and healthy activities in the state through complete facility replacement and specific projects dealing with the deficiencies.

The state program centers on the school districts identifying their problems and correcting them either through maintenance or new construction. Because the state does not mandate what corrections will be made, on any time schedule, we are subject to monitoring the districts action and subsequently can only follow through with inspections tied to those actions.

The data on this chart is in large part from reports received from the school districts as projects are reported through the master plan update required in the odd-numbered year, and through inspections performed by the division of projects partially funded by the state under these programs.

The Statewide Totals Annual Maintenance Report summarizes the school district effort to record their work orders to correct facility deficiencies and track their preventative maintenance effort. This contributes to a more complete picture of facility conditions but not necessarily an accurate one. The weak link in the system is state follow up through an inspection program.

Legislation passed in 2009 aids in the monitoring of school facility condition by establishing a coordinated inspection program of school facilities. State agencies will coordinate with the Division, who will in turn conduct their own inspections, allowed by law, to better determine the true school facility condition. Once this link in the system has been fully implemented we will finally be able to get a more accurate representation of the state of condition of our academic facilities.

Analysis of this report shows that school districts completed approximately 95% of the maintenance work orders and 96% of the preventative maintenance work orders originated this past year. Inspections show that many deficient areas still remain, but they do not show as open work orders. This means that school districts are not reporting in the CMMS their true deficiencies but only

those they intend to correct. This is clearly not the way this system was established not was it the intent of the laws and rules.

School districts are not identifying their true maintenance needs. This may be attributed to;

(1) The school district not recognizing the deficiencies,

(2) Not recording them,

(3) Unaware of a maintenance requirement or

(4) Failure to tie a preventative maintenance fault identified through self inspections, to a need to record and corrects the deficiency.

There is also a fear that recognizing and recording the deficiencies shows a state of condition that counters the school district perception of itself or true facility condition. The latter presents it's self when school districts attempt to replace a facility based on safe, dry and healthy considerations and there is no record of the deficiencies ever reported. It will take a concentrated effort of inspections and training to teach the school districts that identifying and recording facility deficiencies are critical both for their maintenance planning and the state knowing the true condition of its academic facilities.

Inspections of school buildings today will still reveal many deficiencies, most of which are minor, but serve as detractors to the overall school appearance and irritants to the occupants. Torn carpet, missing restroom fixtures, stained ceiling tiles, cluttered electrical closets, blocked HVAC vents, minor roof leaks, clacked windows and the list goes on. These are to be expected at school facilities. But also to be expected is a continuing process to identify them and correct them commensurate with the school districts financial resources and priorities. This is lacking in many schools. Higher priorities of major safe, dry and healthy deficiencies often override the minor deficiencies.

It is anticipated that with the newly emphasized inspection program and the implementation of the computerized

maintenance management system to assist school districts in tracking work order requests and preventive maintenance initiatives, that we will be able to work with the school districts in determining how successful their programs are and how reactive they are to identifying and correcting problems.

To date, the Division has only been able to inspect facilities commensurate with either the program projects or by special request to solve problems brought to our attention. These inspections support a rigid process to ensure that all plans and specifications meet the most current standards, and a process implemented through the Partnership Project Agreement to administer the funds to the school districts to complete these projects, we are at a minimum ensuring that facilities are being made more adequate if the projects are approved by the state. Staffing changes enacted through legislation in 2007 have allowed the Division to increase its manpower and subsequently its physical presence in the school districts in inspecting facilities. It is planned that through the enhanced inspection program beginning this next year that the division will possess the resources to begin maintenance inspections for program compliance for both work orders and preventive maintenance. It is through these inspections that we will be able to better determine if the districts are continuing to identify deficient areas and take the corrective actions necessary to repair them.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

If one were to look at the total number of deficiencies based on project cost from the 2004 assessment and compare it to the total cost of corrective actions to date one can assume that we were approximately 38% complete in solving our problem of inadequate and unsuitable facilities for school children, but you would be completely wrong. The inflation over the past five years distorts the relationship between the two total costs. This means that it has cost us more to correct deficiencies in 2009 had it would have cost had they been corrected in 2004. This supports the argument that a financial analysis of money spent is not a true basis for analyzing the condition of the Arkansas school system but does give a good indication of the effort expended to provide suitable and adequate facilities for our children. But then it begs the question "what is the best method of determining the status of the

condition of Arkansas school facilities". The answer lies in a combination of working closely with the school districts in identifying deficient areas as they develop and monitoring the district's progress toward correcting them.

The identification of deficiencies, as they occur is an ongoing process that will eventually give us a current status of the condition of our facilities. It is only through updating the deficiency status and the corrective actions taken and monitoring the cost of those actions coupled with inspections can we truthfully state the condition of our facilities.

The assessment of 2004 showed us that the state of condition as portrayed by the school districts was not what we believed it to be. The arguments by school districts that the deficiencies were not recognized by them as being deficiencies as they were paired against an unrealistic standard brought to light an operating frame of mind. Inclusive in that frame of mind was the philosophy that maintenance could easily be deferred to support other district initiatives while the district proceeded with construction of what they wanted as opposed to what they needed.

In March 2009 the Division reported to the Combined Senate and House committee on Education that while the state has made advancements in its school facilities these advancements came at a cost which is attributable to the manner in which the programs were established and administered. The fact that the programs were derived from a lawsuit, over shadows the good intentions of the legislature and certainly fueled a power struggle between the two entities: state and school districts.

The Division reported that:

(1) While the state has put in place a strong program of financial assistance,

(2) Caused the school districts to stop and think about their facility needs,

(3) Caused the school districts to examine their facility needs in light of the academic programs,

(4) Better defined school districts facility needs in relation to the school districts over all academic goals, and

(5) Brought the level of cohesiveness to state facilities by establishing state standards,

It has come at a cost.

That cost being;

(1) Programs came fast at the school districts and their reaction time was short,

(2) Confusion and uncertainty in understanding what these new programs were,

(3) Programs required changes that school districts were not prepared to make nor accept quickly,

(4) The Commission and the Division were called upon to make many clarification decisions regarding unanswered areas not in law or rule,

(5) Caused changes to programs each year, and

(6) Caused the Division and school districts to be at odds over programs intent.

The end result on the part of the school districts was to focus on the amount of financial assistance and not on the methods of applying the programs whose true meaning was not just to provide money to the school districts but to change the culture and the method of dealing with facilities in the future. This is without a doubt the greatest challenge facing the program.

Still ahead of us are the things we need to do to make this a more successful program. Inspections and reports are indicators of actions that are interpreted to be results. We still must:

(1) Strengthen the states role in determining what its goals are. We are dealing with a voluntary program that is in the hands of the schools districts by design. To make it effective we must continue to give clear and concise guidance to the school districts and let them know exactly

what the state goals are with regard to school facilities and how we will implement them.

(2) Continue to stress that the state does not want to stand still nor will it allow the program to move backward which could result in a state of condition prior to the court's decisions; That we will continue to review and adjust programs and the monitoring of such to insure that this is happening and that we will update laws and rules commensurate with education change. And that the mind set of doing what we have to do will over ride that of doing what we want to do.

We are meeting resistance in changing the culture of school districts toward their facility needs not because they do not agree that the need is there but that the state is causing this change and establishing the criteria to formulate the end result. This will be difficult to overcome. But by meeting this challenge with coordinated planning between the state and the school districts, by becoming more cognoscente of each others position, by stressing that the states assistance is meant to meet both of our goals, it is possible

We have made great strides in correcting many of the inequities in the Arkansas school facilities, which is obvious. But we must remember that our facility program consists of over 6,500 buildings on 1,200 campuses and that that number is changing on a yearly basis, and we did not get into this condition in a short period of time and that, that condition was caused by as many facility philosophies as we have school districts. When you couple that with the aging condition of our facilities, the wear and tear on school buildings by their occupants, the damage to facilities by forces beyond the control of the school districts, you clearly see how this is a program in which we are only able to surmise the factors and the corrective actions but not able to accurately forecast when we will be in a position to clearly state that we have arrived at equitable, adequate and suitable facilities.

Annual Governor's Report  
October 1, 2009

**ACADEMIC FACILITY TOTAL PROJECT COSTS**

2004 Assessment Current Condition and 5-Year Life Cycle			Immediate Repair		Transitional		Partnership 2006-2007 2007-2009 2009-2011		Percentage of assesment costs from approved projects
System	Project Cost	Percentage of Total Assesment Costs	Activity	Project Cost	Activity	Project Cost	Activity	Project Cost	
Site	\$290,976,912	7.06%	11	\$1,498,769	20	\$4,527,758	137	\$10,469,600	5.67%
Roofing	\$313,277,404	7.60%	92	\$19,826,282	27	\$6,782,095	174	\$47,278,452	23.59%
Exterior	\$200,282,479	4.86%	40	\$1,116,031	5	\$896,602	107	\$8,869,716	5.43%
Structure	\$45,366,634	1.10%	20	\$1,369,593	1	\$717,868	23	\$2,001,443	9.01%
Interior	\$779,021,744	18.91%	46	\$3,644,225	15	\$2,453,938	128	\$26,124,461	4.14%
HVAC	\$519,174,813	12.60%	94	\$15,221,781	10	\$1,775,822	171	\$89,411,722	20.50%
Plumbing	\$229,076,007	5.56%	31	\$1,922,964	1	\$653,394	86	\$6,917,561	4.14%
Electrical	\$223,810,489	5.43%	2	\$91,800	4	\$682,106	102	\$10,570,828	5.07%
Technology	\$151,567,110	3.68%	11	\$1,276,365	15	\$528,682	61	\$3,142,464	3.26%
Fire & Safety	\$158,502,486	3.85%	86	\$5,209,939	3	\$38,407	372	\$15,080,575	12.83%
Specialty	\$290,168,877	7.04%	48	\$1,956,488	1	\$21,196	103	\$6,504,223	2.92%
<b>Space Utilization</b>									
Suitability	\$556,735,819	13.51%		\$0	48	\$54,930,669	192	\$382,153,628	78.51%
Enrollment Growth	\$361,769,048	8.78%		\$0	62	\$142,178,942	119	\$821,125,097	266.28%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$4,119,729,822</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>\$53,134,237</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>\$208,462,434</b>	<b>1775</b>	<b>\$1,429,649,770</b>	

NOTE: Partnership Program projects for 2009-2011 are projects approved and funded on May 1, 2009 list

Revised 7/31/09

### Statewide Totals Annual Maintenance Report

	Corrective Maintenance Work Orders				Preventative Maintenance Work Orders				Composite Totals		
	Total Created	Total Complete	Remain Open	Total % Complete	Total Created	Total Complete	Remain Open	Total % Complete	Total Created	Total Complete	Total % Complete
Systems per ACA Ann. 6-21-112											
Electrical	20354	19414	940	95.38%	2762	2610	152	94.50%	<b>23116</b>	<b>22024</b>	<b>95.28%</b>
Exterior	5192	4778	414	92.03%	3427	3347	80	97.67%	<b>8619</b>	<b>8125</b>	<b>94.27%</b>
Fire & Safety	3224	3000	224	93.05%	22318	21206	1112	95.02%	<b>25542</b>	<b>24206</b>	<b>94.77%</b>
HVAC	17450	16820	630	96.39%	10501	9751	750	92.86%	<b>27951</b>	<b>26571</b>	<b>95.06%</b>
Interior	12892	11580	1312	89.82%	3061	3005	56	98.17%	<b>15953</b>	<b>14585</b>	<b>91.42%</b>
Other											
Miscellaneous	81392	77349	4043	95.03%	10077	9984	93	99.07%	<b>91469</b>	<b>87333</b>	<b>95.48%</b>
Plumbing	17647	16652	995	94.36%	5715	5385	330	94.23%	<b>23362</b>	<b>22037</b>	<b>94.33%</b>
Roof	3815	3470	345	90.96%	2210	2055	155	92.99%	<b>6025</b>	<b>5525</b>	<b>91.70%</b>
Site	4670	4379	291	93.77%	2991	2756	235	92.14%	<b>7661</b>	<b>7135</b>	<b>93.13%</b>
Space Utilization	1194	1122	72	93.97%	480	455	25	94.79%	<b>1674</b>	<b>1577</b>	<b>94.21%</b>
Specialties	6318	6010	308	95.13%	2666	2650	16	99.40%	<b>8984</b>	<b>8660</b>	<b>96.39%</b>
Structural	1117	1061	56	94.99%	1125	1066	59	94.76%	<b>2242</b>	<b>2127</b>	<b>94.87%</b>
Technology	14553	13798	755	94.81%	1246	1238	8	99.35%	<b>15799</b>	<b>15036</b>	<b>95.17%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>189818</b>	<b>179433</b>	<b>10385</b>	<b>94.53%</b>	<b>68579</b>	<b>65508</b>	<b>3071</b>	<b>95.52%</b>	<b>258397</b>	<b>244941</b>	<b>94.79%</b>