CHAPTER 10

DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE STATE FUNDING ASSISTANCE

CHAPTER 11

DETERMINATION OF SPACE ELIGIBILITY FOR STATE FUNDING ASSISTANCE

CHAPTER 12 PROPOSED SCHEDULE/TIMELINES

Chapter 12. Proposed Schedule/Timelines

Freeman School District, with input from the staff and the community, is currently evaluating the proper timing of the next bond campaign and vote.

The proposed schedule/timelines of improvements following a successful bond campaign is as follows:

Phase I (Completed by August, 2005):

A. Modernization, New Construction at the High School (front funded):

Educational Specifications, Design and Construction Documents Bidding, Construction and Occupancy

Spring 2008 – Spring 2009 Spring 2009 – Summer 2010

B. Modernization and New Construction at the Elementary School:

Educational Specifications, Design and Construction Documents Bidding, Construction and Occupancy

Spring 2009 – Summer 2010 Summer 2010 – Summer 2011

C. Site Improvements addressing bus loading/unloading, student drop-off and parking.

Transportation Facility, District Offices and Campus Wide Safety Improvements

(see attached schedule)



Schedule - Approach D

FREEMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS MASTER SCHEDULE APPROACH D (FRONT FUNDED HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT)

PRELIMINARY

ALSC ARCHITECTS DECEMBER 3, 2007

			0000	2040	000
	NOW LOOK date of the country of the	AND IT AND DEC AN THE MAIN APP MAY LIM ALL AND SEP OCT NOV DEC	OCC JAN FEB MARK JAPR JULI AUG SEP OCT NOV DEC	JAN FEB MAR ANY MAN JUL ALGE SEP OCT NOV DEC	NAN FEB MAN AFE MAN JULY ILL AUG SP OCT NOV DEC
STUDY & SURVEY					
BOND CAMPAIGN					
OSPI PROJECT FUNDING	<u>5</u>		*	*	
PROJECT 1 (HIGH SCHOOL) - Educational Specifications - Schemaic Design - Design Development - Covarincation Documents - Bedang & Contact Award - Covarincation				+ 16 Month Construction Period	struction Period
PROJECT 2 (ELEMENTARY) - teluctional Specifications - Schematic Design - Design Development - Construction Documents - Bedging & Contract Award - Construction				+1	± 12 Month Construction Period
OTHER PROJECTS					

CHAPTER 13

UNUSED OR UNDERUTILIZED SCHOOL FACILITIES IN OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Chapter 13. Unused or Under-Utilized School Facilities in Neighboring School Districts

Freeman School District is bordered by 3 school districts. All three school districts (Liberty, Central Valley and Spokane District No. 81) have been contacted concerning unused educational space. Liberty School District reports that they have <u>no</u> unused space available. Central Valley has reported that University High School is partially vacant and is possibly available for lease. Spokane Public Schools (District #81) has reported the Pratt Elementary School available for lease. See attached letters for verification.

See enclosed School Board Resolution 2-2007/2008 related to unused space in neighboring school districts.



15001 S. Jackson Road • Rockford, WA 99030-9755 Telephone: 509-291-3695 • Fax: 509-291-3636 • www.freemansd.org

August 29, 2007

Bill Motsenbocker Liberty School District 29818 S North Pine Creek Rd Spangle WA 99031

Dear Bill:

Freeman School District is currently in the process of reviewing our long-range facilities planning. As part of this process, we are required to complete a study and survey of all existing facilities as well as surveying districts that share a common boundary. It is with a sense of urgency that I request your assistance.

I have enclosed a short survey to determine if you have available school facilities that could be utilized by our district, if needed. I am requesting your cooperation in expediting this back to us by September 14, 2007. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to give me a call.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Sergio Hernandez

Superintendent

Enclosure

DOCUMENTATION OF QUERY TO ADJACENT SCHOOL DISTRICT REGARDING AVAILABLE AND SUITABLE SCHOOL PLANT FACILITIES

DA	ATE:	8/29/07
TC) :	Bill MotsenbockerSuperintendent, Liberty School District
FF	ROM:	Sergio Hernandez, Superintendent Freeman School District No. 358
RĒ	- -	SURVEY TO DETERMINE IF YOUR DISTRICT HAS AVAILABLE AND SUITABLE SCHOOL FACILITIES FOR USE BY OUR SCHOOL DISTRICT
su scl foll	rvey distr hool facili	ne process for obtaining facility matching funds, the State Board of Education requires that we ict sharing a common boundary with ours to determine if they have any available and suitable ties which could be utilized by our school district. I will appreciate it if you could complete the formation and return it to me at your earliest convenience, preferably be September 14, 2007.
1.	Our sch	nool District needs the following type(s) of facilities:
	Elemen	tary School, High School
2.		our school district have any school facilities of the above type(s) vacant now or scheduled for a within five years?
-	If you in	check: Yes No _X If Yes, please complete the information request in Item 3 below. Indicate that you have a building available, I will contact you for further discussion. Thank you assistance.
	Person	Completing This Form: BILL Motsen bocker Signature: (Licent bock Superior Date: 8-31-07
	Title:	SUPERINTENDENT Date: 8-31-07
	School	District: Liberty
3.		facilities of the above type(s) that your school district has vacant now or scheduled for within the foreseeable future:
	School	Facility Name:
	Туре:	
	Street A	ddress:
	General	Condition of Facility:
	Does th	e facility meet reasonable health and safety codes?
	Meet ha	ndicapped accessibility requirements?
	Have ac	lequate site including parking and playfields?
	Assumir facility to	ng that we could negotiate a satisfactory agreement, would your district be willing to lease the our district for an extended period of time?

DOCUMENTATION OF QUERY TO ADJACENT SCHOOL DISTRICT REGARDING AVAILABLE AND SUITABLE SCHOOL PLANT FACILITIES

DA	TE:	8/29,	/07	
TO	:	Mike	Pearson	, Superintendent, <u>Central Valley</u> School District
FR	OM:		lernandez, Si I School Dist	uperintendent trict No. 358
RE	•			RMINE IF YOUR DISTRICT HAS AVAILABLE AND SUITABLE S FOR USE BY OUR SCHOOL DISTRICT
sur sch folk	vey distr ool facili	ict sharinç ties which	g a common t n could be util	g facility matching funds, the State Board of Education requires that we boundary with ours to determine if they have any available and suitable lized by our school district. I will appreciate it if you could complete the to me at your earliest convenience, preferably be September 14, 2007.
1.	Our sch	ool Distric	ct needs the f	following type(s) of facilities:
	Elemen	tary Scho	ol, High Scho	loc
2.		our schoo n within fiv		e any school facilities of the above type(s) vacant now or scheduled for
	If you ir for your	ndicate the assistance	at you have a ce.	If Yes, please complete the information request in Item 3 below. a building available, I will contact you for further discussion. Thank you mild the contact you for further discussion. Thank you so that the contact you for further discussion.
	Title:	$ \begin{array}{c} $	Laf	Date: 093107
	School	District:	CEWT	
3.	School vacation	facilities within th	of the above ne foreseeable	re type(s) that your school district has vacant now or scheduled for le future:
•	School	Facility N	ame: <u>(///</u> /	issesty Control - A possion of DR Building would be wallable the Lease as my
	Type:	:		cremently on High Subri Tomportally Sta
	Street A	\ddress:_	10304	E. Night Spikme
	Genera	I Conditio	n of Facility:_	SAKANE Well used, correstly lensed to Vodley Chairter
	Does th	e facility	meet reasona	able health and safety codes?
	Meet ha	andicappe	ed accessibilit	ity requirements?
	Have a	dequate s	site including	parking and playfields?
	Assumi facility t	ng that w o our dist	e could nego rict for an ext	otiate a satisfactory agreement, would your district be willing to lease the tended period of time? Tokale defended on the New

DOCUMENTATION OF QUERY TO ADJACENT SCHOOL DISTRICT REGARDING AVAILABLE AND SUITABLE SCHOOL PLANT FACILITIES

DA	TE:	8/2	29/07			
то	:	Nancy	Stowell	, Superintendent,	Spokane	_ School District
FR	OM:	Sergio H Freeman	ernandez, S School Dis	uperintendent trict No. 358		
RE	:	SURVEY SCHOOL	TO DETE	RMINE IF YOUR DIS	STRICT HAS CHOOL DISTR	AVAILABLE AND SUITABLE
sur sch folk	vey distr	ict sharing ities which	g a common could be ufi	boundary with ours to c lized by our school dist	letermine if the rict. I will appr	ard of Education requires that we y have any available and suitable eciate it if you could complete the referably be September 14, 2007.
1.	Our sch	nool Distric	ot needs the	following type(s) of facil	ities:	•
	Elemen	itary Scho	ol, High Scho	ool		
2.	Does you	our schoo n within fiv	l district have ve years?	e any school facilities o	f the above typ	e(s) vacant now or scheduled for
	If you ir for your	ndicate that assistance	at you have a ce.	a building available, I w	ill contact you	for further discussion. Thank you
	Person	Completin	ng This Form	Mark Anderson	Signature	e: My Waar
	Title:	Associa	te Superin	tendent Date	e: <u>9/6/200</u>	7
	School	District:	Spokane	Public Schools		
3.	School vacation	facilities n within th	of the abov e foreseeabl	e type(s) that your so e future:	hool district h	as vacant now or scheduled for
	School	Facility Na	ame: <u>Pra</u>	itt Elementary		
	Туре:	<u>Eleme</u>	ntary Scho	001		
	Street A	\ddress:_	6903 Eas	t 4th Avenue, Spo	kane, WA	99212
	Genera	I Conditio	n of Facility:_	Aged, but good	condition	
	Does th	e facility r	meet reasona	able health and safety o	odes? <u>Yes</u>	
	Meet ha	andicappe	d accessibili	ty requirements? <u> </u>	es .	
	Have a	dequate s	ite including	parking and playfields?	<u>Minimal</u>	
	Assumi	ng that we	e could nego		eement, would	your district be willing to lease the

CHAPTER 14

NEED TO ADJUST SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREAS

Chapter 14. Need to Adjust School Attendance Areas

At present and for the foreseeable future, Freeman School District will have only one school building per grade configuration. Consequently, it is not anticipated that there will be any need to consider formation of attendance area boundaries within Freeman School District or involving adjacent school districts.

APPENDIX

BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION SCORE SUMMARY SHEET FREEMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

August 8, 2007

SCHOOL (year constructed/substantially modernized)	EXTERIOR	EXTERIOR INTERIOR ELEC.	MECH & ELEC.	SAFETY	UNADJUSTED SCORE	ADJUSTED SCORE
	_					
ORIGINAL (1970) & ADDITION (1989)	20	15	10	6	54	57
ORIGINAL (1989)	19	17	20	17	73	73
ORIGINAL (1957) & ADD'NS (77 & '9)	17	6	8	8	42	45
HIGH SEMECH VORUE HIGH						
ORIGINAL (1957) & ADDITION (1980)	17	10	9	- 2	38	40

NOTE #1: Maximum possible BCEF score is 100 (unadjusted score), if building has air conditioning and 94 (adjusted score) without A/C. Only the Middle School has Central A/C.

NOTE #2. For reference purposes, the following are common score ranges for reasonably "sound" facilities in other Districts around the State (based on building age):

Original portion of HS & Vo-Tech Bldg. are 50 years old. Original portion of Elementary School is 37 years old.

A. Greater than 60 yrs. old: 44 to 52

B. 45 to 60 yrs. old: 52 to 64

C. 35 to 44 yrs. old: 58 to 70

D. 25 to 34 yrs. old: 65 to 76

E. 10 to 24 yrs. old: 75 to 85

F. Newer than 10 yrs. old: 82 to 100

Middle School is 17 years old.

NOTE #3. Facilities with scores 70 or less, at least 30 yrs. old, and no substantial remodeling in the past 30 yrs. are typically in need of some level of modernization.

NOTE #4: Facilities with scores in the 40's & 50's and no substantial remodeling in the past 30 yrs. are typically in significant need of major modernization.

Deferred Maintenance is becoming a major issue.

NOTE #5. Low building scores are also an indication of significant code changes & program changes since the time of original construction.

BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION FORM

	Spokane/Freeman 358			Elementary School	hool		Original (1970), Addition (1989	Addition (1989
	County/School District			School Name			Building Name/#	
			2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	RATINGS	200 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000			4
COMPONENTS	SYSTEMS	(j) goos	FAIR (2)	POOR (3)	UNSAT. (4)	COMBINED	SINEMINOU	o E
1.0 Exterior Building Condition	1.1 Foundation/Structure	+12						
Ample Account to the Control of the	1.2 Walls		+5				No exterior shear walls.	
+20	1.3 Roof					+3	Significant leakage @ gym.	gym.
Component Score	1.4 Windows/Doors			+0			Uninsulated windows/old hdwe	old hdwe
	1.5 Trim			+0			Wood trim in need of repair	epair.
2.0 Interior Building Condition	2.1 Floors	+8						
+15	2.2 Walls		+5					
Component Score	2.3 Ceilings			+1				
	2.4 Fixed Equipment		+1					
3.0 Mechanical Systems Condition	3.1 Electrical			7+				
	3.2 Plumbing			1+				
+10	3.3 Heating				+1			
Component Score	3.4 Cooling					+3	AC in 1989 addition only	ıly.
	3.5 Lighting		+3					
4.0 Safety/Building Code	4.1 Means of Exit		+4				Exit/Egress marginally lit under	lit under
	4.2 Fire Control Capability				+			emergency powe
Ĝ+	4.3 Fire Alarm System		+3				Vis. alarm does not meet ADA.	eet ADA.
Component Score	4.4 Emergency Lighting				0+		FAC	FACP also serves M
	4.5 Fire Resistance				L +			
	TOTALS	20	21	4	င			
5.0 Provisions for Handicapped				×				
	4 Building makes positive contri	e contribution to educational environment	itional environm	ent.				
Suitability Code and Definition	3 Building suitable.							
(Circle Appropriate Code)	2 Current use of space is compatible with intended use but needs remodeling.	patible with in	itended use bu	at needs remoc	leling.			
	1 Current use of space is not compatible with intended use or design.	mpatible with in	ntended use or	design.				
Significant Location Factors/Overall Conclusions	lusions							
37 year old building in need of remodeling, no tire sprinkler.	eling, no tire sprinkler.					2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200	
Evaluator Signature	Dave Huotari, ALSC Architects	-				Date	Unadjusted Score	Adjusted
School Official Signature		\supset				8/8/2007	54	27
(BCEF.WK1 2/15/92) **Record Information o	tem Data Elem	Reverse Side.**					1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	

Page 1

Building Condition Evaluation

FORM
'ALUATION
IDITION EV
UILDING CON
面

Spokane/Freeman 358

Original (1989)

Middle School

	County/School District			School Name			Building Name/#	
				RATINGS				200 - 200 -
COMPONENTS	SYSTEMS	G005	FAIR	POOR (A)	UNSAT	COMBINED	Š	
1 O Exterior Building Condition	4 1 Exercise the second							
	1.1 tourisation of course		٠					
- The second sec	1.2 Walls		C F				CMU needs sealant replaced	pec
2) +	1.3 Root					+4	Roof patch (east/central) poor.	ooor.
Component Score	1.4 Windows/Doors		Ŧ					
	1.5 Trim		+7					
2.0 Interior Building Condition	2.1 Floors		+5				Carpet being repalced/ wood	pod
	2.2 Walls	φ					þ	being refinished.
Component Score	2.3 Cellings		+3					
	2.4 Fixed Equipment		+1					
3.0 Mechanical Systems Condition	3.1 Electrical		+4				Limited expansion capability	ity.
	3.2 Plumbing		+2					
+20	3.3 Heating		+4				Pumps out of compliance w/	w/
Component Score	3.4 Cooling	9+			,		uno	current standards.
	3.5 Lighting	+4						
4.0 Safety/Building Code	4.1 Means of Exit	9+					Exit/Egress marginally lit under	ınder
	4.2 Fire Control Capability		+3				eme	emergency power.
+17	4.3 Fire Alarm System		+3					
Component Score	4.4 Emergency Lighting	7+						,
	4.5 Fire Resistance		+3					
	TOTALS	76	43	0	0			
5.0 Provisions for Handicapped			×					
	4 Building makes positive cor	ntribution to e	contribution to educational environment	ronment.				
Suitability Code and Definition	3 Building suitable.							
(Circle Appropriate Code)	2 Current use of space is compatible with intended use but needs remodeling.	atible with inter	nded use but nee	ds remodeling.				
	1 Current use of space is not compatible with intended use or design	mpatible with i	ntended use or c	lesign.				
Significant Location Factors/Overall Conclusions Fastly renaizable issues no fire sortokler	usions fer							
						Paris	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Evaluator Signature	Dave Huotari, ALSO Architects						5	2
School Official Signature	ACT IN					8/8/2007	73	73
(BCEF.WK1 2/15/92) **Record Information on Building System Data Elements	on Building System Data Elements on	on Reverse Side.				Building C	Building Condition Evaluation	Page 1

Σ
∼
$\overline{}$
بر
ш
7
$\overline{}$
\simeq
⋖
\supset
4
3
ш
_
_
О
⊏
<u>=</u>
Ω
Z
\overline{c}
×
U
(1)
Ŧ
Ħ
ᆸ
Ξ
\equiv
Ш

	Spokane/Freeman 358		-	High School		Orig	Original (1957), Additions (1977 & 1989)	ıs (1977 & 1989)
	County/School District		0)	School Name			Building Name/#	
				RATINGS				2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
COMPONENTS	SYSTEMS	000 E	FAIR	POOR (3)	UNSAT.	GENIBINOS	SEVERIMEDE	v e
1.0 Exterior Building Condition	1.1 Foundation/Structure		8+					
	1.2 Walls		+5					
41+	1.3 Roof					+3	Between fair & poor.	
Component Score	1.4 Windows/Doors		+1					
	1.5 Trim			+0				
2.0 Interior Building Condition	2.1 Floors		+5				Old & damaged @ pipe breaks.	pe breaks.
6+	2.2 Walls					+3	Between fair & poor.	
Component Score	2.3 Ceilings			+4			Old, stained & worn.	
	2.4 Fixed Equipment			0+				
3.0 Mechanical Systems Condition	3.1 Electrical			+2			Panels don't meet code	de.
	3.2 Plumbing			+1			Problems with valves & breaks	& breaks.
8+	3.3 Heating			+2			Pipes under slab break	ak.
Component Score	3.4 Cooling						NA, Window units through-out.	ough-out.
	3.5 Lighting		+3					
)							
4.0 Safety/Building Code	4.1 Means of Exit		+4				Problems @ Library & IT exit	& IT exit
•	4.2 Fire Control Capability				1+		No fire sprinkler.	
₩ +	4.3 Fire Alarm System			+2			Doesn't meet current code	code.
Component Score	4.4 Emergency Lighting				9 +		Doesn't meet current code.	code.
	4.5 Fire Resistance				7		Bldg. not fire resistive.	ei
	TOTALS	0	26	æ	2			
5.0 Provisions for Handicapped			×				Between fair & poor.	Jr.
	4 Building makes positive contribution to educational environment.	oution to educa	itional environme	ent.		•		
Suitability Code and Definition	3 Building suitable.							
(Circle Appropriate Code)	2 Current use of space is com	patible with in	compatible with intended use but needs remodeling.	needs remod	feling.			
	1 Current use of space is not compatible with intended use or design	mpatible with in	ntended use or d	esign.				
Significant Location Factors/Overall Conclusions	lusions							
a see a see seemble topouror to but							Unadjusted	Adjusted
Evaluator Signature	Dave Huotari, ALSC Architects					0.5	9008	e102¢
School Official Signature	Something the second		1			8/8/2007	42	45
(BCEF.WK1 2/15/92) **Record Information o	**Record Information on Building System Data Elements of	s on Reverse Side.**				Building (Building Condition Evaluation	tion Page 1

BUILDING CONDITION EVALUATION FORM

Spokane/Freeman 358

Original (1957), Addition (1980)

High School, Vo-Tech. Bldg.

	County/School District			School Name			Building Name/#	
				RATINGS				
COMPONENTS	SYSTEMS	G00D (1)	FAIR (2)	POOR (3)	UNSAT. (4)	COMBINED	COMMENTS	S
1.0 Exterior Building Condition	1.1 Foundation/Structure		8+				Some cracks in foundations.	is.
	1.2 Walls		`			+4	Some significant cracking.	
+17	1.3 Roof		+5					
Component Score	1.4 Windows/Doors			0+			Single pane windows.	
	1.5 Trim		**	0+				
2.0 Interior Building Condition	2.1 Floors					+4	Between fair & poor.	
+10	2.2 Walls					+3	Between fair & poor.	
Component Score	2.3 Ceilings					+2	Between fair & poor.	
	2.4 Fixed Equipment		+1					
3.0 Mechanical Systems Condition	3.1 Electrical			+2			Elect. Panels not per code	ď
	3.2 Plumbing				•		Fixtures broken & removed	Ġ.
9+	3.3 Heating			+2			Tanks rusted.	Pipes leak
Component Score	3.4 Cooling						No A/C	
	3.5 Lighting	-		+2			Most light levels too low.	
4.0 Safety/Building Code	4.1 Means of Exit			+2				
	4.2 Fire Control Capability				+1		No sprinkler, no separation	<u>.</u>
+5	4.3 Fire Alarm System				+1		Smoke detection not per code	ode.
Component Score	4.4 Emergency Lighting				0+		Emerg. lighting not per code.	de.
	4.5 Fire Resistance				+1		Building is not fire resistive.	ě.
	TOTALS	0	14	8	3			
5.0 Provisions for Handicapped				×			No real provisions provided	ided.
	4 Building makes positive contribution to educational environment.	bution to educa	tional environm	ent.				
Suitability Code and Definition	3 Building suitable.							
(Circle Appropriate Code)	2 Current use of space is compatible with intended use but needs remodeling.	atible with inten	ded use but nee	eds remodeling.				
	1 Current use of space is not	is not compatible with intended use or design.	th intended us	e or design.				
Significant Location Factors/Overall Conclusions								
Major remodel or building replacement required	nt required							
Evaluator Streeture	Dave Huotari					Date	Unadjusted Score	Adjusted Score
				5		8/8/2007	38	40
School Official olgriamie		** ************************************						
(BCEF.WK1 2/15/92) "Kecord Information of	**Record information on Building System Data Elements on reverse Side.	Heverse olde.				Building C	Building Condition Evaluation	Pade

FREEMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 358 RESOLUTION 2-2007/2008 Available Space in Adjacent School Districts

WHEREAS, WAC 180-25 requires school districts applying for state construction funds to conduct a documented survey of available and suitable school facilities in adjacent school districts to determine whether existing facilities could reasonably serve students of the applying district, and

WHEREAS, the Superintendent of Liberty School District No. 362 has indicated in writing that there are no available facilities within their district, the Superintendents of Central Valley School District No. 356 and Spokane Public Schools (District No. 81) have indicated they have available space, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of Freeman School District has reviewed the documentation provided from the adjacent school districts and has also reviewed current and projected enrollment for the district, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of Freeman School District has determined that the potentially available space of University High School in Central Valley School District No. 356 and Pratt Elementary School in Spokane Public Schools (District No. 81) are unsuitable and will not meet the needs of the District.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of Freeman School District No. 358 that the state requirements to examine the potential use of facilities in adjacent school districts has been satisfied.

Signed this 12th day of December, 2007.

Sergio Hernandez, Superintendent

Secretary to the Board

ATTEST:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Diane Woodman

ad Goldsmith

Brent Fetsch

Randy Primmer

Vicki Sellers

FREEMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 358 RESOLUTION 3-2007/2008

FACILITIES STUDY AND SURVEY

At its December 12th, 2007 regular Board meeting of Freeman School District No. 358, the Board of Directors passed Resolution No. 3-2007/2008 approving the Facilities Study and Survey dated December, 2007 conducted by ALSC Architects of Spokane, Washington.

Signed this 12th day of December, 2007.

ATTEST:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Sergio Hernandez, Superintendent Secretary to the Board

Chad Goldsmith

Diane Woodman

Brent Fetsch

Randy Primmer

Vicki Sellers



