

**VALUE ENGINEERING REVIEW
OF THE
CLUBHOUSE 2 AND GOLF STARTER BUILDING
REPORT OF RENOVATION POTENTIAL
Prepared By The
Tomko Woll Group Architects Inc.**

September, 2006



Value Engineering Review Prepared
By
Bruce H. Collins, PE

**VALUE ENGINEERING REVIEW
OF
TOMKO WOLL GROUP PROPOSED
CLUBHOUSE TWO AND GOLF STARTER BUILDING
RENOVATION PROPOSAL
LAGUNA WOODS VILLAGE
September, 2006**

INTRODUCTION

The following report is a summary of the findings in review and critique of the Clubhouse 2 and Golf Starter Building report of renovation potential prepared by Tomko Woll Group Architects Inc (TWG) heading a consortium of engineering and other expert consultants. This study was authorized by the Board of Directors of the Golden Rain Foundation as recommended by PCM. This critique is done in the mode of a value engineering analysis focusing on an evaluation of the alternative which evaluates renovation as an alternative to demolition and replacement of Clubhouse 2 and the Golf Starter Building (Caddy Shack). The report fails to include an evaluation of performing remediation of the consequences of deferred maintenance and the failure to conduct routine inspection and correction of the problems of aging of these facilities before they become larger problems. This queen of the Leisure World clubhouses is a delightful building having the charm and essence of early California stucco and tile on a spectacular setting. It has aged in its 40 years of existence, and has the wholesome patina rubbed on it from the many great parties that she has hosted.

The following are the perceptions and product of the analysis conducted by an experienced professional engineer having specialized credentials and expertise in the science of value engineering.

Transmittal: The PCM transmittal sheet is addressed to “LWV Resident” but no copies or abstracts of the report have been distributed. The report should include an abstract in 2 or 3 short pages, which could have been distributed as a flyer in the Globe or a handout at the Administration building. This report fails to include a discussion of how these millions of dollars of expenditure are going to be financed and how the LWV owners are going to benefit from this expenditure and its impact on the association fee.

The Title: (Clubhouse and Golf Starter Building Renovation Potential) is misleading inasmuch as the report is clearly structured to support the conclusion that renovation of these facilities has no potential and raises the question as to why the facilities are joined together for the purpose of the study. This presumably is structured to focus on the intent of proving the feasibility of demolition and new construction, and totally avoids any serious consideration of all alternatives, which should include an alternative for the remediation of deferred and neglected maintenance needed to restore this grand old lady to her prior beauty and charm.

This study and report fails to follow the very basic requirement for any facilities planning activity, which is to define all rational options, which in this case should focus primarily on how best to restore this facility to its original designed quality. The scope of the “Renovation”

Value Engineering Review of Tomko Woll Report by Bruce Collins

alternative reflects either an objective to make Clubhouse 2 a grander and more imposing edifice than the original, or else it is a blatant distortion of the facts and deliberate exaggeration of the cost of “Renovation” in order to justify the preference to tear down perfectly adequate buildings and replace them with a grander country club type of facility. Laguna Woods is not a country club.

Of serious concern is the cost estimating procedure of Noel Fearon Associates. Are they duly registered and licensed engineers or architects, or neither? There are numerous contradictions between their cost estimating summary and the cost estimates provided by other expert members of the TWG consortium of consultants. It appears that the most critical aspect of the study (the preparation of cost estimates) was done by someone who apparently did not bother to read and incorporate the data provided by the other members of the consultant team, dealing with elements such as roofing, foundations, soils and structural elements. Why replace such things as foundations and substructures that are in perfect condition after 40 years of existence.

The budget estimate of \$779,765 for foundation renovation is based on the speculation that there “**could be** differential settlement” under a building that has been there for 40 years and shows no visible or measurable evidence of differential settlement. Apparently the estimator had not read the TWG Geotechnical or Structural Engineering reports prior to putting in this huge cost item for foundation renovation, which is clearly not necessary. Is this a careless oversight, or is it an indication of deliberate intent to exaggerate the cost of renovation to favor the destruct-and-replace alternative.

Another major area of significant criticism of the report relates to the design criteria **assumptions** relating to the selection of design occupancy criteria, which greatly impacts the code requirements for bathroom fixture units and other elements of the building. Posted occupancy limits, as determined by the Fire Marshall, as well as the actual usage history of Clubhouse 2 have been ignored and have been replaced by incorrectly assumed criteria. The plumbing renovation proposal is a prime example of the impact of this erroneous and excessive occupancy criteria, which has been compounded by a series of **assumptions**, not facts. As stated in Plumbing Section 3.7. Paragraph 3.7.2, “the age of the buildings and the condition of existing plumbing fixtures **warrant the assumption** that wholesale water piping, and fixture and trim replacement is called for in both buildings”.

The price tag for adding six more toilets, one more urinal and four more lavatories, all of which exceed the allowable occupancy requirements of Clubhouse II, is **\$1,301,457**. This is based on serving an occupancy of 716 rather than the established occupancy limit of 356. Aside from this legal occupancy limit, the report authors do not understand that this limit has been exceeded only once, over the protests of staff, and that the versatility of Laguna Woods Village provides larger facilities, such as Clubhouses 3 and 5, when larger groups must be accommodated.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

A review of this report all adds up to a strong suggestion that a plan should be considered that provides a reasonable remediation of deferred maintenance and modest needed improvements, which would not open the “can of worms” of expensive code compliance issues other than those clearly involving safety issues relating to actual utilization of these facilities. The TWG Report is clearly biased against serious consideration of a more modest necessary remediation and improvement program. What we don’t need is to bring these two facilities up to Pelican Hill or Pebble Beach class country club standards.

Reasonably priced green fees for golf that LWV provides is probably the prime amenity of LWV and should be kept that way. The overwhelming majority of LWV residents are not golfers and should not be taxed to finance this country club level of grandiosity that is being favored by the TWG Report.

If the new Golf Clubhouse were to be paid for by the golfers as a use fee, it could be financed by doubling the basic 18-hole green fee to \$16. If the golfers were to pay also for half of a country club style Clubhouse 2, the green fee would go to \$26.

I am a golfer, and I really enjoy being able to continue to play \$8 golf.

A reasonable maintenance upgrade was mentioned in Section 5-4.2 of the TWG Report as 16% of the Renovation estimate and 13% of the Replacement cost estimate. Although the numbers don’t exactly compute, this is about \$1,150,000, a figure that does not appear in the TWG report.

This is still considered to be exceedingly high, and suggests the development of a realistic project scenario based on things that really do need to be done to bring these facilities back to their original serviceability and quality levels, in keeping with the original objectives of a great, but reasonable place for people aged 55+ to live and play in this wonderful environment which we the current residents of LWV have been blessed to inherit and enjoy in an affordable manner. The need for reasonable improvements of the two facilities in question is warranted, but should be based on meeting reasonable needs and should be met in a cost-effective manner.



Bruce H. Collins, PE

TOMKO WOLL GROUP (TWG) RENOVATION POTENTIAL REPORT REVIEW

(Note that the key word of this title is ***potential***, not necessity)

(Also note that the Tomko Woll Group (TWG) report text referenced is presented in this review in 10 point type and the related review comments are presented in bold italicized 12 point type. Section numbering and nomenclature is that as used in the TWG report.)

3.1 PARKING AND SITE ACCESSIBILITY

1). The number of parking spaces currently provided is considered adequate by the City of Laguna Woods. The **minor additions** at Clubhouse II required for increasing toilet accommodations and providing wheelchair accessibility, including replaced storage; are not considered to increase the occupant load of the building. If these were replaced by new buildings or their use was changed they would need to meet new City standards which would require an addition of some 60 +/- parking spaces. **Wheelchair-access spaces are provided in more than the minimum number required by ADA requirements and by City codes.** However, the wheelchair spaces provided are below standard in four respects:

Then why is there a budget of \$308,158 for site improvements for wheelchair accessibility relating to the renovation of Clubhouse 2? The use of these buildings will not be changed. Without a grandiose renovation or replacement project, code compliance would not be an issue. So why invite complications unnecessarily.

There is no requirement to increase toilet accommodations to meet the currently established occupancy limit for Clubhouse 2. The Main Room is posted at 299 maximum occupancy. The small dining rooms are limited by seating capacity to an occupancy of 57. Also, the small dining rooms are not utilized when there is a large function in the Main Room.

The too-steep-to-reach access routes for wheelchairs refers to access to the Caddy Shack for golfers playing golf from a wheelchair, of which there are none. Wheelchair tennis yes, but wheelchair golf no. The alternative, more sensible wheelchair access to the Caddy Shack can be accommodated with greater safety using golf carts, which are readily available. The “minor additions” referred to for increasing toilet accommodations is only \$1,301,457.

2. No wheelchair spaces have been provided to serve the Golf Starter building.

Again, there are no wheelchair golfers. A golfer’s cart is his wheelchair. The need for a wheelchair sloped path to the Golf House is ridiculous and unsafe at any slope. Use a golf cart; it is safer.

4. An accessible path-of-travel is required from Moulton Parkway transit stops to the building entrances.

There is an accessible path of travel from the bus stop, which is controlled by a traffic signal, and for which there is only an exceedingly rare usage. Laguna Woods Village is not a public facility, and residents are provided transportation to Gate 12 facilities by bus.

None of the TWG wheelchair accessibility recommendations relate to or is responsive to Clubhouse 2 Renovation.

3.1 STRUCTURE AND ENVELOPE

1. Foundations:

- a. The TWG geotechnical engineer observed that the foundation of Clubhouse II, is partly on bedrock and partly on compacted fill, which **could** lead to differential settlement, **but** does not appear to have done so. The foundations of the renovated Golf Starter Building can also remain the same.

If there is no evidence of differential settlement in 40 years, settlement probably won't happen in the next 40 years. Why spend \$779,765 to fix something that is not broke.

2. Structural Frame:

- a. Clubhouse II: the TWG structural engineering consultant observed that “the overall structural condition of Clubhouse II is good. No significant structural distresses that may impact the performance of the building during an earthquake (such as wall cracks, building settlement or member displacement) were observed, apart from building additions at the southwest corner”.

It is actually somewhat amazing that Clubhouse 2 has survived a nominal amount of seismic activity over almost a half century without any “significant structural distresses”, even wall cracks which are somewhat common with stucco and sheetrock wall finishes. The recommendation to strengthen the masonry-to-wood anchors at the southwest wing is valid and should be implemented (it is a fairly simple job that doesn't require tearing down the building to do it). Wood frame buildings are flexible and can ride a seismic wave very well. (I worked on damage appraisal of the Northridge earthquake and was amazed at how well wood framed structures withstood significant damage, other than cracks in wall finishes.)

- b. “Golf Starter building: the overall structural condition is good. The building will be subject to torsional stresses due to asymmetry in the location of existing shear walls. Addition of a moment frame or shear wall in the plane of the porch columns is recommended.”

The TWG recommendation for the addition of a moment frame is appropriate and should be implemented. This is a fairly simple job that should be done and is one which doesn't require demolition or extensive renovation to fix.

3. Suspended Ceilings:

- “Uplift of suspended ceilings was a significant cause of damage during the Northridge earthquake; current standards mandate rigid vertical supports to prevent uplift. These are not present in the large suspended ceiling above the Lounge and the recommendation is to add vertical supports at this ceiling.”

This is not Northridge, but we have had some pretty good shakes here, over the years, and this ceiling is still in excellent condition with no apparent problems over its life span to date. It is simpler and less costly to fix it if it cracks, and it is in no danger of falling down, even if it gets bounced a bit.

4. Exterior Walls:

- a. “Minor deterioration was observed in some of the exterior wood framing members. Although this deterioration is more cosmetic than structural, timely repair is strongly recommended.”
- b. “Minor cracking and other deterioration was observed in stucco walls. Although this deterioration is more cosmetic than structural, deterioration can be progressive and timely repair is strongly recommended.”
- c. “Insulation in the walls and ceilings of both buildings is minimal.”

d. “Brick facings at arcade column bases in Clubhouse II are broken in a number of instances. This appears to be caused by settling of the tiled concrete apron surrounding the building; repair of this condition should follow repair work on the apron.”

a-b. Minor deterioration and cracking is also commonly observed with some of the other grand old ladies of this community, for whom cosmetic treatment fixes a lot. This is a remedial issue, not a renovation justification.

c. Energy isn't as cheap in Southern California as when Clubhouse 2 was built, but we still enjoy a mild range of climate extremes. Certainly it may make sense to add insulation to the roof deck when reroofing is deemed necessary. A lot more energy loss would be prevented by keeping the doors closed when AC is running, than would be prevented by double pane windows. Main Room doors were open during the recent hot weather, but the AC system was still keeping it colder than necessary, even within spaces of minimal or no occupancy. Energy management policies should be reviewed. The TWG recommendation to add blown-in insulation to existing walls is a good idea and should be implemented.

d. It appears to be an error to blame tile subsidence for the damage to brick facings at the arcade column bases. It is quite obvious that these brick facings have been bashed by hand trucks carelessly turning corners too sharply. There are a total of 19 individual bricks that have been impacted, the replacement of which hardly justifies the budget of \$14,200 presented by TWG. A couple of these have been poorly repaired by PCM. These 19 bricks could either be replaced using epoxy grout, or they could be rounded by grinding to restore cosmetic value, or bumper guards could be added to protect them from stray carts. The phantom subsidence of tile cannot be blamed for this problem.

5. Windows and Doors:

a. “most of the original windows at Clubhouse II have been replaced by smaller double-glazed aluminum windows which appear to have been properly installed and to be functioning well. The windows which have not been replaced are single glazed, wood frame, and in deteriorated condition.”

b. “The openings to the large spaces in Clubhouse II are double wood doors, most with single glazed lites and transoms; all in a somewhat deteriorated condition. These constitute a significant load on the heating/cooling of the building and the strong recommendation that they be replaced.”

c. “Openings in the Golf Starter building are large and single glazed. These constitute a significant load on the heating/cooling of the building and the strong recommendation is that they be replaced.”

a-b. There are 6 remaining wood windows in Clubhouse 2, only 2 of which need to have replacement of deteriorated wood frames. None of them needs to be replaced. The TWG budget for replacement of all exterior glazed elements is \$52,488. Apparently the estimator failed to read the architect's report. About \$400 would do the job very nicely. (I would do it for that). This is deferred maintenance, not renovation.

c. Openings in the Golf Starter Building are large to enhance viewing of the golf course. They work fine the way they are but could be double glazed without tearing down this charming caddy shack. (I'm a golfer too, and I think the windows are OK the way they are.)

6. New Walls at Extensions:

“new walls are planned at the south end of Clubhouse II in two locations.”

These new walls are needed only if the incorrect design occupancy of the Main Room and support area is changed from the current legal occupancy limit of 299 to an assumed occupancy of 544, as decided by the TWG plumbing engineer. Any social functions requiring more than this allowed limit of 299 can utilize Clubhouse 5. This incorrect and illegal occupancy criteria change is a major cause of the unwarranted total renovation of the bathrooms, kitchen and storage areas, which appears to be a deliberate attempt to inflate the cost of the renovation option.

7. Finishes:

“Painted trim is in need of repair and refinishing, stucco will require refinishing following crack repair and ceramic tile wainscot matching of the existing will need to be provided for the extensions to Clubhouse II.”

Painting is another matter of deferred maintenance, and is not a legitimate renovation cost item.

8. Hazardous Materials:

“Hazardous materials have not been tested for either in the exterior enclosure for Clubhouse II or for any part of the Golf Starter Building. Before the onset of construction test all exterior materials for Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) and Lead Based Paints (LBP). Notify the Owner of the results of testing so that he can determine his course of action.”

The extensive asbestos testing, done and paid for as part of the TWG Report, indicates 100% non detectable for asbestos. There is no reason to think that untested areas, including the Golf Starter Building, would be any different. This item is budgeted at \$116,860.

II. STRUCTURE AND ENVELOPE RENOVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1a. “Underpin foundations at Clubhouse II. “Provide caissons penetrating 3’ into bedrock at 8’ on center along approximately half the perimeter of the building. The depth of bedrock is between 2’ and 6’ below the existing footings. There is some disagreement as to whether this underpinning is necessary, further investigation would be appropriate if renovation is undertaken. For the purpose of this study, the cost of underpinning has been included in the budget.”

1b. “ No renovation is recommended for footings at the starter building. A new building at a similar location would be recommended to have footings extending 30” into natural alluvium.”

1a. This recommendation is contrary to the observations and recommendations of both of the TWG Geotechnical and Structural engineers who have observed no evidence of subsidence or structural deformation of Clubhouse 2, which is a relatively light weight building whose foundation is on bedrock and compacted subsoil over shallow bedrock. There is less reason to anticipate subsidence during the second 40 years of this buildings life than would have been experienced in its first 40 years.

1b. The Golf Starter Building is situated on less favorable subsoils than Clubhouse 2, and no renovation is recommended. Recommendation 1b is therefore inconsistent with 1a.

2a. “Provide double strap anchors at 4’ on center along the top of masonry walls. Anchors shall be fastened to the masonry with epoxy bolts on either side of roof joists and lag screwed to joists. The total length of wall to be anchored is 90 LF. Repair interior finishes after installation of braces.”

2b. “Provide a steel moment frame in the plane of the porch columns (at column line E) transferring lateral loads from the roof diaphragm to the masonry wall below. Repair finishes after installation.”

2a-b. These two TWG recommendations should be implemented, even though Clubhouse 2 and the Caddy Shack have survived prior seismic movement very well. This is not a very large cost item and can be done with a minimal impact on cosmetic repairs following installation of strap anchors and the steel moment frame.

3. “Provide bracing against uplift for the suspended ceiling above the lounge.”

This is not a safety issue, and it should be noted that, although this is not Northridge, there has been no damage to this ceiling in its life to date and is in perfect condition now. It is more cost-effective to repair a cracked ceiling if that happens, than to take it down now and rebuild at much higher cost than fixing a possible crack in the future.

4a. “Replace deteriorated water and/or termite damaged roof decking to the extent shown and at locations shown”

Roof decking, the bottom of which is visible in the Main Room, looks surprisingly good. There is one section of overhang roof decking near the kitchen entrance which is in bad shape and is in need of repair. Is this another exaggerated deficiency assumption, rather than fact?

4b. “Repair minor stucco cracks at exterior walls:”

There is only a minor amount of this, which should be scheduled the next time the building is painted. This is not a renovation work item. This is deferred maintenance.

4c. “Provide R13 blown-in insulation in all exterior walls for both buildings. (Provision of R30 roof insulation is included under ROOFING.)”

This is a good quality and energy conservancy recommendation that should have been done some time ago. However, it doesn’t do any good to improve wall insulation when the building is air conditioned at below 70 degrees on the hottest day of the year with doors open and when the building is empty of users, as was observed this year.

4d. “At arcade columns of Clubhouse II: remove facing bricks at base of columns where bases have been damaged (identified by location and number of instances noted on Drawing.) Following removal and rebuilding of the tiled apron repair damaged stucco at these column bases and replace, repair and re-point brick facing. (Removal and repair of tiled apron is included under APRON OF CLUBHOUSE II.)”

The facia bricks at the columns have been apparently damaged by careless bumping by hand trucks. This is a cosmetic repair issue. \$15,471 is a pretty high price for fixing 19 bricks that really don’t look too bad.

Value Engineering Review of Tomko Woll Report by Bruce Collins

5a. “**No renovation** is necessary for the recently replaced aluminum windows. Replace all remaining wood windows with double-glazed aluminum replacement windows sized to fit into existing jamb, head and sill trim. Existing trim to remain shall be prepped and painted as part of item 7, below.”

There are really only two of six remaining windows that need some maintenance repair and a new coat of paint, hardly a reason to spend \$52,488 on reglazing, just to have double glass.

5b. “**Remove and replace all doors** to exterior. Include new hardware, closers, thresholds and weather-stripping. Glazed doors shall have ½” fully tempered double glazing.”

These doors are in character with and part of the charm of this wonderful building. There are some talented guys in the Clubhouse 4 wood shop who would love to take on a project to refinish and double glaze these wonderful doors, and for a lot less than the TWG budgeted amount of \$236,881, to replace these neat doors with aluminum doors having no character at all. Aluminum doors are easily dented.

5c. “**Replace glazing** at the Golf Starter building with new ½” double glazing.”

There aren't many double glazed Caddy Shacks around, especially in Southern California. Maybe we could give the old ones to that poor caddy shack that the guys sit in front of on the TV commercial which shows them optimistically waiting for the rain to dissipate. It is a common trait for all golfers to be optimistic.

6. “**Provide new walls** where indicated on plan.”

No new walls are necessary. These walls are deemed necessary by TWG in response to the contrived occupancy design criteria, which is roughly double that which is now legally established for Clubhouse 2. The existing Clubhouse 2 bathroom fixtures and walls are adequate for the maximum occupancy permitted at 356, but are not adequate for the TWG assumed occupancy criteria of 716. This is a \$363,202 budget item in the TWG Renovation Plan, and it is totally unnecessary. These unnecessary new walls and the wholesale rebuilding of new many-fixture bathrooms are a major contrived element of cost against the Renovation Alternative, which has been clearly perpetrated to make the Demolish-It-and-Rebuild-It-Back-Again Alternative look like a \$10,428,852 bargain.

7. “**Prep and paint all** exterior surfaces. Provide new ceramic tile wainscot finish at the new building extensions to match existing.”

Painting is a deferred maintenance item and needs not be budgeted for renovation, and doesn't relate to the destruction and rebuilding of a significant amount of Clubhouse 2. No new ceramic wainscot is required at \$9,481.

8. “**Hazardous Materials:** Include in the budget for renovation costs for testing exterior materials for ACM and LBP in both buildings. Include a contingency cost for removal and disposal of these materials.”

The extensive testing by TWG indicated no asbestos in the interior; it is less likely to be found in exterior plaster. This is just another inflatable budget item against the renovation alternative, which is estimated as an allowance by TWG at \$116,860.

3.3 ROOFS

1. The roofing expert consultant member of TWG has concluded that “the roof system is expected to need replacement within the next several years”, and mentions that there are damaged tiles and places of attempted leak repair”.

This is hardly a mandate for total reroofing at this time and throwing away and filling up the landfill with perfectly good roof tiles which inherently don't leak. Contrary to the TWG report, the wire tie system and valley gutters are in fairly good shape, and the problem areas needing repair are fairly clearly defined and relate closely with recent roof leak history.

A competent local roofing design and construction firm has estimated that quality repairs can be made for under \$60,000, and that most of the broken tile is probably a result of too many people walking around up there recently and the inept attempts to repair flashing and other leaks. Recent roof inspection confirms that the wire tie placement system is well constructed and is still in good condition, and that the valley gutters, although showing limited corrosion, are still in pretty good shape. A complete reroofing job using the TWG design, including insulation, is quoted at \$268,000, and at \$218,000 without added insulation.

The TWG roofing consultant has estimated the cost of total roof replacement, excluding soft costs, at \$386,160. The TWG cost estimating consultant has estimated the cost of reroofing at \$709,750. The TWG conclusion section has the roof replacement cost at \$620,000. This is another example of internal contradictions in the TWG Report and lack of coordination between members of the TWG team.

3.4 INTERIOR REWORK FOR ACCESS

1. “**Toilet Rooms** at Clubhouse 2 do not meet current requirements for wheelchair accessibility. Furthermore the fixture counts existing are somewhat lower than current California Code requires.”

The gross cost impact on the Renovation Alternative for expanding the existing bathrooms and pushing walls out to provide new storage preempted by the bathroom expansion is about \$1,706,099 according to the TWG estimates (including the 23.5% soft cost add-on factor. This huge cost for providing some more unneeded toilets is based on a totally incorrect assumed occupancy for Clubhouse 2 at 716, instead of the legal occupancy as posted at the Main Room at 299 and the established utilization maximum occupancy for the North wing small dining rooms at 57, which comprises the legal total occupancy limit for the building at 356.

This \$1,706,099 budget (including the 23.5% soft cost) amounts to a cost of \$244,000 per additional toilet for the 360 people who would exceed the building's occupancy limit. It should be further noted that Clubhouse2 does not accommodate theater type row seating as in an opera or concert hall where everyone gets up at the same time during intermission to go to the bathroom, which is a situation that forms bathroom lines, particularly for women. Those kinds of activities are scheduled at Clubhouse 3, which is designed for these kinds of performances. Clubhouse 2 is strictly a dining and dancing and small group meeting kind of place. A veteran of managing many social events for the last 22 years at Clubhouse 2 has never seen a line at the ladies bathroom.

Also, on the practical side, it should be noted that the North wing small dining rooms are not normally occupied at the same time as a large function in the Main Room, and these bathroom facilities are also available to the occupants of the Main Room.

Wheelchair Accessibility for Clubhouse 2 bathrooms has been modified to accommodate wheelchair accessibility by widening of at least one stall opening in each bathroom. This modification has messed up the floor tiles where the posts have been removed, and bathroom floor tiling should be replaced. In addition to new floor tiles. It would be very nice to spiff-up the bathrooms a bit with the replacement of wall tile, a bright paint job and maybe some new fancy light fixtures. The potty fixtures work just fine, one of which was recently replaced. The fixtures are all very serviceable and don't look bad and shouldn't be dismissed to the toilet graveyard at the landfill. The existing storerooms work just fine the way they are.

The "Interior Rework for Access" renovation budget also includes replacement of all kitchen stainless steel counters and base cabinets, with total replacement of all main kitchen cabinets and equipment. The stuff that is in there now looks great and the caterers that use it think it works just fine, as was noted in the part of the TWG Report that the cost estimating expert apparently didn't read. The TWG recommended kitchen equipment replacement budget is about \$68,000.

3.5 INTERIOR FINISHES

Renovation Recommendations

Summary: Most of the TWG interior finish renovation plan relates to refinishing those areas torn up to provide for the unnecessary bathroom expansion described in Section 3.4 above, and to repair torn-up walls and floors demolished to replace perfectly adequate copper and cast iron plumbing and electrical wiring, which work just fine.

Recommendations for replacement of bathroom floor tile is a good idea and should have been done at the time wheelchair access modifications were done, which messed up the floor tile where door posts were removed to widen stall access. New wall tile and a spiffy painting spruce-up and maybe some pretty light fixtures are also good ideas to make the bathrooms more attractive, and are things that should have been done as routine maintenance.

Sanding of the floors and refinishing is an OK idea but is not a necessity and doesn't rate as high on the priority list as other deferred maintenance. Light sanding and a new acrylic finish coat for protection of this beautiful floor would make more sense than deep sanding and total refinishing. This beautiful maple hardwood floor and the evidence of many dance steps is part of this beautiful building's charm. Replacing pads on the steel chairs would help minimize floor damage.

The interior area saw cutting of concrete floors required to replace assumed defective plumbing is a totally bogus work item inasmuch as all interior pressure piping is copper, and drain fittings and pipe are cast iron, and are reportedly working just fine.

Note that the TWG report fails to address the most critical plumbing problem at Clubhouse II, which is the root intrusion problem in the lateral sewer waste drain from the building to the public sewer in Moulton. This is a chronic problem which PCM has roto-rooted periodically instead of replacing this poorly jointed terra-cotta pipe with sealed joint cast iron or PVC. This would be far more cost-effective than repetitious and costly root cutting. This would also be a good time to install a grease trap in the wastewater system, another item overlooked by the TWG report.

Most of the exterior and interior refinishing work items are routine cosmetic maintenance items and have nothing to do with renovation. Other than seriously needed refinishing of the doors, there is nothing urgent about repainting the exterior of this grand old lady of a building whose aging signs just add a little patina to its classic configuration.

3.6 APRON OF CLUBHOUSE BUILDING

1. Replacement Recommendation

“The tiled apron surrounding Clubhouse II shows signs of distress at all faces of the building along a line fronting the arcade columns. Break out and remove all tiles within the arcade area. Sawcut the concrete apron along the face of the arcade; break out and remove all concrete and tiles outside this line. Remove the soil down to bedrock and recompact to 95% compaction or per alternate recommendation of the soils engineer. Replace the concrete apron with a new reinforced 6-inch slab doweled to the building/arcade floor slab along the face of the arcade. Replace all tiles following the pattern shown on the drawing.”

This renovation plan element, priced at \$559,553 to demolish and replace 11,500 square feet of the lovely apron tile and its concrete slab base which surrounds Clubhouse 2, is based on TWG's perception of severe subsidence of the tile apron and its concrete pad. Note that this cost item includes demolition and removal of tile, slab and subsoil down to bedrock, which is as deep as 6 feet in some places, and tile is priced as quarry tile instead of terracotta. No wonder it is so expensive.

Actually, out of the 11,500 tiles in the apron, there are only 12 that are chipped or broken enough at this time to warrant immediate replacement. There are another 20 that have hairline cracks, which are virtually unnoticeable. Replacement of broken tiles should be more

carefully done than in the past, it being evident that whoever did the replacement neglected to take a tile sample to the tile shop and to ensure color match.

With regard to the comments of the TWG expert observers who have made a big deal out of the “subsidence problems” of the tile apron, they can possibly be excused because they are architects and not engineers. The fact of the matter is that the tiled apron was brilliantly designed and executed during construction with regard to providing effective drainage of this rather large apron. The apron is properly sloped away from the building and the arcade line for the simple technical reason that it is important to drain the rain away from the building, especially a wood framed building, and it is important to drain away from the walkways under the arcades and away from the main entry walkway across the apron from the road. This has been beautifully done at Clubhouse 2. It is also not a coincidence that there are two almost unnoticeable low swale areas on either side of the main walkway, which have been apparently misinterpreted by the experts as “subsidence”. These low areas are precisely located at the quarter points of the apron, on either side of the walkway, and for some strange reason they drain towards the drain pipes which penetrate the planter wall at the edge of the apron, which permits rainwater to drain off the apron in a manner which minimizes puddles that would otherwise have to be walked through to get into the building.

This is not “subsidence”; it is a very well conceived and meticulously executed drainage pattern, subtly sloped to do the job of drainage while being almost imperceptibly noticeable to dancers wanting to cross the apron without walking through a puddle in their dancing shoes. However it was not imperceptible to the TWG observers looking for flaws in this lovely tile apron as an excuse to add another large chunk of cost against the Renovation option to further justify their preconceived objective of recommending the death of this beautiful building in favor of doing something like matching that clubhouse across the street. There is no indication on site that there was any testing of the apron underlying soil to lead to a conclusion that the apron is placed on uncompacted soil. There is no apparent evidence of a hole being drilled through the tile for this purpose.

The only obvious deviation from as-built grading of the apron is some “negative subsidence” at the northeasterly corner where the roots of a very large tree have lifted the apron and its bordering curb. It is also notable that this is the only location on the apron edge curbing that is not perfectly and uniformly straight. Why didn’t the curb subside along with the apron?

This beautiful apron, along with its concrete underlayment should not be sent to needlessly fill up the landfill. It is not garbage. Even the variably miscolored repair tiles lend a certain casual patina to this great building. Also it is very inappropriate to waste \$559,535 to destroy the apron and then replace it. It’s beautiful and it’s not broke.

3.7 PLUMBING

I. Replacement Assumptions and Recommendations

The MEP engineer's report concerning plumbing concludes and recommends as follows:

"The age of the buildings and the condition of existing plumbing warrant the assumption that wholesale water piping, fixture and trim replacement is called for in both buildings. The rework of toilet rooms in Clubhouse II will require rework of sanitary piping associated with these rooms."

"The age of the installation and the nature of the soils warrants the assumption that water service to these buildings from Moulton Parkway should be replaced. Water heaters should be replaced with gas-fired efficient models. Provide plumbing for gas, water and refrigerant piping to serve the new HVAC equipment."

- 1) "Replace all restroom plumbing fixtures to comply with ADA requirements
- 2) Replace all kitchen plumbing fixtures
- 3) Replace water heaters to current code requirements"

The key words in this recommendation are assumption and wholesale. The assumption of wholesale replacement hardly constitutes a thoroughly professional, unbiased evaluation of the facts by someone who is not paying the bill and who might be motivated to promote a project for his company. The basic assumption of TWG is that the owners of the LWV property won't know any better, and, therefore, assumptions to maximize the cost estimate of the renovation project is no big deal. This is contrary to the fundamental ethics of the engineering profession. I assume it is for architects also.

The facts, which are easily verified, as done by this author, are as follows: The water piping is all copper and the wastewater system is all cast iron, both of which should last for at least the next 40 years. The cast iron system proposed for demolition is much more durable than the ABS plastic that would most likely be used in the replacement system.

There is no need to rework the plumbing in the toilet rooms inasmuch as the occupancy limit does not require additional fixtures. No rework of cast iron drain piping is required.

Replacement of the main service line is another false assumption. That line is copper and works just fine and will most likely last longer than the plumber who made this assumption.

The two existing 100 gallon water heaters are already gas-fired units properly installed to code, and are not in need of being replaced by three \$4,122 water heaters, as indicated by the TWG Renovation cost estimate. Home Depot has them for a lot less than that.

Gas, water and refrigerant piping is not required. The existing HVAC is working perfectly, super cooling the building even with doors open during the recent triple digit hot spell.

3.8 HVAC

I. Replacement Assumptions and Recommendations

“The age of buildings, the evident malfunctioning of existing equipment and the improvements in building envelope which reduce heating/cooling loads all warrant the recommendation to remove all existing HVAC equipment including piping and ducts and replace with new systems. Re-use existing under-floor ducts to the extent possible.”

“The ventilation system for golf cart charging in the Golf Starter building basement was designed for ventilation of gasoline powered equipment. This system should be re-worked or replaced to provide for efficient removal of products of battery charging.”

The MEP engineer’s report recommends the “replacement of all ducts and equipment within both buildings due to the age of them”.

Again, the age of the building and the malfunctioning of existing equipment are cited as a reason to rip everything out and throw it away and then replace it. TWG has failed to mention that the three AC chillers are less than three years old. Only one of the two south chillers was operating the other day when the outside temperature was in the 90s, and the inside temperature felt like 65. Again assumptions, not facts, seem to be the excuse to make recommendations to maximize cost of the renovation alternative on the basis of very unprofessional assumptions. This appears to clearly be the philosophy of the TWG report. The AC system works just fine, especially in the empty spaces in the building, even on days when no events are scheduled. Who is minding the energy consumption budget by insisting on cost-effective operations policy?

The recommendation for changing the ventilation system in the Golf Starter Building may be a valid recommendation, if it is essential to maintaining a safe atmosphere in the cart charging room. However, the guy who operates the charging of golf carts and spends more time in this room than anyone, indicates that ventilation is no problem because the entire face of this room is open at all times. There are no apparent emissions from battery charging. No facts have been provided concerning the capacity of the existing ventilation of this room or the number of air changes needed to keep the operation safe. It seems to be OK the way it is. This may be another “assumption”; no one knows.

3.9 ELECTRICAL

Replacement Assumptions and Recommendations

1. See MEP engineer’s report in Appendix F.
2. “All sub panels and respective feeders and power wiring should be demolished and a new system designed and installed. Possibly the existing 300 KVA and 120/208V distribution could be reused.”
3. Existing Service should be replaced with a new 480V 3 Phase, 4 Wire system with minimum of 1200 AMP depending on existing design load and other projects foreseen for the future that need to be fed from this system. The Starter Building which is fed from the existing service is foreseen to increase power demand drastically and may even require its own service depending on SCE input. Prior to design for construction a meeting between the parties and SCE is required.

Value Engineering Review of Tomko Woll Report by Bruce Collins

3. Electrical outlet provisions for both buildings are substandard according to current practice.
4. Lighting for both buildings is outmoded, requires frequent replacement of incandescent bulbs and is far below current standards of energy efficiency.
5. The cart-charging system in the basement of the Golf Starter building is patched together. A new charging system should be designed and installed.
6. Provide power and control wiring for new HVAC equipment included under Section 3.10.”
7. “As part of temporary provisions during renovation (Section 3.10):
 - Provide power to temporary buildings replacing the Golf Starter building.
 - Design and provide a temporary cart-charging system to be installed in an existing parking area.
8. “The electrical service entrance for all of the buildings in the vicinity of Clubhouse II (including the Golf Starter building) is underground to a main panel in the electrical room at the southwest wing of Clubhouse II. Services to all other buildings are underground from that point. If Clubhouse II is to be demolished it would be most economical to build a small structure in place of the existing electrical room. This provision has been included in the Budget Estimate for new construction.”

1. The MEP engineer’s report recommends that the maximum electrical demand load be obtained by the client from So. Cal. Edison. It would seem that it is logical for the TWG team electrical engineer to have done this, inasmuch as the maximum electrical demand is necessary to define the basic criteria for design of the replacement system that they are recommending and on which costs are to be estimated. It appears that this was an inconvenient task that TWG decided was not a necessary element of their scope-of-work and that no one would notice the deletion of this important task. Also, it is not all that difficult to calculate the maximum electrical load, knowing what all the connected loads are, and adding them up or actually testing the circuits under load, rather than calculating maximum load. A Hi-Pot test of the system would determine if existing wiring insulation is satisfactory and replacement, if necessary, could be done as needed, not as assumed. The TVG electrical engineer apparently just assumed criteria that would maximize the cost estimate for renovation, which seems to be a basic theme throughout this report. What is the basis for the recommendation for a new 1200 AMP service when the service load has not been verified?

1. It is noteworthy to mention that the existing electrical equipment, in spite of its age, appears to be working quite nicely under the maximum load conditions experienced during the recent hot spell when the air conditioning was going full blast with the building doors open. The TWG electrical engineer even acknowledges that: “possibly the existing 300KVA transformer and the 120/208V electrical distribution system could be reused”. Criticizing the existing electrical system because it is an “old 480V, 3 phase 3 wire system without a neutral wire, which makes it incapable of being used for interior lighting” appears to be a bum rap. This is nonsense. Also, it should be noted that the transformers being recommended for demolition by TWG are the property of the Southern California Edison Company, and Edison might take exception to this recommendation to demolish their equipment. The seal on the transformer enclosure gate, located under the Edison NO TRESPASSING sign, indicates that these transformers have not been inspected by Edison since 1998. They must be working OK.

2. This TWG recommendation to “demolish and replace the electrical [power system is also nonsense: If the three-phase 480V transformer is to be used for 120V lighting, a 3- phase 480V primary, 240/120V secondary is available for interior lighting and does not need a neutral wire. If a transformer fails, it can be rewound, or Edison can replace it. If greater capacity is needed, an additional transformer can be purchased and installed to provide the

additional capacity required. Capacity should be added as needed, not on the assumption that it may be needed. Also, these older transformers are typically better encased and insulated than newer ones.

The sub panels and respective feeders and power wiring should not be “demolished”. A great deal of the brainwashing relating to the argument to demolish Clubhouse 2 has included the concern that the electrical system is old and that the Zinsco panels and breakers are no longer manufactured and cannot be readily replaced. The facts are quite different. Although Zinsco was acquired by another company some time ago, Zinsco breakers are considered to be the “industry standard for affordability and efficiency”, and the full line of Zinsco electrical panels and breakers is available as a complete line of new, used, and obsolete replacement parts by the Bay Breakers Electrical Parts Supply House, and they can be ordered on line at www.baybreakers.com/catalog/Zinsco.html for immediate delivery.

When Clubhouse 2 was built, copper wire was priced at \$0.30 per pound. In 2006, it is selling for \$3.50 per pound. Therefore, it makes no sense at all to demolish electrical gear. Transformers and motors can be rewound if there is a failure, and the three power phases can be tested to assure that all phases are equally balanced to prevent overload on any one phase. The existing 300KVA Transformer has a wye connected secondary with a ground and 208/120Volt leg. At the most, at this time the electrical power system conductor insulation should be tested, using a Hi-pot test procedure, which is not expensive. This would permit replacement based on need, not assumption.

3. There is no need to replace the existing electrical service, as provided by the 800 ampere Edison transformer system, with a 1200 amp transformer system. There is no justification to assume that amount, if any, increase in power demand. What may make sense is the suggestion made by the TWG report to consider taking the golf cart charging system electrical feed out of the Clubhouse 2 electrical system, and to take a direct feed to the Caddy Shack for golf cart charging. The original system probably was not designed for this golf cart power load, inasmuch as gas fueled golf carts were being used at that time. A direct power feed to the golf building would also facilitate accounting for the cost of this power use as a golf facility operating expense. Also, it is not anticipated that the golf cart charging load will be increased significantly, as assumed by TWG. This use does not appear to be a problem at this time and is not expected to change in the near future.

3a. Electrical outlets are claimed to be substandard according to current practice, without TWG having explained why. Electrical outlet provisions are only below code in the kitchens and restrooms due to lack of safety (ground type) outlets. This is a relatively inexpensive, easily accomplished change, which can be done, and should be done, by the maintenance crew.

4. The quaint incandescent lighting chandeliers of the Main Room of Clubhouse 2 constitute a significant element of the charm of this delightful senior building, and they are (or should be) only on when the building is being used for an event, and the fluorescent fixtures now there could be used at other times like during table setup. The minor savings in efficiency do not

warrant the expense of their removal and replacement, which has been given a price tag of \$257,766 by the TWG cost estimator.

5. The golf cart charging system, clearly does not appear “patched together” as represented by TWG. Golf carts are positioned in orderly rows under the electrical wiring conduits supported from the ceiling, and each cart is provided with a drop cord extending from individual charging units located out of the way over head. The system is appropriate in appearance and function for the purpose intended, which is a bit of an industrial function, which is located in the basement and is out of sight.

6. New HVAC power supply is not needed. The existing chillers are only 3 years old.

7. The need for temporary power during construction is another reason not to tear down Clubhouse 2 and the Caddy Shack.

8. Since all power for the Gate 12 facilities goes through Clubhouse 2, demolishing the clubhouse plays havoc with the entire system for all these facilities and would require the construction of a new electrical distribution building to replace the electrical room in Clubhouse 2. Note that the TWG cost estimating specialist neglected to include the cost of this electrical system distribution building, although it was mentioned in the report (above) for the new construction alternative.

Bottom Line Electrical Conclusion:

The TWG Renovation Alternative budget estimate includes \$504,477 to totally replace a Clubhouse 2 electrical system that ain’t broke, and part of which belongs to Edison, and for which spare replacement parts are readily available. Staff is not aware of any electrical malfunctions in recent years. This TWG budget would pay for a lot of inefficient light bulbs, to go in those inefficient but charming chandeliers.

3.10 TEMPORARY PROVISIONS DURING RENOVATION

II Renovation Recommendations:

“1 Provide temporary facilities to house the Golf Starter function, cart charging and Clubhouse II administration.

2. Provide a temporary building to house the Administrative staff for Clubhouse II or find temporary office accommodations for them elsewhere.

3a. Provide a temporary building (approximately 1800 SF) to house the golf starter office, pro shop, restrooms and a minimum snack shop at a location to be designated in the existing parking lots. Temporary classroom-type structure 32’x32’ would accommodate these requirements.

3b This building would require wheelchair accessibility. Provide a wood deck at the floor level of the temporary buildings accessed by a ramp and a stair. A deck about 640 SF in area would allow for access to both buildings and provide an outside seating area for patrons.

3c Provide temporary power, wiring and weather-protected charging apparatus for 40 golf carts at a location to be designated in the existing parking lot.”.

4. “Phase construction of the two renovations so that Clubhouse II is out of operation during the entire construction for the Golf Starter building (to allow for installation and use of temporary facilities) and during the final work on the part of the site occupied by the temporary facilities.

Value Engineering Review of Tomko Woll Report by Bruce Collins

5. Phase construction of the site improvements so that approximately half the existing parking is available for use at all times by golf course patrons.”

1. Although not itemized in the TWG cost estimate section, \$445,000, including 23.5% “soft cost”, has been estimated for a temporary Caddy Shack under the Renovation Alternative, but nothing is budgeted for this purpose under the Demolish and Reconstruct Alternative. The humorous aspect of this is the provision in the Renovation Alternative for providing housing for the Clubhouse 2 staff, which will not have anything to do while their building is shut down. It would be cheaper to give them paid vacation time.

3 a-b-c. The proposed fully functional temporary Golf Starter Building is planned to be located in the parking lot for 15-18 months, but it will be provided with a viewing deck so that golfers can watch the construction and the golf carts mixing it up with the cars looking for a parking place. No mention is made that this area will also need to be used for the contractor’s staging yard, which will require a generous space. Construction vehicles will add to the mix of cars and carts.

4. This appears to be a recommendation to reserve the remaining parking spaces left over after the temporary Caddy Shack is built, for use primarily for golfers. Again, there has been no thought given to the fairly substantial contractor’s staging area that will be required for either the Renovation Project or the Destroy and Build New Project. This would suggest just the opposite, that project staging should be sequential to minimize impact on the parking lot space problem, but this would mean as much as a 3-year construction period and its associated disruption to all Gate 12 facilities, and a total mess in the parking lot if any facilities other than golf are to be used.

THE ESSENTIAL REHABILITATION ALTERNATIVE

The following is an outline of a rehabilitation program based on the same structure as utilized by the TWG Report, but includes only those items that really need to be done to remediate deficiencies in Clubhouse 2. This report does not include the Golf Clubhouse except for handicap access, the possible relocation of power supply and the seismic protection moment frame. The following TWG cost estimates are construction cost estimates only, which include costs for “General Contractor’s Management and Supervision Costs”, as follows:

- Overhead and Fee: 16%**
- Schematic Design stage contingency: 15%**
- Escalation Allowance to Anticipated Bid Date: 3%**

Note that these costs do not add up to 34%; they are progressively multiplied, which ends up being an add on factor equal to **37.402%**

Also, the referenced TWG costs do not include the **23.5%** adder indicated in the TWG transmittal letter of 2/10/06, which also suggests an **8%** adder cost for an “Owner’s construction management and contract administration cost”. See the last two pages of the TWG Report.

The Essential Rehabilitation Alternative Plan Summary

3.1 PARKING AND SITE ACCESSIBILITY (TWG Cost Estimate: \$308,158)

Discussion:

- City says parking spaces provided are adequate for existing use.
- Existing wheelchair access provided exceeds the minimum number required by ADA requirements and City code.
- Wheelchair access to the golf building is needed

Project:

- Install buzzer system to alert starter to send a golf cart to parking area to transport wheelchair and handicapped person to the golf clubhouse. Install a buzzer call button at the parking area and run a signal wire to the starter desk in a conduit mounted under the handrail along the walkway.

Contract Cost:	\$1,200
Soft Cost:	<u>280</u>
Total:	\$1,480

Deletion from TWG Budget Estimate: \$ 306,678

3.2 STRUCTURE AND ENVELOPE (TWG Cost Estimate: \$1,226,252)

Discussion:

- **Foundation:** No settlement or subsidence has been noted by the TWG Geotechnical or Structural Engineers for either building.
- **Structural Frame:** The TWG Structural Engineer states that “the structural condition of both buildings is good, with no signs of structural distress”.
- **Deferred Maintenance:** Windows and doors, as well as other cosmetic and insulation improvements are needed.

Project:

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. Install masonry wall-roof anchors per TWG recommendation for Clubhouse 2. | \$5,200 |
| 2. Install steel moment frame at porch columns at the Golf Clubhouse per TWG recommendations. (Not in CH2 Budget) | 0 |
| 3. Blow-in wall insulation per TWG recommendation. | 17,640 |
| 4. Refinish exterior door frames. | 2,200 |
| 5. Repair 2 wood framed windows. | 400 |
| 6. Cornice and Trim Repair at Columns | 7,500 |
| 7. Restore and Refinish Exterior Doors | 8,800 |

Contract Cost:	\$41,740
Soft Cost:	<u>9,810</u>
Total	\$51,550

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$1,174,702

3.3 ROOF (TWG Cost Estimate: \$709,750)

Discussion:

- The roof has some damaged tile, and roof penetrations need to be reflashed. Wire ties and valley drains are slightly corroded but are functionally adequate. The roof appears to be repairable. Replacement is not required.

Project:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Repair existing roof. | Contract Cost \$60,000 |
| | Soft Cost: <u>14,100</u> |
| | Total: \$74,100 |

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$635,650

3.4 INTERIOR REWORK FOR ACCESSIBILITY (TWG Estimate: \$1,301,457)

Discussion:

- The major portion of the TWG estimate is based on assuming extreme expansion of the bathrooms to serve an occupancy of 716, which exceeds the legal occupancy by 360.
- TWG also proposes replacement of a perfectly good kitchen with new equipment and to rebuild storage by an add-on to the building.

Project:

- Spruce up the existing bathrooms with new tile on the floors and walls and spiffy light fixtures. Repaint and trim.

1. Ceramic floor tile	\$17,820
2. Ceramic wall tile	\$17,760
3. Toilet accessories	\$ 8,420
4. Shelving and millwork	<u>\$ 3,910</u>

Contract Cost \$47,910

Soft Cost \$11,260

Total Cost: \$59,170

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$1,242,287

3.5 INTERIOR FINISHES (TWG Estimate: \$226,438, other than as in 3.4)

Discussion:

- It would be nice to spruce up the interior of the Main Room and add a pleasant color scheme, as suggested by TWG.

Project:

- | | | |
|--|--------------|-------|
| 1. Sand and refinish Main floor. The TWG estimate is high, but use it. | \$34,300 | a bit |
| 2. Remove and replace carpet and resilient floors | 16,800 | |
| 3. Ceiling preparation work | 10,000 | |
| 4. Rework Tectum panels | <u>3,200</u> | |

Contract Cost \$64,300

Soft Cost: 15,110

Total Cost: \$79,410

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$147,028

3.6 APRON (TWG Cost Estimate: \$559,535)

Discussion:

- The existing tile apron is beautiful and is generally in good condition, is well drained, and has not subsided. Don't mess with it other than replacing a few tiles and some grout.
- 12 tiles are in need of replacement. 20 tiles have hairline cracks.

Project:

1. Replace 32 tiles	\$1,600
2. Restore grout where necessary	\$2,000
3. Repair column brick bases	<u>\$800</u>
	<u>\$4,400</u>

Soft Cost:	<u>\$1,034</u>
Total:	<u>\$5,434</u>

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$554,105

3.7 PLUMBING (TWG Cost Estimate: \$68,701)

Discussion:

- Without the “wholesale renovation” of bathrooms and store rooms to accommodate an incorrect occupancy criteria, there is no necessity to tear out and replace copper and cast iron plumbing, and bathroom fixtures.

Project:

1. Replace sewer lateral to City sewer in Moulton.	\$3,200
2. Fire sprinkler system for Kitchens and store room	<u>\$12,000</u>
	\$15,200

Soft Cost:	<u>\$3,570</u>
Total:	<u>\$18,770</u>

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$49,931

3.8 HVAC (TWG Budget Estimate: \$428,626)

Discussion:

- The existing HVAC system is working just fine and the relatively new (3 years old) AC chillers cooled the Clubhouse, even with the doors open, on the hottest day of our recent heat spell.
- The furnace is old but doesn't need to work that hard in our mild climate. A good party heats up the Main Room just fine. It might be a good idea, however, to put some money in contingency fund for its replacement when needed.

Project:

1. Consider a more sophisticated thermostatic HVAC control system to improve operation efficiency and to save big on energy and operating cost.

\$8,000	
Soft Cost	<u>\$1,800</u>
Total:	<u>\$9,800</u>

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$418,826

3.9 ELECTRICAL (TWG Cost Estimate: \$479,499)

Discussion:

- The electrical system is a few years old, but not past 55+. Even so, the system apparently works just fine, although the added demand of the golf cart charging system may exceed the original design parameters, but hasn't blown the system.
- Some of the components of the "old" electrical system were typically manufactured to higher load tolerance factors than newer comparable parts. Again, tearing out the entire system does not seem to be warranted, but it might, again, be a good idea to budget for contingency purposes for parts replacement, if needed.

Project:

Nothing, but suggest budget for contingency parts replacement: **\$25,000**

Consider the feasibility and desirability of running the Golf Building power supply directly to the Caddy Shack and removing it from the Clubhouse 2 main panel.

Cost: ? \$

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$454,499

3.10 TEMPORARY PROVISIONS (In Golf Building Budget only @ \$360,000)

Discussion: No temporary provisions are required

Deletion from TWG Budget: \$404,625

ESSENTIAL REHABILITATION COST SUMMARY

	<u>REHAB</u>	<u>TWG</u>	<u>DELETIONS</u>
3.1.1	\$1,480	\$308,158	\$306,678
3.1.2	51,550	1,226,252	1,174,702
3.1.3	74,100	709,750	635,650
3.1.4	59,170	1,301,457	1,242,287
3.1.5	79,410	226,438	147,028
3.1.6	5,430	559,535	554,105
3.1.7	18,770	68,701	49,931
3.1.8	9,800	428,626	418,226
3.1.9	25,000	479,499	454,499
3.1.10	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL:	\$324,710	\$ 5,308,416	\$4,983,706
Soft Cost @ 23.5%		1,247,478	
Owner Management @ 8%		<u>424,673</u>	
Total TWG Estimate		\$6,980,567	