

**Comments on the Working Drawings by WCPHOA  
With UCSB Responses • July 2, 2009**

**Note:**

\* Comments in *blue italics* in the fourth column were added by Eric Dahl.

\* Comments in "*blue italics and quotes*" are Eric's summary of comments Maryann made in the July 2 meeting.

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
	<b>Functional Issues</b>			
1)	The project should be described as "correction of defects in original construction," not renovation. Please correct any use of the word "renovation" to refer to "defect correction."	The project is named as it has been funded. This is a leak remediation project with reference to Units 917 and 918 only.	Sheet A1.00 says 'Faculty Housing Renovation Units 917-918', and makes no mention of remediation. If the wrong title for the project is in the funding, change the title in the funding documents.	These are 50% documents with incorrect title. The funding name is Leak remediation
2)	The information and comments provided by the WCPHOA at the beginning of October, 2008, do not appear to have been incorporated or addressed. A copy of these comments is included in the appendix to this document.	I believe we have answered and addressed the comments as best we could with regards to the bidding of 917 and 918. If there is a specific item of concern not listed in your 50% review that pertains to Units 917 and 918, please let me know and I will do my best to address it.	The specific items were given in item #3.	
3)	Key issues include re-routing of the roof and deck drainage, coping, and proper treatment of appendage walls. Additionally, the deck (terrace) trellis is STILL not centered with the gable over the master bedroom.	The centering of the gable is noted and has been corrected. We are in agreement as to key issues of this work.	However, the issues of re-routing the roof and deck drainage, coping, and proper treatment of the appendage walls remain largely unaddressed.	Coping on the building is addressed- other coping not in project-as well as appendage walls. Re routing of drains not recommended.

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
4)	The base project has eliminated the two alternatives for addressing water intrusion from the courtyard and patios: 2% grading of the courtyard and patios, and the trench drain in the courtyard.			<i>"Every unit is not the same. Grading of the courtyard and patios will be corrected as needed."</i>
a)	Areas of existing water intrusion along the intersection of unit walls with the courtyard and with the patios, where pooling of water now induces water intrusion into units, should be addressed in the working drawings.	a. Refer to Add Alternate #6 it is addressed-Courtyard sloping. Specifications section 01100	Cannot find specification 01100, can that be provided to us?; patio sloping is not address in Add Alternate #6.	
b)	Roof water should not be routed through the patios, particularly in absence of 2% grading in the patios.	b. Existing slope limitations of roof prevents drain relocation exact conditions at rear patios to be determined in field. An alternative is to add additional roof drains.	Or, to route the roof drains differently.	Not recommended
c)	In some units, water seeps up from underneath the foyer tiles. We do not know whether this seepage is caused by standing water in the courtyard or other factors. Whatever the cause, this problem needs to be resolved.	c. Not observed in 917 nor 918 .Also Add Alternate #6).	It is believed 918 has this issue.	

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
5)	In some cases, water drains from the high-slope roof to the flat roof portions before it exits the roof area. We suggest that roof water drain, to the maximum extent possible, directly to the ground without intermediate routing through the problematic flat roof portions.	This will result in far too many downspouts- Proposed water management system reviewed by University's waterproofing consultant with no exception.	It is believed that one additional downspout is necessary. Please forward the University waterproofing consultant's report on this specific issue.	There is no report, just a review meeting at the architect's office. They believe what is shown is adequate. Another downspout is not recommended.
6)	There is substantial missing information, including drawings and specifications as to manufacturer, model, and quality specifications of components. There are also details missing associated with appearance and operability of various features of the project. Since the plans are intended to guide contractors, the greater the specificity about minimum standards, the greater assurance we will have that the completed work will be of acceptable quality.	All information is and will be in the specifications that are needed. I am unaware of details on appearance or operation that is referenced. Please clarify.	Provision of the specifications to WCPHOA will be essential for obtaining consensus on the proposed project. Numerous components, including the roofing materials, the stucco coating system, and the doors and windows, among other items, lack data in the current working drawings on minimum standards and appearance.	Specifications are on the FTP site with the 50% documents. They have yet to be reviewed by the University but are at the 50% + level.

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
a)	East and West Elevations for the Study Patio area are omitted, and should be included.	a. Drawing A3.01B-A3.02 C. refers to North- no additional details needed.	A3.01 B shows North elevations, but not East nor West, for the study patio. A3.03 C shows the West Kitchen/Living patio elevation, but not the study patio West elevation. These elevations was in drawings A-11 3 and A-12 3 in the original blueprints. There are a number of details that are omitted from this drawings because of the absence of these elevations, including: disposition of the concrete pillar holding up the trellis in the study patio, disposition of the vent penetration through the wall portrayed, downspouts, and demolition of interior downspouts.	No additional elevations needed for bidding.
b)	Roofing material: Sarnafil not specified; a strong consensus for TPO, not PVC, exists in the WCPHOA because of environmental and technical concerns.	b. It is specified according to Roofing and Waterproofing Forensics' recommendation. He is a proponent of Sarnafil for all the reasons we have previously stated. Refer to section 07541 Specifications.	07541 Specifications cannot be found, can that be provided to us? The HOA is unified in support of TPO; can Forensics' specific report language regarding TPO be forwarded to us?	What is TPO? <i>Thermoplastic polyolefin membrane is based on polymers defined by ASTM D 5538. See <a href="http://www.astm.org/SNEWS/AUGUST_2003/obeoli_aug03.html">http://www.astm.org/SNEWS/AUGUST_2003/obeoli_aug03.html</a> - Eric</i>
c)	Demolition of asphalt under solar panels appears to be omitted; it is not clear that TPO will extend up under the solar panels.	c. Demolition notes will be revised for clarity. Demolition under the solar panels is not omitted.	Demolition notes 1.05, 1.06, and 1.17 do not currently mention the disposition of the asphalt tiles.	Demolition notes will be revised for clarity.

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
d)	Specifications and samples of the replacement concrete tile need to be provided before approval for 917 and 918 can occur.	d. Samples are called for in Specification section 07321. Samples to be provided.	Specifications section 07321 cannot be found, can that be provided to us?	
e)	Many details of intersections of roofs and walls, including chimney areas, where saddle flashing and other sheet metal accessories should have been indicated, are omitted. In general, it appears that much of the flashing detail will be left to the roofing contractor to include/omit at their discretion, much like the initial project that led to the current unacceptable situation. Coping on the demising wall between the decks (terraces), the wall around the deck (terrace), the walls around the patios, and the front wall of the courtyard is omitted and should be included.	e. All saddle flashing is included-in 50%. – There are flashing details: A5.01, A5.02, A5.03, A5.04, and A5.05. Specification section 07600. Exterior stand alone walls are not coped it will be detailed as it intersects interior space walls. Only walls coped are those over conditioned space.	Specifications section 07600 cannot be found, can that be provided to us? Saddle flashing details A5.01.5 and A5.01.6 do not appear to be referred to anywhere on A2.03, leaving it to the contractor's judgement where saddle flashing is deployed. Detailed flashing for the 'V' and the parapet/chimney intersections appear to be omitted. No detailed drawings of coping at parapet corners seem to exist. No detailed drawings of the coping/flashing at intersections of appendage walls with structural walls seem to exist. At the meeting of 8/8/08, coping of all walls was agreed to; there have been leak/rot problems with the appendage walls.	Details for exterior walls meeting conditioned spaces to be detailed as drawings continue. Coping of appendage walls not included.

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
f)	<p>Vent covers are omitted for the attic vents, covers are desirable both for prevention of water intrusion during our intensely windy rainstorms and also for architectural harmony. The vent sizes should be evaluated with respect to the attic volume they service to insure adequate ventilation. Past experience has shown that the attic vents must incorporate screens to impede entry by wasps and termites.</p>	<p>f. There are no covers on vents-we have used true thru wall vents. There have been vent samples at all our meetings and have shown details. The vents are adequate and used in exterior locations. Specification section 10200.</p>	<p>Have vent samples been available at meetings? I only saw the blueprints Fremer showed at that last meeting. I have very serious doubts about the adequacy of these vents for our weather conditions—what does it mean, “the vents are adequate and used in exterior locations”? If they have a sample to show, I would like to test it with a hose—I suggest Fremer holds it in front of his chest while I direct a hose to spray water as if simulating heavy rain propelled by wind. For this is the sort of rain we occasionally get at WCP. Specifications section 10200 cannot be found, can that be provided to us? Experience at West Campus Point has indicated that uncovered vents are inadequate.</p>	<p>I can only say that these are standard for exterior walls. A hose is not an accurate test because of the pressure.</p>
g)	<p>The vertical plaster relief joint above the picture window (above the entry doors) facing the courtyard is a source of leaks in some units, and specification should be made to correct this defect.</p>	<p>g. The window assembly addresses joint problem. Detail2/A5.02</p>	<p>The vertical plaster relief joint is not shown or addressed in Detail2/A5.02.</p>	

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
h)	The rear facing intersection of the stucco wall at the rear of the high-sloped roof portion above the master bedroom has no drawing of the flashing detail. This issue has been raised many times, and must be addressed.	h. It will be included in 100% documents		
i)	Scuppers not specified with 4" height, in apparent contradiction with Section 1101.11.2.1 of 2007 California Plumbing code. Based on this example, code compliance checking for this and all other details appears to have been omitted.	i. All drains will be compliant with 2001 California Building Code Section 1506.	Sheet A1.00, 'Applicable Codes' block specifies 'California Plumbing Code, 2007 Edition', not 2001 California Building Code. Is it accurate that no review has been conducted of these drawings for detailed code compliance?	No it is not accurate. Consultants are responsible for code compliance.
j)	The metal downspouts and/or covers, particularly in the garage vicinity, are vulnerable to damage from impact, and either the specifications should address this, or the downspouts should be rerouted to a lower traffic location, e.g., the carport.	j. One would then be running into the wall damage more extensive than a downspout.	In our experience, a lot of activity happens in the autocourts that would damage exposed downspouts. Indeed, sometimes wall damage has occurred in the past 22 years but our estimate is that damage to thin metal downspouts would be more severe.	If the downspout is damaged it is the responsibility of those that damage it, as those that break a window.
k)	Demolition/closing of some existing interior drains, e.g., those that drain to the carport and that cross the third bedroom, need to be included in the demolition plans.	k. All internal drains shall be capped or removed as required.	Can this statement be memorialized in the notes or specifications?	yes

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
l)	Use of only one external downspout, instead of two, on each end of the building from the 'V' between units should be explored.	i. Inconsistent with both architect and roofing consultant as both are identifying 2 downspouts due to water flow.	Please provide us with the detailed calculations that underpin this statement.	We have not requested such info from consultant.
m)	The Master Bedroom deck (terrace) drainage design has many sub-optimal features, including:			
i)	Absence of a drain strainer.	i. Strainer is included in deck drain assembly - -see Section 15160, Paragraph 2.01.C Specifications.	Specifications Section 15160, Paragraph 2.01.C cannot be found, can that be provided to us? Drawing A5.05.1 does not show any drain strainer.	
ii)	Possibility of a large puddle arising on the entire deck before the secondary (scupper) drainage kicks in.	ii. Overflow drain requirements are met per Section 1506 of California Building Code.	The pertinent code is section 1101.11.2.1 of the 2007 California Plumbing Code, and the height of the scupper portrayed appears to violate that code. In any case, the entire deck will be covered in a puddle if the primary drainage clogs due to this secondary drainage arrangement, which we find unacceptable.	Code list on first page is merely a reference boiler plate. This scupper is correct.  <i>If the deck drain is plugged, I estimate the top of the BR door sill pan will clear the top of the pooled water by 1.67 inches and the edge of the pool will be about 34 inches from the door. See the "<a href="#">Deck Drain Analysis</a>" worksheet in this spreadsheet (last page of PDF file). -- Eric</i>

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
iii)	There is an additional penetration for a drain in the deck.	iii. Please clarify the question.	Currently, there is one penetration in the deck for drainage; this proposed arrangement specifies two penetrations, which makes failure, rot, and problems twice as likely as presently.	Yes that is correct. We will be constructing the penetration with correct flashing to be successful.
iv)	The detail drawing does not specify scupper at minimum height with respect to the lowest point on deck. (A5.05.1; buildup of slope near scupper is inaccurately shown).	iv. Height is specified; refer to Detail 1/A5.05.	The 2% slope is not accurately portrayed in A5.05.1, so the depiction of L.P. (lowest point) is inaccurate on the drawing. In fact, the scupper would have to be right on top of the deck material, not an inch or so above it as portrayed in the drawing.	Drawing is correct
v)	An alternative has been conceived of by the WCPHOA: The roof drain can empty to the deck, and deck sloping could carry water to a drain in the middle of the carport side of the deck. The external downspout could carry the water to the location close to the interior corner of the carport where the existing drains empty.	v. This is not the solution agreed upon with Roofing & Waterproofing consultant as I envision the description. Design wise it would create a sloping external downspout of dubious aesthetic quality.	Please forward the Roofing & Waterproofing consultants specific report considering this alternative.	We do not require a report. I would have to get a proposal for such a report and ask Marc to fund this.
n)	Exterior Wall coatings			
i)	The acrylic Flexyl is not specified.	i. In specs (Section 09540)	Specifications Section 09540 cannot be found, can that be provided to us?	

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
ii)	Details as to how this cloth-like surface would be flashed/interfaced to all window/door penetrations appear to be absent.	ii. It will not be part of the drawings, if needed refer to Manufacturer's recommended installation standards.	The Manufacturer's recommended installation standard cannot be found, can that be provided to us?	Yes, we can issue a package at the termination of construction. I doubt if the manufacturer has much more than an illustration.
o)	Windows			
i)	Only the installation (outside) window dimensions are specified, but no internal dimensions are specified. All dimensions concerning the windows should be specified.	i. Only Rough Opening is dimensioned –we receive shop dwgs submittal which shows installation in detail as it pertains to the condition.	The shop drawings submittal could not be found, can they be provided to us?	They are from the contractor and are time sensitive. They are the responsibility of the architect and University Rep to approve.. I would oppose supplying shop drawings to anyone outside of those with the correct contract redentials.
ii)	The interior finish for windows should be specified.	ii. In window specification section 08520.	Specifications Section 08520 cannot be found, can that be provided to us?	<i>Section 08520 will be included in the 100% specifications.</i>
iii)	The manufacturer of the add-alt windows and doors is specified (Loewen), but the base project manufacture is not specified and should be. The base is specified simply as vinyl clad with sealed-insulated glass (sometimes specified as tempered, sometimes not so specified).	iii. In spec-we can call out only as equal and describe the product.	We cannot find the pertinent spec. Can the spec be provided to us?	<i>See the sample base project window, which is at my house -- Eric</i>

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
iv)	There is no standard specified (e.g. some relevant ASTM standard for windows and their hardware.)	iv.ASTM does not cover fenestrations AAMA does. (AAMA stands for American Architectural Manufacturer's Association) refer to 6ii.	Specifications Section 08520 cannot be found, can that be provided to us? Roofing Forensics recommended that all installations satisfy ASTM #2266-04, which we recommend be specified in the working drawing title block and all other specifications.	
v)	There is no specification of glazed area and/or light transmission. The plans (a8.01) do not specify Low-E or any other details about the glass including UV protection ratings. There is no specification about tinting.	v.Windows in specs. We do not have tinting. Refer to 6ii.	Heat Smart Plus 1 was specified in the 8/8/08 meeting.	That is a glass type not a tint. <i>"Heat Smart Plus 1 has been specified."</i>
vi)	Andersen has a line of "Coastal Windows and Doors" especially for locations like ours which are vinyl-clad. Is vinyl-clad a superior product for this reason? Please clarify other pluses and minuses for the two window cladding options besides simply color, material and cost.	vi.Suitability for coastal conditions is based upon manufacturer's warranty and AAMA ratings. Cost of systems vary-Anderson is on the lower end.	I would like to be able to see samples of these—any place in town we could examine them? The presence of internal screens is potentially quite an aesthetic change; please direct us, or bring a sample.	You might try Hayward downtown. <i>(a.k.a. Hayward Design Center, 606 Olive St. telephone: 965-7772. I called, and the employee who answered the phone was not familiar with Andersen's Coastal Windows and Doors. -- Eric)</i>

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
vii)	Window hardware: Do the crank handles fold down on the casement windows, so that they do not protrude into the room? Window hardware, such as crank handles, should not interfere with the operation of window treatment components such as drapes or blinds. Where are the cranks positioned on the windows (particularly the longest windows), and how do they relate to the presence of screens? What finish is on the hardware? What quality is the hardware? With respect to the screens, how do they mount, how are they removed, and when they are removed, what is the appearance of the frame?	Windows will have a fold down handle. The screens are made to fit the windows with the hardware since it is the same manufacturer. The homeowners are responsible for their own window treatments and fit. The installation of screens will be in manufacturer's instructions. It is always rather simple and direct.	We would like to see samples of the proposed hardware.	We will show you the submittal samples for approval, of course. <i>See the sample at my house or <a href="#">click here to view pictures online</a> . -- Eric</i>
viii)	Window openings: do they permit egress in the event of an emergency?	viii. Egress requirements consistent with requirements of the building code.	Can the specific section(s) of the 2007 code be enumerated, along with an evaluation of the proposed design in the context of the code?	Not in documents, but you may review 2007 BC. I can refer you back to the section .
ix)	Kitchen window is shown centered with respect to sink. This is not accurate.	ix. Noted –drawing will be changed.		
p)	Doors			

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
i)	The plastering/sealing/flashing around the garage door in the original project is the same poor quality as that around the other doors. The garage door frame and nearby stucco should be shown as being demolished and re-done. The garage door itself need not change.	i. Not in project	As far as we know, all building penetrations were defectively flashed in the project, and the penetration of the garage door is one such penetration, so we believe it is in the project.	not in project. <i>"Not observed as a problem."</i>
ii)	The height of the main entry door threshold has been raised to roughly 4 inches, from an existing height of about 2 inches. It appears that this change will require raising the door frame lintel and thus considerable structural work in the wall. If this is the case, it would be a major structural change of the sort that the University has sought to avoid. This is also an aesthetic concern. (See Item 5 under "Aesthetic Concerns and Additional Options" below.)	ii. We do not have a 4" threshold as previously explained. Please clarify.	Drawing A5.03.2 shows an inaccurate portrayal of 917's door threshold area. The door threshold is actually nearly flush with the Saltillo tiles. To achieve the portrayed height between the tiles and the threshold, the entire door must be raised. As far as we know, this will cause the lintel to be raised as well, implying considerable structural work and aesthetic issues.	Gave sketch to Eric that should explain the detail. <a href="#"><i>Click here to view drawings.</i></a>
iii)	Detailed drawings of the utility room door jamb, lintel/head jamb, and sill are needed.	iii. Included in 50% -same as all doors- reference Dwg. A5.03	The utility room door is rather different than the entry door... the 2% slope of the Courtyard makes its threshold different; it opens outward not inward, implying different sealing issues as well.	door swing noted

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
iv)	The door between the garage and the utility room is depicted as opening the wrong direction (into the garage). It opens into the utility room.	iv. Noted		
v)	There are no standards specified for doors and their hardware (e.g., some relevant ASTM standard).	v. Reference: AAMA, Sections 08520 & 08210	Specifications Section 08520 and 08210 cannot be found, can that be provided to us?	
q)	The materials for the trellises and the details of the attachment to the walls need to be specified.	q. They are in specs and details in sheet A5.06, Specification Section 05160.	Specifications Section 05160 cannot be found, can that be provided to us?	
r)	Details of the removal and reinstallation of external light fixtures and electrical outlets should be addressed.	r. Exterior plate is covered-HOA supplies new lighting-we will supply flashing detail.	Flashing details, drawings, and specifications could not be found, can they be provided to us?	They are throughout the documents and there will be more as the documents progress.
i)	Leaks, including filling of the fixtures and water entry into the walls, have historically occurred at the external light fixtures, and were addressed in previous remediations.			not in project
ii)	We believe that many units with the original electrical outlet covers have water leaking into the sockets, into the junction box, down the conduit, and into the walls.			Not in project

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
s)	Drawing A5.01.1, the wall-to-courtyard drawing indicates more vertical height in the concrete foundation than is present in many units, including 917.	s. Code compliant condition is 2" –weep screed is required to be installed in compliance with Building Code.	The basic problem does not appear to have been appreciated: A5.01.1 is an inaccurate depiction of existing conditions at 917, and to change the existing to the depicted, considerable concrete work would have to be done. See 6.p.ii.	Yes, that is correct-that is our alternate detail if the courtyard is a pooling problem, we will remove the concrete in supply the 2" required to screed. The detail in an "existing situation" will be coming in the 100%. Eric has a detail
t)	Directions for addressing the known leak condition in the second bathroom on the second story must be included.	t. Further investigation may be indicated. We will be replacing the skylights which could be the source. Piping joints were not indicated when wall removal was done. If the cause is caulking, this falls to the homeowner.	During the 8/8/08 meeting, solution to this problem was agreed to be part of the project.	We are solving it-I have said that the piping is not the problem therefore the skylite will be replaced. Caulking is the homeowner's responsibility.
<b>Aesthetic Concerns and Additional Options</b>				
1)	The base plan calls for the elimination of all pillars as well as all trellises. This is a radical architectural change that has been historically rejected by the ARB and is not acceptable to the WCPHOA. There are various add-alt options to retain trellises with significant redesign. Concerns raised by the redesign include:		Yes it is.	I understand your concerns. Let us see what the numbers bring in. We can always add it.
a)	The workings drawings should include an add-alternative for the carport trellis.	a. Please refer to dwg.numberA2.04		

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
b)	Units 917 and 918 should include all trellises so we can determine their costs.	b. We will be best equipped to evaluate trellis prices when they are add alternates rather than included in base price.		
c)	Deck (terrace) trellis: it is not centered above the apex of the roof behind it. It needs to be.	c. Noted		
d)	Study trellis: If the cement pillar is not needed to support the new trellis, it should be removed and the demising wall should be extended to the low appendage wall so the gap is filled. Otherwise the pillar and the trellis should be indicated in the add-alternative.	d. We will be leaving the post as of now.	Why? Surely we do not envision a project that leaves this in without a trellis present?	noted and agreed
e)	Carport trellis: it needs to be able to support plantings, such as bougainvillea or flowering vines.	e. The planting of a flowering vine, under standard conditions, will be supported by the trellis. Excessive planting is questionable.		

**Comments on Working Drawings**

<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
<p>2) The project entails the complete replacement of doors and windows. Some of these have already been replaced by individual homeowners without recourse to the ARB—for instance, the door to the upper deck has been replaced with a new door that is painted blue and has a window. There appear to be marked differences of opinion about how some of the doors and windows should be designed, so it would seem reasonable enough to offer some small number of options. For instance, there has been an extensive debate about the French doors in the courtyard being replaced by operable windows, and as a result we have been told that this option will be provided to each homeowner. Consistent with this approach, can the following options also be made available?</p>	<p>2. This bid package is only Units 917 and 918 –all other conditions will be handled in future.</p>	<p>Of course assent of the owners of 918 is important to specification of the project for 917 &amp; 918; generally the owners of 918 want the project as executed on their unit to be as close as possible to that foreseen for the entire complex. However, their requests and opinions are rather important to the 917/918 bid package.</p>	

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
a)	The upstairs door to the deck is currently designed to be a door with a window within it. Since the overall project seems to be enthusiastic about increasing the ventilation throughout the units by introducing operability where there was none in the past, can this window be operable (as an option)?	a. That will not be an option.	Why? Marc was the one to suggest we think big at the early meetings and consider additional work (at our cost) to take place at the same time.	Our project will not include any operable window in a door. This was discussed at earlier meetings. If you want it for the future units we can address it at that time. For now we are concentrating on 917 & 918
b)	The utility room door has a (required) vent, but this room is always dark. Can this door be designed (as an alternative) to have a glass window above the vent?	b. Not at this time	Why?	It is not within my scope of leak remediation.
3)	The impact of changing the windows and on the amount of daylight entering the units is an important aesthetic issue. We want to be able to compare the surface area of the glazing (glass) of the old and new items to ensure the impact is negligible.	3. We have discussed this issue and have indicated that glazing area will not be exactly equal due to new window design.	Unfortunately, specific dimensions were omitted from the working drawings, so no calculation of the current area can be made. It is hard to see how a consensus can be built in absence of specific dimensions for this long-identified critical element of the project.	We would not normally calculate glazing area in working drawings. You are free to do so by looking up the window type and sizes of sash etc. We have always said wait and see 917 before you state that it will be darker.

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
4)	The base project calls for a vinyl-clad exterior windows and doors that come in one of three shades of white/grey. This proposed change in the exterior color from the current Pratt & Lambert Estuary Blue is being opposed vigorously by many homeowners and has historically been opposed by the ARB.	4. I understand but those are the only color options of vinyl.	It is a bit surprising that with a professional architect and a project involving 65 units, each with about 20 windows+doors that color matching options are as limited as available at Home Depot. Historically, the ARB has denied numerous requests such as this one through the last 22 years.	Custom coloring of windows is not a viable economic option. I believe Home Depot does not carry our window manufacturer.
5)	If there is any change in the height of the entry door threshold, care must be taken to ensure that the heads of the doors and the windows align.	5. There is no situation where door and adjacent window height differ.	It appears that the details and reasons for the WCP comment have not been absorbed before the response was formulated.	I understand your statement, but there is no answer other than that which I gave.
6)	The issue of patio drainage has come up frequently as a possible source of water intrusion. The current base plan does not include any re-grading of the back patios or the courtyard.		Why no response to 6?	Yes the statement is correct. If we find the case different we will readjust the slope of the patios.
a)	Given the magnitude of the project and the intention to prevent future water intrusion problems, the project needs to assure that there is proper grading of patio slabs and courtyards.			There will be proper drainage in patios

**Comments on Working Drawings**

<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
<p>b) Some of the water intrusion problems for some units might have been compounded by homeowners installing tile on the back patios on top of the cement slabs, raising the height of this surface and possibly interfering with the weep screeds at the bottom of the exterior walls. These cases must be remedied. In cases where new, properly graded patio cement is installed, the work should be done in consultation with the homeowner to ensure sufficient clearance for the installation of exterior tile by the homeowner if desired.</p>			Understood
<p>7) The interior trim of the window wood (where the window meets the glass) seems to be specified as an ogee (see a5.02-8). Is that correct? Have other trim shapes been considered? WCPHOA would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the interior trim.</p>	<p>7. We have used the standard detail. Is the reference to casing? There is no interior trim.</p>	<p>The interior appearance of the windows and doors is of great interest to homeowners and a comprehensible designation and specification is essential to achieving consensus.</p>	<p>The window section is standard.</p>
		<p>I thought we raised the issue of changing the exterior lighting at the time of the project, but can't see any reply to this (nor do I see the original request now).</p>	<p>Lighting is not in the project</p>
<b>Outstanding Issues</b>			

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
1)	What is the expected duration of the defect correction effort for each unit?	I can't say at this time, much depends on how they are bid and in what quantity.		
2)	What household items will need to be moved or stored in order to enable the work?	We will learn much after we do 918 since Ben Reese will be there during the work.		
3)	What impact will there be to inside space—e.g., floor coverings, wall paint, etc.? If there is impact, what provisions will be made to remediate that impact?	There will be an impact on all items you have mentioned. They will protect the floor and repair the openings for doors and windows. I believe we discussed that we will not be repainting the rooms however. That point will need further discussion before we go out to bid on 917 & 918. Obviously 917 will be completed in its entirety.		
4)	The builder must provide an accurate construction schedule in advance so residents can plan around the modifications.	Construction schedules are updated frequently during the construction period. We can require one every 2 weeks if need be. The PM will inform the tenants, in this case it will be Ben.		
5)	What mechanisms will be put in place to prevent or minimize schedule slippage?	We have updates as explained in #4 and will know slippage when milestones are not met. As previously discussed, the PM will submit weekly progress reports to the HOA representative.		

**Comments on Working Drawings**

	<b>WCPHOA Comments - 5/28/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>WCPHOA Response - 6/16/2009</b>	<b>UCSB Comments - 7/2/2009</b>
6)	How will the sign-off on the project work? Who decides if the work was done properly and as specified and/or agreed upon?	We will have an inspector on site daily plus the university Project Manager weekly or as many times as needed during the week.	What provision for inspections with binding consequences by either the HOA or a third party retained by the HOA?	Unless the HOA holds the contract, they have no authority over the contractor. You may hold the contract as discussed previously. A representative will be invited to all construction meetings.
7)	How much damage will be done to the landscape, and how will it be remediated?	We do not intend to damage the landscape during 917 & 918 nor in the future. We will need to cut back certain areas where suggested and can review that with HOA.		
8)	Many units have had leaks inside the walls or floors of the upstairs bathroom. The cause of this problem must be identified and should be rectified as part of this project.	The upstairs leak has been difficult to pinpoint. We are assuming it is the skylight which will be replaced plus the roof. It does not seem to be any piping problem. Caulking can be an issue, but is the homeowner's responsibility.	Has 917 been analyzed with possible further destructive testing to ascertain the origin of the water intrusion?	No