## Lawn Activities Scenarios with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lawn Bowls - Full</th>
<th>Lawn Bowls - Partial</th>
<th>Bocce</th>
<th>Shuffleboard - courts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB-Full</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$193,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Full</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Full</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Full</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Full</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Full</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB-Partial</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$145,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Partial</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$184,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Partial</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$184,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Partial</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$184,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-Partial</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$184,280.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$193,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$182,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$182,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$182,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>$116,280</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$182,280.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$193,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key:
- LB-Full: Lawn bowling, single full-size regulation court, can accommodate croquet
- LB-Partial: Lawn bowling, single partial-size court to accommodate croquet
- B: Bocce, single full-size regulation court
- S-4: Shuffleboard, 4 full-size regulation courts, with covered seating
- S-2: Shuffleboard, 2 full-size regulation courts, with covered seating
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FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT PLAN
INFORMATIONAL MEETING

NOVEMBER 18, 2014
FEP PROJECTS

- Fitness Center at Clubhouse II
- Crystal Ballroom at Clubhouse 1
- North Wing Renovations at Clubhouse 1
  - Cascade Bistro
  - Terrace Room
  - Maryland Room
- Comprehensive Site Plan
- Administration Building
- Golf Course Playable Area Enhancements
- Golf Course Pond Rehabilitation
- PPD Customer Service Area Enhancements
FITNESS CENTER @ CLUBHOUSE II

- Estimated Project Costs: $1,670,000 - $1,770,000
- Existing space is 2,500 sf - “bowling alley”
- +55,000 recorded uses per year
- Resident demand is not met during peak use – incur wait times
- Space is constrained for stretching and balancing exercises
- Facility is not representative of LW quality and standards
FITNESS CENTER @ CLUBHOUSE II

CLUBHOUSE II - FITNESS CENTER ADDITION

FITNESS CENTER ENTRANCE
MAIN BUILDING ENTRANCE
FITNESS CENTER @ CLUBHOUSE II

- Expand to 5,000 sf
- Improve quality of fitness experience
- Connect to exterior to enhance views
- Variety of exercise areas – stretching, balancing, group lessons
- Direct access to restroom facilities
- Increase equipment by ~50% (final equipment selections not determined)
FITNESS CENTER @ CLUBHOUSE II
Next Steps

- Detailed layout of equipment and spaces
- Presentation and selection of finishes
- Finalize equipment list
- Develop site plan
CRYSTAL BALLROOM

- Estimated Project Costs: $620,000
- Update finishes – carpet is worn and stained
- Improve acoustics
- Lacks coordinated details – exposed mechanical grilles, 3 types of lighting temperature, exposed sprinklers
CRYSTAL BALLROOM

FLOOR PLAN

WOOD FLOOR WITH PATTERN

OPTION FOR TABLE LAYOUT - BANQUET

CRYSTAL BALLROOM

REFLECTED CEILING PLAN

CENTRAL CHANDELIER

COFFERED CEILING WITH ASSORTED LIGHTING FIXTURES

Leisure World of Maryland
CRYSTAL BALLROOM

- Update finishes
- Improve acoustics
- Enhance audio/visual capabilities
- Enhance lighting with appropriate fixtures to enrich appearance and accommodate various activities
CRYSTAL BALLROOM
Next Steps

- Detailed layout of floor and ceiling plan
  - Board and E&R considering chandelier lighting
- Presentation and selection of finishes
- Selection of furniture
- Design acoustical systems
NORTH WING @ CLUBHOUSE I

- Estimated Project Costs: $1,000,000 - $1,500,000
- Redistribute restaurant demand evenly
- Resolve kitchen capabilities and catering needs
- Update finishes
- Improve access and identification of restaurants to exterior
NORTH WING @ CLUBHOUSE 1

CLUBHOUSE I NORTH WING PLAN
CASCADE BISTRO

• Add exterior vestibule
• Update restaurant finishes
• Variety of seating options – small, large and semi-private gatherings
• Add a patron bar and lounge area by expanding into the Maryland Room
• Separate existing interior entrance from restrooms
• Add outdoor seating area
TERRACE ROOM

- Add exterior vestibule
- Update restaurant finishes
- Revise table configurations for adequate passage
- Strategically place buffet area
- Create connection between Terrace Room and Stein Room for overflow
- Add outdoor seating area
MARYLAND ROOM

• Update room finishes

• Improve lighting with appropriate fixtures

• Build expansion to regain space taken by Cascade Bistro

• Enhance connection to exterior
MARYLAND ROOM

FUTURE ADDITION

MARYLAND ROOM

STORAGE

CORRIDOR

WARM NEUTRALS

OUTDOOR CONNECTION

Leisure World of Maryland
NORTH WING @ CLUBHOUSE I
Next Steps

• Detailed layout of floor and ceiling plan
• Presentation and selection of finishes
• Selection of furniture
COMPREHENSIVE SITE PLAN

Objectives:
- Improve accessibility
- Improve distribution of parking
- Improve safety of pedestrians and vehicles
- Improve identification of restaurants to exterior

Site Plan 3A:
- Endorsed by BOD, CPAC, Restaurant and E&R Committees
- Proposed access road impacts lawn activities
- Under consideration by BOD – retaining amenities vs improving accessibility
COMPREHENSIVE SITE PLAN

ADVANTAGES:
- Drop off close to North Wing of CH1 ~ 40' - 60'
- Creates distinct pedestrian areas for access to buildings
- Distributes parking across parking lot for closer access to entrances of buildings
- Creates ~93 parking spaces closer to entrance of CH1
- Geometry of drop off road allows for slower traffic without blocking flow
- Separation of CH1 and Admin Blg allows for landscape to create views
- Creates connection directly from drop off points to parking areas

DISADVANTAGES:
- Impacts all lawn activities
- Loading dock area is still prominent

LEISURE WORLD OF MARYLAND - SITE PLAN 3A
LAWN ACTIVITIES/ACCESS ROAD

• 1 Regulation Size Lawn Bowling Court*: $164,000 to relocate
  – $17,000 to maintain
  – 12 members of Lawn Bowls Club
  – hosts Maryland Senior Olympics
  – Croquet uses court (croquet sized court $116,280)

• 1 Bocce Court: $29,000 to relocate
  – minimal maintenance costs
  – regular play Spring to Fall

• 4 Shuffleboard Courts*: $72,000 to relocate or $12,000 for single court
  – minimal maintenance costs
  – minimal use by residents
  – hosts Maryland Senior Olympics

• Access Road: $95,000 to construct

• Total Cost to relocate all Lawn Activities and construct Access Road: $346,000

*can be relocated at current size or reduced; if reduced may not be useable for Maryland Senior Olympics
COMPREHENSIVE SITE PLAN

Next Steps

- Board of Directors considering access road and impacts to lawn activities
  - Eliminate access road; all lawn activities remain
  - Retain access road; eliminate or relocate all lawn activities
  - Modify access road; eliminate or relocate some lawn activities

- Coordinate North Wing Renovations with Administration Building

- Establish schedule for submission to Montgomery County Park and Planning
1960's design for community amenities
Not designed as office space
Staffing requirements change
- Growth in Community
- Demand for additional services
- Changes in Community expectations

Functional space needs
- Prominent reception
- Adequate work space
- Circulation/accessibility
- Work flow adjacencies
- Meeting space
- Staff support facilities

Support LWMC as competitive employer
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING


Space needs assessed include:
- LWMC administration staff
- Bank (reduce footprint from 3,500 sf to 2,500 sf)
- Montgomery Mutual
- Post Office
- No Real Estate Offices

General programming indicates ~20,000 sf of space is needed.

Existing Administration Building is +16,000 sf.
## Administration Building Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Expand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovate</td>
<td>$5,178,250</td>
<td>$3,123,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~20,000 sf</td>
<td>19,709 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,634 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criteria
- Accommodate space needs
- Optimize work flow/adjacencies
- Disruption to LWMC operations
- Improves accessibility
- Risk of unknowns
- Life cycle
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Why Build New?

Based on information from consultants and past experiences of Management, constructing a new Administration Building is the best use of Community’s funds.

1. Accommodates all functions
2. Provides flexibility as needs change
3. Optimizes work flow
4. Provides improved accessibility
5. Redistributes demand on parking
6. Less risk with unknown conditions
7. Longer building life cycle: 40 yrs. vs 20 yrs.
8. Studies show renovated building have half life span of new construction
9. Outside consultant reported buildings far less than 50 years old are often replaced
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

2 Frequently Asked Questions

• How can actual square footage requirements be determined?
  – Refinement of general programming study
  – Micro details of each department – adjacencies and work flows
  – Layout furniture and equipment, support spaces, circulation

• How can estimated renovation costs be refined to mitigate risks of unknown?
  – Conduct invasive facility conditions assessment of existing building
  – Detailed documentation of physical conditions of the building
  – Document efforts needed to meet minimum code compliance
  – Provide associated cost estimate
  – Approximately $100,000 - $150,000
GOLF COURSE PLAYABLE AREA

Estimated Project Costs: $914,000

- Address tees, trees, and traps
- Improve playability and pace with forward tees
- Renovate traps to improve drainage and diversity of strategy
- Selectively remove trees for air circulation and sunlight exposure
- Add under story trees for visual interest and beautification
GOLF COURSE PLAYABLE AREA
GOLF COURSE POND REHABILITATION

- Estimated Project Costs: $810,000
- Oldest water feature
  - ~2.5 acres
- Accumulation of organic matter created shallow body of water
- Facilitates formation of algae blooms - unsightly, odor producing
GOLF COURSE POND REHABILITATION

- Algae controls used:
  - Surface aeration
  - Algaecides
  - Barley straw
  - Beneficial biological treatments
  - Phosphorous isolators
  - Manual removal

- Cannot use harsh chemicals as pond is irrigation source for golf course

- Best long term solution – dredging pond
  - Removes accumulated organic matter safely ~3,400 cy
  - Returns pond to original capacity
GOLF COURSE & POND REHAB

Next Steps

- Coordinate sediment and erosion control requirements between projects
- Complete design and permit documentation
- Submit for permit
PPD CUSTOMER SERVICE AREA

- Estimated Project Costs: $285,000
- Depository for repurposed furniture and materials
- Not representative of workmanship of PPD trades
- Customer service area is inefficient
  - Counter is not accessible
  - Service reps are not oriented towards walk-in counter
  - Difficult to address more than 1 customer at a time
  - No space for foreman to meet with residents/Mutuals
- Work flows are not efficient
- Need to create additional office
PPD CUSTOMER SERVICE AREA

COLOR PALETTE

FLOORING

streetsense.
PPD CUSTOMER SERVICE AREA

- Improve accessibility at service counter and vestibule
- Improve visibility to service counter by staff
- Create multi functional service counter
- Add consultation meeting space for residents and foreman
- Reposition administration offices to accommodate current staff and improve work flow
- Create functional conference room
- Update finishes and furniture
PPD CUSTOMER SERVICE AREA
Next Steps

• Complete design and permit documentation
• Submit for permit
• Issue for competitive bids
QUESTIONS?

- LWMC Board of Directors
  board@lwm.com
  last Tuesday of the month

- Advisory Committees
  - Community Planning  1st Monday of the month
  - Education & Recreation  1st Tuesday of the month
  - PPD  2nd Tuesday of the month
  - Golf & Greens  2nd Friday of the month
  - Restaurant  3rd Monday of the month

- Mutual representatives on Board and Committees

- Jolene King  jking@lwm.com
- Nicole Gerke  ngerke@lwm.com
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Agenda Item 7-a(i) — Lawn Activities/Access Road/Comprehensive Site Plan

Proposed Resolution #1:

That the proposed access road between the new Administration Building and the restaurant section of Clubhouse 1, as shown on Site Plan 3A, be eliminated.

Proposed Resolution #2:

Amend Resolution #79, dated 10/29/13, to increase the amount by $15,000 from $50,000 to a total sum of $65,000, to explore alternate options to improve accessibility the North Wing of Clubhouse 1. Funds to come from the Resales Fund.

**Resolution # 79, 10/29/13**

Whereas the Board authorized a new Administration Building with a conceptual project budget of $5.3 million and a comprehensive plan for the food services wing of Clubhouse 1 with a conceptual project budget of $1.0 to $1.5 million, Management is directed to interview and recommend qualified architects and consultants to produce a master site plan of the Administrative Building/Clubhouse 1 site area which addresses how these can be part of an overall conceptual site plan, identifies any other options with regard to site design, and, if necessary, considers the phasing of implementation. The Board authorizes $50,000 for the preparation of a comprehensive conceptual site plan.

Refer to attached report for additional information and Site Plan 3A.
Site Plan Option 3A with proposed access road
SECTION 11
Appendix G

LWCC BOD Agenda Item 7.f. CPAC Resolution on Administration Building

6/25/15 by Carole Kennon, Chair, CPAC

Executive Committee/CPAC New Administration Building - Space Allocation Recommendations

RESOLUTION

Resolved, the LWCC Board of Directors approves Community Planning Advisory Committee New Administration space allocation recommendations for a large meeting room, large shared meeting room, and three shared small meeting rooms, and inclusion of space for the Communications/Leisure World News Department as described in the attached memo.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The Executive Committee reviewed the Community Planning Advisory Committee New Administration space allocation recommendations for Board action. The memo contained four resolutions recommending Board action.

The Executive Committee agreed by general consent to forward the following resolutions from the Community Planning Advisory Committee with the recommendation that they be approved -

Resolution #37 - 6/19/15
That the new Administration Building includes a dedicated 1,680 square foot room (which can be divided) as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015.

Resolution #38 - 6/19/15
That the two shared meeting rooms, as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015, be reduced to one, thereby cutting square footage by approximately 400 square feet.

Resolution #39 - 6/19/15
CPAC accepts the shared/collaboration small conference rooms as a total of three, a total of 360 square feet, as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015.

Resolution #40 - 6/19/15
That the Communication/Leisure World News Department be included in the new Administration Building, occupying approximately 400 square feet.

Background information and Rationale are attached.
RATIONALE FOR CPAC RESOLUTIONS – LWCC BOD Agenda Item 7.f.

CPAC reviewed programming information for the new Administration Building obtained from Streetsense and Management in reports dated April 13, April 22, May 11, and June 8, 2015 and approved the following resolutions. Relevant information from these reports is included in the rationales for each resolution.

#1 Resolved, that the new Administration Building includes a dedicated 1,680 square foot room (which can be divided) as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015."

- Dedicated Large Meeting Room – 1 total
  - Accommodate 40 seated at conference table and 50 guests
    - Ease of passage around table while occupied
    - Sight lines for viewing guests and displayed images
    - AV technology to record meetings, table and ceiling mounted microphones/speaker, projection screen/projector to display images, connection of external devices to video and sound system, teleconferencing (including video), podium area
    - Lighting options for various meetings and presentations
    - Divisible to accommodate smaller meetings (20 persons seated)
  - Locate off Main Lobby
  - Type of meetings:
    - Board of Directors
      - meets at least once per month
      - currently use Montgomery Room
    - Executive Committee
      - meets at least once per month
      - currently use Sullivan Room
    - LWMC Staff
      - full staff and intradepartmental staff meets once per month
      - currently use Sullivan Room
    - Property Managers
      - meets at least once per month
      - currently use Sullivan Room
    - Large Advisory Committees
      - 13 meetings per month
      - currently use Sullivan, CH1 and 2
    - Large Mutual Boards (annual and monthly meetings)
      - at least 10 meetings per month
      - currently use CH1 and 2
    - Large group staff training
      - meetings several times per month
      - currently use Sullivan or Montgomery Room

- Impact to Clubhouse 1 and 2 Meeting Rooms
Appendix G

- Removes monthly use from Montgomery, Chesapeake and Annapolis Rooms for LWCC BCID and various Advisory Committee and Mutual meetings
- Allows for more opportunity to utilize the Montgomery Room rather than overburden Maryland Room for larger functions

The concept behind the large conference room in the new Administration Building is to create a properly sized, state of the art technology (recording, broadcasting, etc.) conference room that could serve multiple functions and purposes including, but not limited to, the Board of Directors' meetings with adequate guest space to large Advisory Committee and Mutual meetings, and training space for staff. The large conference room will be divisible into 2 smaller meeting rooms to facilitate multiple meetings occurring at the same time or to be used as another shared meeting room (see CPAC Resolution #2). Locating the large conference room in the Administration Building places the Board, Mutual, and Advisory Committee meetings within close proximity to staff and administrative support functions making effective and efficient use of staff and space. This large conference room would be a long-term benefit to the Community and fits with the goal of housing all administrative support spaces in one functional building.

#2 Resolved, that two shared meeting rooms, as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015, be reduced to one, thereby cutting square footage by approximately 400 square feet.

- Shared Meeting Room – Large – 1 total
  - Accommodate 8-12 persons seated
    - Ease of passage around table while occupied
    - Sight lines for viewing guests and displayed images
    - AV technology to include wall mounted screen to display images, connection of external devices to video and sound system, table and ceiling mounted microphones and speakers, teleconferencing (including video)
  - Locate central to all staff areas
  - Type of Meetings (most meetings currently use the Sullivan Room):
    - meeting with external consultants – auditors, insurance, IT, etc.
    - intradepartmental and departmental staff meetings
    - small Advisory Committee meetings
    - small Mutual Board meetings
    - training sessions for staff
    - Security meeting with families of residents
    - HR meeting with Department staff
  - Impacts to Clubhouse 1and 2 Meeting Rooms
    - Minimal impact to Clubhouse spaces as most of these types of meetings take place in the Sullivan Room; space for these types of meetings would be replicated in the new Administration Building
The concept behind the shared conference room in the new Administration Building is to create a smaller multi-functional conference room that serves smaller Mutual and Advisory Committee meetings and various staff meetings with vendors that occur several times a week. There are also times when groups, such as LW News or the Auditors, require a sizeable room in which to create a base of operations to conduct business over several days without having to move materials and equipment each day to another location. With a large dedicated meeting room which will be able to be divided, this reduction in space does not affect the underlying concept of housing administrative functions in one building.

III Resolved, CPAC accepts the shared/collaboration small conference rooms as a total of three, a total of 360 square feet, as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015.

- **Shared Conference/Collaboration Rooms – Small – 3 total**
  - Accommodate 4-6 persons
    - AV technology to include wall mounted screen to display images, connection of external devices to video system, teleconferencing (including video)
  - Locate central to all staff areas
  - Type of Meetings (most meetings currently use the Sullivan Room, when available, or meet at staff's desks):
    - Processing of new residents with Resales, Security and Montgomery Mutual
    - Mutual Board members or residents consulting with Mutual Assistants/Accountants
    - Interviews by Human Resources
    - Private meetings between Supervisor and staff members
    - Private meetings between Security and resident on Mutual issue
  - Impacts to Clubhouse 1 and 2 Meeting Rooms:
    - Minimal impact to Clubhouse spaces as most of these types of meetings take place at staff desks or in the hallways of the Administration Building or in the Sullivan Room, if available; space for these types of meetings would be replicated in the new Administration Building

- **Meeting Space - Desk Survey of Business Encounters:**
  - As requested by CPAC, Management conducted a 2 week study of daily face to face meeting between administrative staff and visitors/residents. The study indicated there are 103-140 face to face meetings occurring daily. The encounters range from mutual specific to committee related to individual resident issues and outside consultant/vendor discussions. Below is information on the business encounters, by department, indicating the number of staff per department and associated encounters per staff tracked over a 2 week period, Monday through Friday, 8:30AM to 5:00PM. This information supports the need for smaller, collaborative, private shared meeting spaces to be used throughout the day by administrative staff to conduct daily business activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Encounters</th>
<th>% of Staff</th>
<th>Daily range</th>
<th>#/Staff/Day</th>
<th>Weekly range</th>
<th>#/Staff/wk</th>
<th>Annual range</th>
<th>#/Staff/Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Assistants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60:3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Help Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22:7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34:1</td>
<td>11:11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12:2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40:5</td>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>21:3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>28:6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Transfers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>23:8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security - Including Lifeline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13:7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55:38</td>
<td>70:70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>140:50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>115:70</td>
<td>300:300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Data represents business encounters at staff desks and does not include regularly scheduled full-room meetings (Executive Committee, Advisory Committees, Mutual Board, LWMC Staff, etc.)
2. Data collected over a two-week period, Monday through Friday, 8 AM to 5 PM.
3. Encounters include scheduled and unscheduled meetings.
4. Data collection does not include internal staff meetings – collaboration among staff, inter-department meetings, intra-department meetings.

Based on review of the number and type of business encounters by the Administration staff, it was felt spaces that can be used for meetings with residents and collaboration areas was a necessity for efficiency and effectiveness of staff conducting daily business operations. Privacy of meetings is also an important factor considered in assessing the need for these smaller meeting spaces. These types of daily encounters revolved around residents meeting with accounting to discuss financial issues, meetings with Mutual Assistants and staff meeting with vendors.

#4 Resolved, that the Communication/Leisure World News Department be included in the new Administration Building, occupying approximately 400 square feet.

- Proposed programming space allocation:
  - 3 staff members
  - Combination of enclosed office and open plan (cubicles) – can be an enclosed suite but may not be required
  - Interaction with Residents and LWMC Staff (locate close to main lobby/reception)
    - LW News Committee
    - Utilize shared conference room for 4-6 persons

The Communications Department/Leisure World News, currently located in Clubhouse 1, is the only administrative operation not currently housed in the existing Administration Building. It is proposed to be added to the new Administration Building to consolidate administrative business operations.
The Communications Department interacts with all departments and also oversees the Leisure World News. Leisure World News was formerly under the E&R Department whose core business focus is on social and clubhouse operations. Departmental control switched with the addition of a Director of Communications in late 2014. The functions of the Director of Communications have been focused on editor responsibilities, but are expected to grow to serve administrative operations and handle internal and external communications. Thus, this department should be central to the other core administrative business operations. This supports Streetsense's recommendation for good planning in that all business operations of LWMC should be housed together in the Administration Building and all social, educational, and recreational functions for the Community should remain in the Clubhouses.

**Next Steps:** CPAC requested that a floor plan within context of the site be prepared based on the proposed programming space allocations per these resolutions. The floor plan will be presented to the Committee in August 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION BUILDING PROGRAMMING SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/15 Proposed Building SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Large Meeting Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Meeting Room - Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Conference/Collaboration Rooms - Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/LW News Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Proposed Building SF</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approximate area of the new Administration Building inclusive of these recommendations will be 21,715; however it should be noted that square footages may fluctuate based on layout of spaces, building geometry, site restrictions, etc.

Additional information on meeting room usage in Clubhouse 1 and 2 and the Sullivan Room is contained in the attached report which was provided to CPAC as part of the June 8, 2015 to aid in their discussions of the programming study.
New Administration Building – Meeting Spaces

Meeting rooms in varying sizes and located throughout the Administration Building are a key component to being able to conduct daily business operations in an effective, efficient and private manner. The current Administration Building is sorely lacking in meeting space – only the Sullivan Room is available which is used by Advisory Committees, Mutuals, and staff for all types of meetings and often overlapping when needed to be used.

The attached Streetsense memo dated September 4, 2014 was presented to CPAC at the September 9 meeting as part of a discussion on the new Administration Building Programming, in particular discussing meeting spaces. The memo documents Streetsense’s assessment of existing meeting room usage data and identifies two significant issues with current available meeting spaces:

1. noticeable lack of small private meeting/collaboration spaces in the current Administration Building that would see beneficial use in a new building
2. cost analysis of retrofitting the Sullivan Room or Montgomery Room in lieu of building a new properly sized and equipped meeting room to handle larger meetings, such as the LWCC BOD monthly meeting.

Clubhouse 1 and 2 – Meeting Spaces – Usage Information:

The E&R Advisory Committee reviewed and validated the list of regularly scheduled meetings held in Clubhouse 1 and 2. Discussions of the E&R Advisory Committee resulted in consensus that any reduction in meeting space is a detriment to the community as participation (recreational, governance, social, etc.) by residents has increased, causing a growing demand for available and flexible use of space throughout LW.

Below is information on Clubhouse 1 and 2 meeting room uses for 2012 – 2014. The data tracked is by number of events but does not track the total hours of the events due to reporting limitations. For example if a room is reserved for 1 day or 1 hour, it is recorded as 1 event. Note: The new room reservation system, fully implemented in April 2015, has the ability to track room usage by number of events and total of hours per event to provide more accurate data on actual room usage.

Sullivan Room usage shows the number of events held but not the duration of the events, similar to the Clubhouse 1 and 2 information. Four Mutuals have moved their meetings to other locations to accommodate an increase in attendance that cannot be accommodated in the Sullivan Room.
# Appendix G

## Average Monthly Meeting Room Usage 2012 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Name</th>
<th>2012 avg # of uses/month</th>
<th>% of use</th>
<th>2013 avg # of uses/month</th>
<th>% of use</th>
<th>2014 avg # of uses/month</th>
<th>% of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis Room</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Room</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Room</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Room</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Room</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room (CH2)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room II (CH2)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSSIBLE ROOM USES/MONTH: 40

**NOTES:**
1. Data based on meetings scheduled 9AM to 5PM, Monday through Friday.
2. Due to employees' meeting time preference for start times of early AM and early PM, possible # of meetings per month is 40.
3. Information does not account for downtime of room for breakdown and set up requirements.
4. Information does not track unscheduled use.
5. New reservation software fully implemented in April 2015 can track schedule/meeting duration, but not actual meeting duration.

---

## Average Monthly Meeting Room Usage 2012 - 2014 - Graph

![Average Monthly Meeting Room Usage 2012 - 2014](chart.png)

---
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Date: June 30, 2015
## Sullivan Meeting Room Regularly Scheduled Monthly Usage 2013 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Name</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of uses/month</td>
<td>% of use</td>
<td># of uses/month</td>
<td>% of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuels</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSSIBLE ROOM USES/MONTH: 40

**NOTES:**
1. Possible times a room can be used is 40 times per month
2. Information tracked does not indicate duration of a meeting - system tracks all meetings as 1 use regardless of duration.
3. Information does not track unscheduled use.
4. Decrease in Mutual use of the Sullivan Room is the size of the room is too small to accommodate growing attendance.
Memorandum for the Record
Date: September 4, 2014
Subject: Leisure World Administration building meeting room programming

Based on Streetsense’s review of the programming survey completed with the Administration Departments and room usage data, there are 2 types of meeting spaces required in the new Administration Building that are not currently accommodated in the existing building.

The current Administration Building lacks a small private meeting / collaboration space to be shared among Departments. Various departments require private meetings and collaboration sessions with staff and/or residents that currently are held wherever space may be available. These private sessions may be between Administrative Assistants and Committee Chairpersons or between Accounting and Banking Regulatory Agencies. The new Administration Building program provides for a small, 4 to 6 person meeting room located near these administrative Departments. Other Departments, such as Reale and Montgomery Mutual who interact with the public on a more frequent basis, indicate the need for small, private areas within their suites, which have also been accommodated in the programmed space.

The existing Sullivan Room accommodates several different types of meetings ranging from Advisory Committees to Mutual Board Meetings. It also serves as a lunchroom for staff. The size of the room is not conducive to allowing ease of movement between people seated at the conference table and guests seated around the perimeter of the room. Also, the arrangement of the room does not allow for proper projecting and viewing of images or recording of meetings as necessary. The Sullivan Room is approximately 1,000 square feet and based on standards for the type of use should be a minimum of twice the size equaling 2,000 sf.

Streetsense believes a large multi-functional conference room is required for the operation and functions of the administration of Leisure World and should be located in the Administration Building versus elsewhere in the Community. The Administration Building houses all the departments and functions that operate the day to day running of Leisure World. Inclusive of this should be Board of Directors meetings, Advisory Committee meetings and Mutual Board meetings, all of which can be accommodated in a properly sized, arranged, and equipped meeting room in the new Administration Building. Grouping of similar type functions in a single building is an efficient use of space, money, energy, and employee time rather than segregating functions into separate buildings.

Additionally, if we just focus on the cost to renovate and equip the existing Sullivan Room or a similarly sized room elsewhere in Leisure World, we would anticipate the cost to reach as much as $100 per square foot or $200,000. To accommodate the same size meeting room in the new Administration Building we anticipate the cost to be less than $75 per square foot realizing over $50,000 in savings for build out.
SECTION 12
MEMORANDUM

TO: LWCC Board of Directors

FROM: Carole Kennon, Chair, Community Planning Advisory Committee

DATE: September 16, 2016

SUBJECT: Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 Site Plan Package

The “Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 Additions – Site Plan Version H, Floor Plans and Elevations” report and presentation is attached for review and consideration by the LWCC Board of Directors.

The LWCC Board of Directors is being asked to:

1. Review substantive changes to the site plan
2. Authorize submission of the site plan to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC).
3. Approve funding for the necessary consultants to complete the regulatory submission process.

Once the LWCC Board of Directors approves the site plan, it will take the consultants 3-4 months to fully develop the M-NCPPC submission packet. Once submitted, it can take 12-18 months for regulatory approval. The Fitness Center, a simpler project, took 11 months to reach final approval with M-NCPPC.

Upon completion of M-NCPPC’s review and after competitive construction bids are obtained, the project will be brought to the LWCC Board of Directors to consider funding authorization before proceeding with construction.
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AND CLUBHOUSE 1 ADDITIONS:
SITE PLAN VERSION H, FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

RESOLUTION:
Resolved, the LWCC Board of Directors approves the Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 Site Plan Version H package (site plan, floor plans and elevations) dated 9/27/16 as recommended by the Community Planning Advisory Committee and endorsed by the Education & Recreation, Restaurant, Security & Transportation Advisory Committees and Management; and authorizes submission to Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission for approval.

Further, the LWCC Board of Directors authorizes an amount not to exceed $258,000 for consultants to complete the regulatory submissions process including architecture and engineering (mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire protection), civil engineering and landscape (including storm water management fees); geotechnical engineer, audio visual engineer; utility expeditor; legal and related filing fees, etc. Funds to come from the Facilities Enhancement Fund (Resales Fund).

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this resolution is to obtain approval of Site Plan Version H package and the funding necessary to develop the plans and documents needed to submit to Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for Planning Board review.

RATIONALE:
The M-NCPPC regulatory submission process for site plan approval will require documentation of all site changes, parking, vehicles and pedestrian traffic patterns, covered walkways, landscape, site lighting and amenities, Administration Building Floor plans and elevations and Clubhouse 1 addition floor plans and elevations. The LWCC Board of Directors needs to provide approval of the attached site plan package (site plan, floors plans and elevations) in order to complete the development of the documents to meet the M-NCPPC submission requirements.

The information contained within this report outlines how the criteria for evaluating improvements (see Site Plan section below) influenced the Administration Building design, as well as the site plan which added significant amenities to Clubhouse 1 in response to community interests. The cost analysis for the expanded scope of this project includes not just a new building but also those site improvements to Clubhouse 1 and the surrounding area.
Site Plan:
The priorities for evaluating the design of the site plan associated with the new Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 are:
- Improve accessibility to the buildings
- Increase parking closer to the buildings
- Improve safety for pedestrian and vehicular interactions
- Improve the overall ambiance of the site

The LWCC BOD Resolutions #70 (9/29/15) and #84 (11/24/15) approved for continued development the November 9, 2015 preliminary site plan package for the new Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 extensions. All LWCC BOD resolutions relating to the Administration Building and Site Plan project are included at the end of the report.

As Community Planning, Education & Recreation (E&R), Restaurant and Security & Transportation (S&T) Advisory Committees continued to review and develop the site plan, it was determined that the November 9, 2015 plan could be improved to better meet the stated priorities and improve on the residents’ access to and use of community amenities. The Committees’ areas of concerns which needed to be resolved were:

1. No drop off to Clubhouse Grille (formerly Cascade Bistro)
2. Confusing vehicular traffic patterns between Clubhouse 1 and Administration parking lots
3. No real opportunity for improved accessibility to North Wing of Clubhouse 1
4. LW bus stop not on-grade at Administration Building main entrance
5. Conflicts between interaction of trucks and vehicles at the loading dock

The consultants re-evaluated the site plan to provide a design that would satisfactorily address all of the concerns identified. In response, Site Plan Alternate F dated July 11, 2016 was presented and approved by Community Planning, E&R, Restaurant and S&T Advisory Committees. Minor revisions were made to Site Plan Alternate F to reflect Committee suggestions and on-going refinement for regulatory compliance resulting in Site Plan Version H dated September 27, 2016 and included in the attached presentation.

The Advisory Committees fully endorsed Site Plan Version H as it includes significant improvements in critical areas:
Accessibility

- Roadway (drop off circle) provides more direct access to the north side of Clubhouse 1 amenities: Terrace Room; Maryland Room; Chesapeake Room; Pool and Lanai
- Creates a designated drop-off area in front of Terrace Room and Clubhouse Grille
- Provides on grade-level LW bus stop/drop-off area at the Administration Building main entrance
- A ramp to enter main entrance of the Administration Building accommodates change in grade as an alternative to steps for access from the lower end of the parking lot
- The lower level entrance to the Administration Building is on grade without the need for steps
- One-way traffic from north to south passes by both entrances to the Administration Building and does not deviate from current traffic flow through the parking lot

Safety

- Roadway (drop off circle) is 24 feet wide which allows cars to drop off passengers at the venues on the north side of Clubhouse 1 while allowing another car/LW bus to pass safely on the left
- Roadway (drop off circle) layout provides increased vehicle and pedestrian safety vis-a-vis the loading dock by more clearly delineating pedestrian, personal vehicle and truck entrances into this busy area
- Truck access and parking at the loading dock is angled and wider for ease of travel and safety
- Roadway (drop off circle) provides closer access for emergency equipment to the north side of Clubhouse 1
- Traffic flow in the Administration Building parking lot will continue to be designated “one way”
- Clubhouse 1 parking lot also designated “one way” for consistency
- Variations in surface materials provide visual cues for safety by clearly delineating pedestrian pathways from vehicular pathways
Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Site Plan Alt K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Spaces</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking in close proximity to CH1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop off access in close proximity to CH1 North Wing</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total of 392 parking spaces included in this Site Plan with 317 in the Administration Building Parking lot and 75 on-level in a new parking area in front of Clubhouse 1
- 25 handicap spaces (12 near the restaurants and Clubhouse 1, 9 at the North end of the Administration building, and 4 at the lower entrance to the Administration building)
- Two entrances to the Administration Building redistributes staff parking away from Clubhouse 1 which reduces congestion

Ambiance

- Roadway (drop off circle) is enhanced by retaining the Lawn Bowling Area in front of the Terrace room and by adding plantings along the roadway and in the circle.
- Variations in surface materials and plantings improves the visual impact of the parking area by adding color and texture
- Permeable paving incorporated into the design, as appropriate
- Architecture and facade materials selected are consistent with Clubhouse 1 and 2 and overall concept of LW
- Landscaping around building, as well as side trellis and benches, are designed to harmonize with the overall site
- Overall landscaping will be consistent with other Leisure World Trust properties

The E&R Advisory Committee supported the relocation of the 1 shuffleboard court and the bocce court in order to accomplish the benefits of the site plan. The lawn bowling area remains unaffected. The E&R Committee is weighing relocation options for the bocce and shuffleboard court.

There are currently 144 trees of varying sizes and species on the Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 property. Of these, 22 will be protected, 57 will be removed and 65 are unaffected. A detailed landscape design will be developed once the LWCC BOD approves Site Plan Version II. Per County requirements, new trees will be planned to replace those trees that are removed. MNCPPC
will dictate the quantity, size and species of trees that will need to be included as part of the project permit and will have final approval of the overall landscape plan.

Administration Building Floor Plans and Elevations:
The floor plans for the Administration Building were developed based on Advisory Committee input and LWCC BOD Resolutions #49, #50, #51 and #52 from June 2015 and were included with the Site Plan package approved in November 2015. The floor plans have not significantly changed from November 2015; however, the lobby was modified to improve accessible transition from the parking lot to the main entrance.

The exterior elevation of the Administration Building takes its design elements from the surrounding area, Clubhouse 1 and 2 and the overall aesthetics of the residential units in Leisure World. The design ties outdoor elements with interior functions to take advantage of the golf course views, lawn bowling area and open plaza entrance to allow for areas of landscape and encourage community interactions. Building materials will reflect natural elements with the use of composite wood and stacked stone accents. It is a design that is based on LEED concepts to provide a functional, energy efficient and sustainable project while balancing aesthetics and durability.

A covered walkway is included at the Leisure World bus stop at the Administration Building and provides a protected pathway to the main entrance.

Clubhouse 1 Additions and Covered Walkways:
The floor plans for the additions to the North Wing of Clubhouse 1 were further developed to create elevations that complement the existing architecture of Clubhouse 1 and relate to the materials of the new Administration Building to provide a unified look on the site.

The vestibules to the Terrace Room and Clubhouse Grille serve several functions:
- waiting space for table service without impacting dining area
- enclosed waiting space for patron pick up
- air trap to minimize loss of heating/cooling

All vestibule doors will function with motion sensor auto door operators.
Covered walkways, the amenity most frequently requested by residents, were added to the site plan for convenience and comfort. These covered walkways provide safe access routes and shelter residents during inclement weather. The covered walkways have been added at:

- Terrace Room vestibule to drop off circle
- Clubhouse Grille vestibule to drop off area
- Previously mentioned Administration Building entrance to the LW Bus stop

**Construction Cost Estimate:**
The concept of a new Administration Building was presented to the LWCC BOD in August 2012. The cost estimate of approximately $5.2 million was a conceptual budget based on limited design detail and many assumptions. It served to provide an order of magnitude with which to prioritize the various FEP projects under consideration by the LWCC BOD.

As work began on developing plans for the Administration Building, it became clear the best option was for a new Administration Building in a different location and was approved by the LWCC BOD. Subsequent LWCC Board actions and engagement by the Advisory Committees evolved into a project which now offers improvements to meet an array of needs and desired conveniences for a diverse population. Thus, the new site plan is a much different project.

Changes related to the Administration Building include:

1. relocation of the building from along Leisure World Boulevard to the east side of the parking lot
2. increasing space by 2,000 sf to accommodate current staffing needs, LWCC business functions, resident/staff interactions and resident amenities (bank, post office)
3. development of building elevations
4. provide covered area and walkway at LW bus stop to main entrance

After the Advisory Committees' analysis of the site plan and consideration of the many comments from members and visitors, the scope of the site plan changed significantly to include substantial improvements to Clubhouse 1 accessibility and safety relative to parking and drop off at multiple entrances with covered walkways. Site plan changes related to Clubhouse 1 improvements are:

1. provide drop off area for Clubhouse Grille entrance
2. increase parking closer to Clubhouse 1 main entrance
3. provide ADA parking at Clubhouse 1 entrance
4. provide drop off area at North Wing of Clubhouse 1
5. provide covered walkways from entrances to drop off locations at vestibules
6. design of loading dock area to improve safety for pedestrians with truck traffic, increase efficient use of space in the loading dock area and screen activities from public view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEP Concept Cost Estimate</th>
<th>$5,178,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Building &amp; Site (Site Plan Version II)</td>
<td>$5,583,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHII Site Improvements (Site Plan Version II)</td>
<td>$1,054,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Construction Cost Estimate (prepared by Cost Estimating Consultant)</td>
<td>$6,638,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>($1,460,056)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. An indirect benefit of the project is the $583,000 in the Facilities Maintenance Plan and Facilities Reserve Plan may be potentially unspent on the upkeep of the existing Administration Building.
2. An FEP Cash Flow analysis will be updated to reflect Site Plan Version II as presented and associated construction costs which will shift the start of the Golf Course Enhancement project by approximately 1 year.

Design Fees for Regulatory Submission:
To complete the documents for submission to the various regulatory agencies (M-NCPPC, MC-DPS, MCFRS, WSSC, PEPCO, WGL, Verizon, Comcast), including filing charges, the following consultant fees will be needed:

- Architecture and Engineering (Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, Fire Protection) $82,000
- Civil Engineering and Landscape (includes SWM fees) $55,000
- Geotechnical Engineer $10,000
- Audio Visual Engineer $10,000
- Cost Estimator $18,000
- Utility Expeditor $10,000
- Legal $23,000
- Filing charges not included above $50,000
Appendix G

Project Budget for Design and Permit Fees:

- Design & Permit Fees: $580,000
- Approved to date (Resolutions #72 11/25/14, #73 11/25/14, #14 2/24/15): $255,000
- Remaining Budget: $325,000
- Requested Funding for Regulatory Documents: $258,000
- Remaining Budget: $67,000

Document and Regulatory Submission Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHS</th>
<th>Document Prep 4 months</th>
<th>M-NEPPC 12-18 months</th>
<th>MCOPS 6-8 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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M-NCPPC Submission Requirements

Final Site Plan documenting the following:
- all existing site conditions
- proposed site alterations inclusive of building footprint changes
- parking design
- sidewalks
- site amenities (bike racks, benches)
- landscape/plantings
- site lighting
- material selections

Stormwater Management Concept documenting the following:
- grading
- collection systems and locations

Building Floor Plans documenting the following:
- floor plans with access points (entrance doors) noted
- roof plans

Building Exterior Elevations documenting the following:
- materials
- window design
- building lighting
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING & SITE PLAN
LWCC BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESOLUTIONS

# 71, 9/24/13 Administration Building

The Board of Directors authorizes management to proceed with developing the Administration Building, option 3, new building, which was presented as part of the July 2013 Facilities Enhancement Project. Management is directed to come back to the Board for initial planning funds.

# 77, 10/29/13 Administration Building

The Board of Directors reaffirms that the construction of a new administration building will be designed to accommodate space for a bank, a post office, and office space for Montgomery Mutual. Each of these spaces will have rental agreements that cover all the costs related to the space utilized if the cost of construction of the rental space can be justified.

# 79, 10/29/13 Administration Building/Clubhouse I

Whereas the Board authorized a new Administration Building with a conceptual project budget of $5.3 million and a comprehensive plan for the food services wing of Clubhouse I with a conceptual project budget of $1.0 to $1.5 million, Management is directed to interview and recommend qualified architects and consultants to produce a master site plan of the Administrative Building/Clubhouse I site area which addresses how these can be part of an overall conceptual site plan, identifies any other options with regard to site design, and, if necessary, considers the phasing of implementation. The Board authorizes $50,000 for the preparation of a comprehensive conceptual site plan.

#28, 4/29/14 Comprehensive Site Plan for Administration Building and Clubhouse I North Wing

To adopt, for further development, Site Plan 3A, as shown in the report (Comprehensive Site Plan for Administration Building and Clubhouse I Facilities Enhancement Plan dated April 29, 2014) locating the new Administration Building on the east side of the parking lot.

# 40, 6/24/14 Clubhouse I North Wing – Access/Drop Off Road

That the LWCC Board of Directors approves an access/drop off road to provide alternate access to the north wing of Clubhouse I.
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Lawn Activities/Access Road/Comprehensive Site Plan

The LWCC Board of Directors resolves that the proposed access road between the new Administration Building and the restaurant section of Clubhouse 1, as shown on Site Plan 3A, be eliminated, and that Management and Streetscapes be tasked with developing alternative access opportunities for persons with disabilities.

#72, 11/25/14

Lawn Activities/Access Road/Comprehensive Site Plan

The LWCC Board of Directors resolves to amend Resolution #79, dated 10/29/13, to increase the amount by $15,000 from $50,000 to a total sum of $65,000, to explore alternate options to improve accessibility of the North Wing of Clubhouse 1. Funds to come from the Resales Fund.

#73, 11/25/14

Administration Building Design

The LWCC Board of Directors resolves that $35,000 be allocated from the Resales Fund to complete the programming phase to refine the actual square footage needs for the Administration Building.

#14, 2/24/15

Administration Building and North Wing Clubhouse 1

Resolved, that the Board of Directors approves up to $155,000 to undertake the next phases of civil and geotechnical engineering services to continue the progress of the Administration Building and North Wing of Clubhouse 1 projects. Funds to come from the Resales Fund.

#49, 6/30/15

Administration Building

Resolved, that the new Administration Building includes a dedicated 1,680 square foot room (which can be divided), as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015.

#50, 6/30/15

Administration Building

Resolved, that two shared meeting rooms, as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015, be reduced to one, thereby cutting square footage by approximately 400 square feet.

#51, 6/30/15

Administration Building

Resolved, CPAC accepts the shared/collaboration small conference rooms as a total of three, a total of 360 square feet, as described in the document, "New Administration Building - Meeting Rooms," dated June 8, 2015.
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Administration Building

Resolved, that the Communication/Leisure World News Department be included in the new Administration Building, occupying approximately 410 square feet. (A correction was made to change 400 square feet to 410 square feet.)

#70, 9/29/15

Administration Building

The LWCC Board of Directors approves all the CPAC recommendations adopted at its September 24, 2015 meeting. The resolution “Administration Building Options B (Bi-Level) and Site Plan B Location” is attached. The Board further authorizes Management to proceed with the development of a site plan reflecting a Parking Lot and Traffic Plan consistent with the attached CPAC recommended plan. (See attached.)

#84, 11/24/15

Administration Building Site Plan

Resolved, the LWCC BOD approved the recommendations of the Community Planning and Education and Recreation Advisory Committees to eliminate three of the four shuffleboard courts to provide parking accessible to the Administration Building and North Wing of Clubhouse 1 as shown on the “Administration Building Site Plan – Preliminary Layout – CPAC – November 9, 2015”.

#34, 6/28/16

Administration Building and Site Plan – Signing Authorization

The Leisure World Community Corporation Board of Directors authorizes the General Manager, Kevin B. Flannery, to sign the site line plat for the new Administration Building.
CHANGES TO CLUBHOUSE 1 NORTH WING AND ADMINISTRATION ACCESSIBILITY:

- DROP OFF FOR N WING CLUBHOUSE 1
- DROP OFF FOR ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
- LOADING DOCK ACCESS
- TRAFFIC FLOW
LEISURE WORLD
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
FLOOR PLANS & ELEVATIONS

September 27, 2016
VIEW FROM LEISURE WORLD BLVD.
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

VIEW FROM LEISURE WORLD BLVD.

LOWER LEVEL ENTRANCE

not to scale
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Materials

- Tonal Pavers
- Bronze Accent
- Exterior Wood
- Green Slate Look Exterior Tile
- Stacked Stone
- Retaining wall with plantings (example)
- Seating opportunities
THANK YOU
SECTION 13
MEMORANDUM

TO: LWCC Board of Directors
FROM: Jolene King, Asst. General Manager for Facilities and Services
DATE: February 22, 2017
SUBJECT: Administration Building - Invasive Study

At the January 2017 LWCC Board meeting, Management was asked to provide responses to questions related to an invasive study of the structure and systems of the existing Administration Building. To provide more context to aid the discussion, a brief history of the administration building project is also included. Additional questions received from a BOD member and an advisory committee member along with the corresponding answers are contained in the report, as well.

An invasive study was previously considered by the BOD in November 2014. At that time, Management prepared an outline RFP for the process for undertaking an invasive study. This outline RFP has been updated for current code and regulatory requirements and is attached to the report.

Agenda Item 6a. Administration Building Project - Table of Contents

- Summary of Administration Building Project History Page 1
- LWCC BOD Decisions Page 2
- Responses to Questions Received
  - B Cronin issued 1/31/2017 Page 3
  - E Hurley issued 2/9/2017 Page 5
  - B Namovicz issued 2/9/17 Page 6
- Process and Scope of Work for Comprehensive Facility Condition Assessment of the Administration Building Pages 8-9
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LWCC Board Meeting 2/28/17 - Agenda Item 6a. Administration Building Project

Summary of Administration Building Project History:

In August 2012, CPAC presented the Administration Building project to the LWCC BOD for consideration. The stated objectives for the Administration Building project were:

1. Provide efficient space utilization for improvements to the work environment and work flow
2. Improve building systems to be energy efficient and "green"
3. Allow for flexibility of spaces to accommodate future changes in technology and work systems
4. Allow LWMC to be competitive in the job market to attract highest qualified employees

The LWCC BOD reviewed three options for the Administration Building - renovate, expand or construct new.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovate</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Square Footage</td>
<td>12,210 sf²</td>
<td>15,510 sf²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Duration</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$2,240,200</td>
<td>$3,123,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Existing Administration Building is 16,643 gross square feet

In 2012, a construction company, Folger Pratt, estimated the construction costs for each option based on conceptual building layouts created by AR Meyers reflecting the LWMC organizational structure and staffing at that time. The estimates provided an order of magnitude for the LWCC BOD to decide on a scope for the project. The 2012 conceptual building layouts are not applicable today due to changes in the structure of several LWMC departments (upper management, administrative support, accounting, security and HR) and do not include the Communications Department. Also, these 2012 cost estimates are not reflective of the current market costs, codes and regulations and space needs.

Two architectural firms (Street sense and AR Meyers) advised the LWCC BOD that a new building is the best option as it satisfies project objectives, meets space needs with an approximately 20,000 square foot building and provides the longest-term value to the Community. The benefits of a new Administration Building are:

1. All required functions and spaces can be accommodated
2. Greater accessibility and maneuverability within the building without losing program functions
3. More efficient layout to optimize operations and services – where the function dictates the form versus a renovation where the form dictates the function
4. All new systems and building envelope design increase energy efficiency and reduce energy costs – leads to lower operating costs
5. Longer life cycle (30 - 50 years for a new building versus 15 - 20 years for a renovation)
6. More reliable and realistic cost estimates due to fewer unknowns
7. No disruption to resident services - existing operations and services remain undisturbed (versus any renovation scenario where operations would need to be relocated to trailers)
8. Improved accessibility and parking in close proximity to buildings

LWCC BOD Decisions:
The LWCC BOD voted to proceed with developing a new Administration Building, inclusive of space for a bank, post office and Montgomery Mutual (Resolutions #71, 9/24/13 and #77, 10/29/13). In addition, Management was directed to undertake a comprehensive review of the site surrounding the new Administration Building and CH1 to achieve:
- Improvement of accessibility to the buildings
- Increase in parking closer to the buildings
- Improvement of safety for pedestrian and vehicular interactions
- Improvement of the overall ambiance of the site

The LWCC BOD approved the Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 Site Plan Version H dated 9/27/16 as the final design for the project (Resolution #44, 9/27/16). The current construction cost estimate for a new Administration Building and associated CH1 and site improvements (not considered in 2012) is $6.6 million.

LWCC BOD requested Management to provide the following information and responses to questions regarding an invasive study of the existing Administration Building. An invasive study was previously considered by the LWCC BOD in November 2014, but failed to pass.
Responses to Questions Received

1. Questions from B Cronin issued at the LWCC BOD meeting on 1/31/17:

   1. What is the total amount of money that has been spent to date on the development of plans (building and site plans) and the preparation and filing of the current site plan?

   *Budget Approved to date $513,000, spent $448,870 as of November 2016.*

   2. What will be the resources cost (money and staff time) needed to select a qualified firm to do the proposed study?

   *Management staff time required to write the RFP, solicit and review proposals, work with Advisory Committee[s], coordinate and conduct the interview process, and develop a recommendation report for the LWCC BOD would be approximately 168 hours.*

   *Management staff time required during the study process to supervise, coordinate, document and report on progress would be approximately 356 hours.*

   *Estimate $6,000 to digitize plans, reports and other information needed for the RFP and make available other specifications/conditions requested by bidders.*

   3. What would be included in the Request for Proposal to firms for consideration of doing an invasive study?

   *Refer to attached report “Process and Scope of Work for Comprehensive Facility Condition Assessment of the Administration Building” based an original issued to BOD in November 2014 and updated for current conditions and regulatory requirements.*

   4. Is the proposed cost of the invasive engineering study realistic in terms of finding a firm to do such a study and then the actual cost of preforming the study and delivering the report?

   *The $100,000 - $150,000 estimate for the invasive engineering study is based on Management experience and confirmation from 2 engineering firms specializing in these types of studies. Actual costs would be determined once proposals are received from qualified firms.*

   5. What would be the timeframe the Board could expect to have a final report of such a study?

   *The estimated time frame is 9 months. Actual duration to perform the analysis and generate a report will be determined once proposals are received from qualified firms.*

   *Refer to schedule outlined in attached report “Process and Scope of Work for Comprehensive Facility Condition Assessment of the Administration Building” based an original issued to BOD in November 2014 and updated for current conditions and regulatory requirements.*
6. How will the results of such a study resolve the question of "new vs. renovate" or will it simply still leave the board with options that need to be weighed and decided?

The invasive study itself will not resolve the question of "new vs renovate". Invasive studies are used to minimize the risk of unexpected costs due to unknown conditions in bringing an existing building up to code and current industry standards. The LWCC BOD will still need to weigh and decide what functions will be accommodated in the existing 16,500 square feet (which includes the bank space) if 20,000 square feet of space is needed for the identified program. Additionally, the value in improvements to accessibility, parking, and pedestrian and vehicular safety will have to be weighed by the LWCC BOD.

There are 2 factors that comprise a renovation project – the cost to bring the building up to code and the cost of interior improvements based on space needs. The previous studies in 2012 took into consideration actual space planning and interior improvements of the building and made assumptions in the cost of bringing the building up to code. An invasive study in 2017 would provide cost estimates to bring the building up to code based on actual conditions, but would not account for actual or realistic space needs.

For an invasive study to be to useful and for the LWCC BOD to reconsider the cost of renovation, the study should be developed reflecting current space needs along with the costs associated with bringing the building up to code. Therefore, new renovation space plan would be needed. The cost for a space plan design of $50,000 - $60,000 should be added if the invasive study is to be undertaken.

7. What are the possible unintended consequences of doing the study rather than moving forward on the currently approved plan?

a. A protracted schedule can mean incurring additional maintenance costs on the existing Administration building. As of September 2016, there was approximately $583,000 in maintenance and replacement reserve costs that may be potentially unspent on the upkeep of the existing building. However, in 2016, $24,300 was spent for necessary repairs which reduce the amount of potentially unspent maintenance and replacement funds.

b. Escalation of construction costs by 4%-5% per year
II. Questions from E Hurley issued via email on 2/9/17:

1. What is the total square footage of the planned new Admin building?
   
   The total square footage for the new Administration Building is 20,555.

2. What is the planned space for the bank facility?
   
   The total square footage for leasing space in the new Administration Building is 1,950.

3. What is the total additional square footage of impervious surface planned?
   
   The current quantity is estimated at 5,000 sf; however, there may be additional offsetting credits based on final stormwater management design and approval by regulatory agencies.

4. In terms of anticipated property taxes do you have a projected cost?
   
   There is no impact.

5. Do you know what amount per sq. foot is currently levied under the Water Management Protection Tax?
   
   The Water Quality Improvement tax for the existing Administration Building is $3,799. The impact of a new building is expected to be close to net neutral. Refer to the Montgomery County website regarding Water Quality Protection Charge rates and calculations [www.montgomerycountymd.gov/water/wqpc/rates.html].
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III. Questions from B Namovicz issued via email on 2/9/17:

1. Can the benefits of “destroy and build” be attained under a renovate option? What is the projected cost difference between these alternates?

The benefits and costs of a renovation depend on the scope — if the existing building is to include all new exterior envelope (roof, walls, windows, doors, etc.), infrastructure/MEP systems, and interiors and adjustments to the structure, the benefits are on par with a new building and costs are closer to or can exceed new construction. However, if a renovation is limited to interior finishes and/or MEP systems, the benefits are not close to that of a new building and the costs can be expected to be less than new construction.

As was stated in the November 25, 2014 Administration Building Design report (Agenda Item 7-afii) issued to the LWCC BOD, the typical life cycle cost of a new building is 30 – 50 years whereas a renovated building is 15 – 20 years. The decision to renovate versus construct new is a question of the best long term investment for the Community.

2. Can legitimate space requirements be attained if a new building is not built?

Per the space analysis studies performed by two architectural firms, the square footage required for all identified administrative functions is 20,000 – 22,000 sf. The existing Administration Building is 16,534 sf. Unless administrative functions are deleted from the program, the existing Administration Building cannot handle the identified functional needs.

3. Were any significant, costly, or concerning engineering or structural issues discovered when Club House I restaurant renovations were studied or completed? How much has been spent recently from Maintenance funds to keep CH I functional? (Keep in mind that both buildings were designed and built by the same architect at the same time.)

There were several engineering and structural issues uncovered during the CHI renovations. It is assumed these issues and others will be present in the Administration Building and will be required to be addressed as part of a renovation.

a. Broken roof trusses ($35,000)
b. Broken and severely deteriorated underslab electrical conduit and wiring ($25,000)
c. Full replacement of existing electrical panels and wiring ($12,000)
d. Inadequate or missing concrete floor slabs ($15,000)
e. Broken and severely deteriorated underslab plumbing ($8,000)

Annual costs to keep CHI functional average $65,000 – $75,000 per year and include HVAC, plumbing, electrical, life safety systems, automatic doors, etc.

4. Do requested cost analyses consider that the Administration Building project as now envisioned includes Club House I renovations as well? What are those cost differences?

The last cost estimate performed was based on Site Plan H which included the new Administration Building and CHI Site Plan Improvements. The total construction cost was
estimated at $6.6 million with the cost of the site improvements associated with CHI was $1.5 million.

5. Are there benefits to Special Strategic Planning Committee efforts (only now being proposed for a new committee) that might contribute to this analysis?

Relative to this discussion, it is unlikely.

6. Have the changing demographics of LWM been adequately considered? Do opinions about keeping some form of Bank branch take into consideration nationwide changes in the number of branches? Could banking needs of our residents be met by other means (like putting a banker credit union in Club House II)?

This is an item to be considered by the LWCC BOD.

7. Is it appropriate and desirable to spend Resales funds to create space for leasing? If it is, why just for a bank branch?

This is an item to be considered by the LWCC BOD. Leasing space generates revenue which can offset community expenses and have a positive effect on the Community Facilities Fee. The convenience of any service amenities for residents is a value judgment for the LWCC BOD.
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Process and Scope of Work

for

Comprehensive Facility Condition Assessment of the Administration Building

Process for Facility Conditions Assessment:

1. Request for Proposal (RFP) written by Management will include:
   a. Statement of Need
   b. Description of Leisure World community
   c. Part I - Technical Requirements
      i. Scope of Services to be performed
      ii. Qualifications required – minimum references for similar projects within past 5 years
      iii. Proposed work plan including all disciplines needed to complete assessment and schedule of activities
      iv. Resumes of key individuals from each discipline
   d. Part II - Interview Requirements
      i. Principal and Project Manager of consultant
      ii. Representatives from each discipline
      iii. Work Plan specific for this project
      iv. Example of similar project

2. Submit RFP to Community Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC) and Board of Directors for review – amend as needed

3. Solicit proposals from consultants following LWCC BOD approval (1 month)

4. Review of proposals by Management and CPAC (1 month)

5. Submit recommendation for interviewees to Board of Directors

6. Interview consultants with a 3-5 person ad hoc advisory committee comprised of qualified members potentially selected from the Board of Directors, CPAC and/or PPD (month)

7. Board of Directors approves contract with selected consultant

8. Conduct facility conditions assessment (4 months)

9. Submit final report to CPAC and Board of Directors (1 month)
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ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

VIEW FROM LEISURE WORLD BLVD.
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

VIEW AT COVERED WALKWAY
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MATERIALS

- Tonal Pavers
- Bronze Accent
- Exterior Wood
- Stone Look Exterior Tile
- Green Slate Look Exterior Tile
- Stacked Stone
- Retaining wall with plantings (example)
- Seating opportunities
CLUBHOUSE GRILLE

VIEW AT VESTIBULE & COVERED WALKWAY

WOOD LOCK UNDERSIDE

STONE LOOK CLADDING

COVERED WALKWAY WITH TRANSLUCENT PANELS

GLASS ENTRANCE
TERRACE ROOM

VIEW AT VESTIBULE & COVERED WALKWAY
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
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February 20, 2018
Leisure World Administration Building/Clubhouse I
Site Plan Project

I. History

A. Administration Building——Renovation or New Building?

1. Space Needs and Work Flow Assessment and Preliminary Systems Analysis:

Early in 2012, the Leisure World Community (LWCC) Board of Directors determined it was time to move forward on the renovation of the Administration Building. The current building was designed over 50 years ago, when business operations were much different than today’s practices. In addition, the building does not meet today’s numerous building, fire and safety, ADA, and “green” codes, as well as best practices for office space design. The Community Planning Advisory Committee and the Board also recognized the need for a professional assessment of the current administrative operations and accommodations to understand the deficiencies in the existing building and what would need to be done to meet the functional needs of the LWMC organization and the Community.

In August 2012, the A.R. Meyers architectural firm presented a space needs and work flow assessment and preliminary building systems analysis report to the Board. Based on the report’s findings, three conceptual floor plan options were offered for consideration:

1. Renovation of the building on the existing footprint,
2. Renovation of the building with a 3,000 feet addition,
3. Construction of new building at a new location to replace the current facility.

The pros and cons and preliminary cost estimates** of each were included.

**Construction costs were estimated for each option based on the conceptual building layouts reflecting the LWMC organizational structure and staffing at that time. The 2012 conceptual layouts are not applicable today due to changes in the LWMC organizational structure. In addition, the costs estimates did not reflect the current space needs, costs, and codes and regulations.

Initial objectives for the Administration Building project were to:

1. Accommodate all functions and spaces and provide efficient space utilization,
2. Provide code compliant physical and circulation space requirements per employee,
3. Improve work flow efficiency and the working relationships of several departments
4. Allow for flexibility of spaces to accommodate future changes in technology and work systems,
5. Provide building systems that are energy efficient and “green.”

2. Professional Opinions

After assessing current operations and facilities and using current industry standards for space allocation; two architectural firms (A.R. Meyers in 2012-2013 and Streetsense in 2014) independently determined that a new building would satisfy all project objectives and would provide the best long-term value to the community.
In addition to meeting all the objectives stated above, a new Administration Building would have:
- A longer life cycle (30 – 50 years vs 15 – 20 years for a renovation),
- More reliable and realistic cost estimates due to fewer unknowns,
- All new systems and a building envelope designed to increase energy efficiency, thus, reducing energy costs and ultimately lower overall operating costs,
- No disruption in resident services. Existing management operations and resident services would remain undisturbed (versus the need for operations and services to be relocated to trailers with any renovation).
- And the site of a new building would provide improved accessibility and close-in parking to both the new building and Clubhouse I.

Management also consulted a third architectural firm (SEI) that stated; in their experience, buildings far less than 50 years old are replaced. A critical component of renovation is the requirement to meet all the current applicable building, life safety, energy and ADA codes; and to achieve LEED certification. In addition, the 40-year life cycle cost of new construction would be less than renovation, which has higher maintenance and operating costs.

All three architectural firms acknowledged that, although there would be some disadvantages to a building a new building (primarily higher initial construction costs and a longer construction time); there would be a greater cost/benefit in new construction than renovation of the old building.

B. Creation of the Facilities Enhancement Plan (FEP) (2012 -2013)

As the Community Planning Advisory Committee was deliberating the three Administration Building options; management and several other Advisory Committees presented additional ideas for improvements of other Trust facilities/amenities. The Board of Directors requested that Management develop an organized plan for addressing them.

In June 2013, after input from five resident volunteer Advisory Committees and consultants and work by management; a comprehensive Facilities Enhancement Plan (FEP) was presented to the Board. In addition to the three options for the Administration Building; the plan included proposed plans for renovation of the Crystal Ballroom, the north wing of Clubhouse I (to include the Terrace Room, Cascade Bistro, and Maryland Room), and the PPD Customer Service area; enhancements of the golf course and remediation of the golf course irrigation pond; and a new Fitness Center.

The funds to pay for all these projects would come from the Trust’s Resales Improvement Fund into which all LW unit owners pay when they purchase their units. This restricted Trust fund is to be used only for “expanding, altering or improving existing improvements (amenities) or other properties of the Trust.”

There was much activity related to the FEP in the next three months. The plan was made available to residents on the website and in the library. Included were the pros and cons and preliminary cost estimates of the three Administration Building options. Residents and Board members were invited to submit comments; sponsoring Advisory Committees reviewed their projects and submitted comments; and there was an evening community forum for residents to address their questions and comments about the plan, including those related to the three
Administration Building options. Twenty-four individuals submitted 138 comments, all of which were posted on the Leisure World website. On September 9, 2013 the Board of Directors held a full day work session to review and discuss all the comments submitted and to initially prioritize and determine the overall time schedule for the proposed projects. The work session included discussion of the Administration Building options and was open to all residents.

C. Administration Building Board Action

At the September 24, 2013, Board meeting, the LWCC Board of Director’s adopted eight resolutions related to the FEP. One of those eight was:

“The Board of Director authorizes management to proceed with developing the Administration Building, option three, new building, which was presented as part of the July 2013 Facilities Enhancement Project. Management is directed to come back to the Board for initial planning funds.” Resolution #71, (9/24/13)

D. Creation and Evolution of Administration Building and CHI Project Site Plan (2013 – 2016)

Because renovation of the north wing of Clubhouse I (the Terrace Room, Maryland Room and the former Cascade Bistro), included exterior building elements; a site plan would also be necessary to complete those projects. It was decided that incorporating the Clubhouse I exterior building elements into the Administration Building site plan would be the best way to proceed.

Therefore, on October 29, 2013 the Board adopted the following resolution:

“Whereas the Board authorized a new Administration Building with a conceptual project budget of $5.3 million and a comprehensive plan for the food services wing of Clubhouse with a conceptual project of $1.0 to 1.5 million, Management is to interview and recommend qualified architects and consultants to produce a master site plan of the Administration Building/Clubhouse I site area which addresses how these can be part of overall conceptual site plan, identifies any other options with regard to site design, and, if necessary, considers the phasing of implementation. The Board authorizes $50,000 for the preparation of a comprehensive conceptual site plan.” Resolution #79, (10/29/13)

During the next few months, the architects and consultants, in collaboration with the Community Planning, Restaurant, and Education Advisory Committees worked on the development of the Administration Building/Clubhouse I (north wing) site plan.

On April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the following resolution:

“To adopt, for further development, Site Plan 3A, as shown in the report (Comprehensive Site Plan for Administration Building and Clubhouse I Facilities Enhancement Plan dated April 29, 2014) locating the new Administration Building on the east side of the parking lot.” Resolution #28, (4/29/14)

During the two years following the approval of Site Plan 3A, the scope of the site plan changed, and it went through several iterations—primarily as the result of Advisory Committees’ and resident input and requests. As the scope of the site plan changed and evolved, including adding significant amenities to the exterior of Clubhouse I; additional priorities and objectives for the project emerged. They were to:

• Increase accessibility to Clubhouse I and the new Administration Building,
• Improve distribution of parking, including handicap spaces, in relation to the new building and Clubhouse 1,
• Improve the safety of pedestrians and vehicles within the parking areas,
• Improve the overall ambiance of the site.

E. Approval of Site Plan H (2016)

On September 27, 2016 the Board adopted the following resolution:
The LWCC BOD approved the Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 Site Plan Version H package (site plan, floor plans and elevations) dated 9/27/16, as recommended by CPAC and endorsed by E&R, Restaurant, S&T and Management, and authorizes submission to MNCPPC for approval.

Further, the LWCC BOD authorizes an amount not to exceed $258,000 for consultants to complete the regulatory submission process, including architecture and engineering (MEP and FP), civil engineering and landscape (including storm water management fees); geotechnical engineer, audio visual engineer and utility expediter, legal and related filing fees, etc. Funds to come from the FEP (Resales Fund). Resolution #44 (9/27/16)

F. Resolutions and Meetings Related to the Administration Building/Site Plan Project

From September 2012 through November 2017:
1. The LWCC Board of Directors passed 20 resolutions specifically related to the Administration Building/Site Plan Project.
2. The Community Planning Advisory Committee (the principal Advisory Committee for the Administration Building/Site Plan Project) passed 53 resolutions related to the project and forwarded them to the LWCC BOD for consideration. The Education and Recreation, Restaurant, Security and Transportation, and Landscaping Committees also forwarded numerous resolutions related to the project to the LWCC BOD.
3. There were 80 open meetings of the Board and Committees (involved in the project) during which the project was discussed, and/or an action was taken.
   ✓ These meetings are held on a regular monthly basis and are open to all community residents.
   ✓ A calendar of meetings is published in the LW News and agendas are posted in advance of all meetings.
   ✓ At these meetings, residents may comment on any agenda action item before a vote and again during the meeting Open Forums.

G. Leisure World News Articles and Community Meetings

1. From 2012 through 2017, 25 articles and excerpts from Board meeting reports about the Administration Building/Site Plan project appeared in the LW News.
This information afforded the Leisure World residents many opportunities to learn about the process of the development and the authorizations for the construction of the new administration building/site plan project, as well as informing the community when key decisions about the project were made by the Board.

The THOUGHTS & OPINIONS: From Our Residents section in the LW News also afforded Residents opportunities to share their thoughts and opinions about the project with the Leisure World community. Fifteen such letters from residents were published in the LW News.
2. In addition to the Board of Directors and relevant Committee meetings at which the Administration Building/Site Plan project was addressed, the following community meetings were also held:

- Community Open Forum: April 7, 2013, 7:00 PM
- Meeting on FEP Projects: August 14, 2013, 7:00 PM
- Open Board Work Session: September 9, 2013, 9:30 AM – 2:00 PM
- Residents Forum: February 26, 2014, 3:00 PM
- Budget Assumption/Open Forum: June 12, 2014, 2:00 PM
- Meeting on FEP: November 18, 2014, 3:00 PM (Over 300 residents attended)
- Site Plan Pre-Submission Community Meeting: March 29, 2017, 6:00 PM (80 residents attended)
- Resident Group sponsored Town Hall Meeting: September 27, 2017, 1:30 PM (Over 300 residents attended)

H. Invasive Engineering Study

In 2014 and again in 2017, the Board of Directors was asked to vote on performing an invasive engineering study of the Administration Building. In 2014, the Board voted “no”.

Prior to the 2017 vote, the Board requested and received a comprehensive report from Management about doing a study. The report also included answers to Board members’ and residents’ questions.

The Invasive Study Report listed ten applicable State and County codes and addendums that would need remediation solutions to bring the 50-year-old building into compliance with current standards.

It also stated that the ongoing repairs and modifications to the Administration Building over time have identified these deficiencies; such as the need to remove the asbestos and mold, the need for upgraded and new mechanical systems, replacement of the obsolete electrical systems, compliance with safety/fire code requirements (addition of sprinklers and fire alarm systems), plumbing system upgrades, and compliance with Montgomery County’s new required “Green Construction Code.”

In February 2017 the Board of Directors voted almost unanimously not to approve an invasive study. The Board recognized the cost of doing the study would only provide additional information on the known building infrastructure problems, the building code changes required, and the cost of remediation. It would not answer the question—— renovate the old building or build a new one?

II. Results of the Maryland National Capital Park & Planning Commission Hearing---November 30, 2017

The Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 Site Plan Version H package was submitted to the Maryland National Capital Park & Planning Commission on June 26, 2017 for review. The
Commission held a hearing on the Leisure World site plan on November 30, 2017. A determination on the plan was deferred and the following actions were requested.

A. Actions Requested
   1. Site Plan Changes
      a. Explore options to remove stairs/ramp at main entrance to upper level of Administration Building
      b. Explore options to reduce congestion at exit of upper lot/loading dock/drop off access road
   2. Additional Community Outreach
      a. Reach out to residents beyond the 1 pre-application community meeting required by M-NCPCC

B. Actions Taken
   1. Propose Site Plan Changes — will be presented to relevant Advisory Committees for feedback
      a. Redesign upper parking lot
         i. Delete "through" road connecting Cascade Circle to main parking lot
         ii. Design 1-way traffic flow through upper lot
         iii. Maintain drop off to CH I Grille entrance
         iv. Provide sidewalks connecting parking spaces to CH I building entrances
         v. Review impacts on storm water retention facilities and trees
      b. Redesign main entrance at upper level to Administration Building
         i. Delete stairs/ramp
         ii. Relocate main entrance to corner of building near drop off area
         iii. Open plaza to accentuate main entrance and provide direct access to main entrance
      c. Other
         i. Move pedestrian crosswalk across lower parking to align with open plaza/main entrance of upper level
         ii. Add islands to break up lower parking lot to reduce asphalt area
   2. Additional Community Outreach — Management will attend Mutual Board or Special meetings in January/February/March 2018 to present:
      a. Overview of Facilities Enhancement Plan
      b. Overview of Montgomery County regulatory process
      c. Submitted and revised site plan for Administration Building and Clubhouse 1

C. Follow-Up Actions

Once Management has completed presenting the project to all Mutuals, comments and recommendations from residents on the project plan will be presented to the various Advisory Committees for consideration and incorporation into the design as recommended by the members.

A complete report documenting all Mutual meetings, attendance, questions/comments raised and recommendations for plan changes from the Advisory Committees will be provided to the LWCC BOD. The LWCC BOD will decide if the revised plans should be submitted to MNCPC or if further development is required before proceeding further.
SECTION 16
LEISURE WORLD OF MARYLAND

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING & CLUBHOUSE 1
SITE PLAN PROJECT

MUTUAL PRESENTATION
JANUARY 25, 2018
rev. FEBRUARY 28, 2018
PRESENTATION AGENDA

1. FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT PLAN (FEP)
   - History
   - Process
   - Projects

2. SITE PLAN
   - Review process
   - Project objectives
   - A look at plans and updates

3. Q & A
FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT PLAN HISTORY

• In 2012, LWCC Board requested a comprehensive plan of projects for Trust facilities improvements

• In 2013, LWCC Board approved (7) projects that were submitted and vetted by Advisory Committees that contribute to the enhancement of Trust facilities

• Projects are funded through the Resales Fund, a two percent fee paid by the buyer on each property transfer in Leisure World
FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT PLAN PROCESS

• Each Advisory Committee was assigned oversight of FEP projects with input solicited from other Advisory Committees (committees are comprised of volunteer residents from LW Mutuals)

• Multiple Advisory Committees interacted with Consultants and Management throughout the design of the projects

• Over (4) years, there were numerous LWCC BOD, Advisory Committee and community outreach presentations/discussions on all FEP projects

• LWCC BOD voted on funding requests and final designs of projects with interim decisions at major milestones
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING & CLUBHOUSE I SITE PLAN PROJECT
MONTGOMERY COUNTY REGULATORY REVIEW PROCESS

- M-NCPPC (Maryland National Capital Park & Planning Commission) reviews proposed site plan, building plan and elevations, landscape and stormwater management concept to comply with Montgomery County Zoning and Land Development regulations.
- M-NCPPC review can take 12 to 18 months to complete
- Once M-NCPPC approves the site plan, MC-DPS (Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services) reviews proposed plans for the following:
  - Sediment and Erosion control to comply with Maryland Department of the Environment regulations
  - Building Construction Documents to comply with International and Local Building Codes
- MC-DPS review can take 6 to 9 months
- Once MC-DPS approves the plans, a building permit is issued for construction
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING/CH1 SITE PLAN
PROJECT OBJECTIVES

• Improve access to the administration building and Clubhouse I

• Increase parking closer to entrances of the administration building and Clubhouse I

• Improve safety for pedestrians and vehicular interactions
SITE PLANS
LANDSCAPE PLAN: submitted to MNCPPC JULY 2017 (to be updated)
VIEW AT VESTIBULE & COVERED WALKWAY
THANK YOU
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Administration Building/CH1 Site Plan Revisions

Resolution for LWCC BOD:

Resolved, the LWCC BOD approves the changes to the site plan for the new Administration Building/CH1 Improvements as reflected in Site Plan Alternate A4 dated 5/9/2018 and authorizes Management to submit the final engineered plans to MNCPPC for Site Plan Approval.

Rationale:

Beginning in January 2018, Management made 26 presentations to all Mutuals regarding the site plan for the new Administration Building and CH1 Site Improvements which is a project in the Facilities Enhancement Plan (FEP). Overall, +800 residents attended the presentations and participated in the discussions.

The primary focus of the presentation was to update residents on the status of the Site Plan for the new Administration Building and CH1 improvements, the review/development/evaluation process undertaken within Leisure World, the regulatory process required by Montgomery County for permit and construction approval and review the changes made to the Site Plan since the 2017 site plan submission approved by the LWCC BOD.

Another focus of the presentation was to inform the residents of what is the Facilities Enhancement Plan, how it was developed, the process for review/development/evaluation of projects contained within the Plan, how the Plan is funded and who are the final decision makers of the Plan.

Residents asked questions and made statements pertaining to the operation of Leisure World, the Facilities Enhancement Plan process and the Site Plan project design. Many residents asked questions about the funding source (Resales/Property Transfer) for the project and FEP as a whole and how costs are determined and controlled for these projects. Residents also asked about the governance structure of Leisure World, who are the final decision makers and how should opinions/concerns get expressed to these decision makers. Comments and suggestions for design consideration for the Site Plan, new Administration Building and additions to CH1 were recommended by residents.

Management provided the suggestions and comments specific to the design of the Site Plan to Community Planning, Security & Transportation, Education & Recreation, Restaurant and Landscape Advisory Committees for consideration in any revisions to the plan. These Committees met separately at their monthly Committee meeting in March 2018 to make recommendations for design changes. The
were 2 main areas where differing opinions were expressed that the Committee Chairs felt a joint
meeting was warranted so all members could hear opinions and come to an agreement on a final
design. The 2 main differences related to 1-way versus 2-way traffic flow through the parking lots and
connection points from the Cascade Circle to the new parking lot to the existing parking lot.
The outcome of the April 19, 2018 joint meeting was Site Plan Alternate A3 Modified dated 4/19/2018
(provided to the LWCC BOD on April 24, 2018 for information). The plan continues to maintain 1-way
traffic flow through the parking lots but allows the outer parking lane of the existing lower parking lot to
have 1-way traffic flow in the opposite direction. The connection between Cascade Circle and the new
upper parking lot allows for entering and exiting the lot whereas, the connection between the new
upper lot and the existing lower lot is exit only.

Based on final engineering review, there were some minor revisions to Site Plan Alternate A3 resulting in
Site Plan Alternate A4. These revisions resulted in the loss of parking spaces in the upper parking area
due to locations of stormwater management areas needing to be shifted to save additional existing
trees and the addition of ADA spaces to serve the main entrance to new Administration Building.

At their May Committee meetings, Community Planning and Security & Transportation made resolutions
endorsing the design of Site Plan Alternate A4.

The Community Planning Advisory Committee approved the proposed
Administration Building/Clubhouse I Site Plan A4 Red Line, with the
modification of making the current path from the parking lot to the
Clubhouse I main entrance a covered walkway.

The Security & Transportation Advisory Committee recommends that the
Leisure World Board of Directors approve site plan A-4 as presented at
the 05/10/18 meeting.

The attached site plans show the major design changes between Site Plan Submitted 7/2017 and Site
Plan Alternate A4 dated 5/9/2018. The numbering below corresponds to the numbering on the site
plans:

1. Removal of the thru road providing direct connection from Cascade Circle to the existing lower
parking lot:

2. Removal of cross intersection at the new drop off road and the loading dock area. This
eliminates a crosswalk.
3. Revised new upper parking lot layout reducing the total number of spaces to 59 but increasing the total number of ADA spaces to 18. Site Plan Alternate A4 accounts for 351 total parking spaces, 31 of which are ADA located near building entrances.

4. Relocated entrance from Cascade Circle to the new upper parking lot making a combined divided entrance/exit access point.

5. Added right turn only exit point from the new upper parking lot to the existing lower parking lot to allow residents to access the existing lower parking lot without having to travel back to Leisure World Boulevard.

6. Removed the steps and ramp at the main entrance to the Administration Building by relocating the entrance to the corner. This provides for an open direct access plaza to the building as well as giving prominence to the entrance point. The open plaza will have planting beds, trees and seating.

7. Relocated the bike storage lockers to the lower entrance to the new Administration Building.

8. Relocated the main crosswalk in the existing lower lot to align with the open plaza to the main entrance of the new Administration Building.

9. Revised traffic flow to be 1-way the opposite direction along the outer parking lane of the existing lower lot to allow residents to go back to the upper end of the lot without having to go onto Leisure World Boulevard.

10. Revised the entrance to the CH Grille vestibule to align the covered walkway with the revised drop off/pick up location in the new upper parking lot.

11. Added covered walkway from the existing parking lot along the walkway to CH1 covered entrance. This new covered walkway system will intersect with the covering at the CH Grille drop off point in the new upper parking lot.

The next steps for the Site Plan would be to complete the civil and stormwater engineering, make architectural revisions to the revised entrances to the CH Grille vestibule and the new Administration Building and make associated changes to the landscape plan. Once all changes and engineering are complete, the revised Site Plan package can be resubmitted to MNCPPC for review, including reviews by MC DPS for stormwater management concept and MC Department of Fire and Rescue services for emergency vehicle access.

Supporting information will be provided to MNCPPC highlighting the evolution of the project since 2012 showing there were substantial opportunities for community involvement by hundreds of residents through six years of open Advisory Committee and LWCC BOD meetings, status reports, votes, open forums and community meetings. Information on the FEP and specifically this project is available in the LW Library, LW News articles and on the website.
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Summary of Administration Building/CH1 Site Plan Presentations to Mutuals

Beginning in January 2018, Leisure World of Maryland Corporation’s Management made presentations to all 26 Mutuals regarding the site plan for the new Administration Building and Clubhouse I (CH1) Site Improvements, a project in the community’s Facilities Enhancement Plan (FEP). Overall, more than 800 residents attended the presentations and participated in the discussions.

The presentation provided residents an update on the status of the site plan and explained the plan’s process of review, development and evaluation within Leisure World, as well as the regulatory process required by Montgomery County for permit and construction approval. Further, the presentation reviewed the changes made to the site plan since the 2017 site plan submission approved by the Leisure World Community Corporation Board of Directors (LWCC BOD).

The presentation also fully outlined the context of the site plan by reviewing the broader FEP: how the FEP was developed; the process for review, development and evaluation of the projects contained within it; how it is funded; and who makes final decision regarding the FEP.

Residents asked questions and made statements pertaining to the operation of Leisure World, the FEP process and the Site Plan project design. Many residents asked questions about the funding source (Resales/Property Transfer) for the project and FEP as a whole and how costs are determined and controlled for these projects. Residents also asked about the governance structure of Leisure World, who makes final decisions, and how opinions/concerns should be conveyed to the decision makers. Some residents at the presentations offered comments and suggestions about design of the site plan for the new Administration Building and CH1 Site Improvements.

Management provided the suggestions and comments specific to the design of the Site Plan to the Community Planning, Security & Transportation, Education & Recreation, Restaurant, and Landscape Advisory Committees, for consideration in any revisions to the plan. These Committees met separately at their monthly Committee meetings in March 2018 to make recommendations for design changes. The Community Planning and Security & Transportation Advisory Committees held a joint meeting in April 2018 to resolve critical opposing design recommendations in order to present a unified final site plan for consideration and approval by the LWCC BOD in May 2018.

Questions asked by Residents at Mutual Presentations:

1. Cost/Funding:
   a. What is the cost of the project? Why wasn’t a new cost estimate done (figures are based on a 2012 estimate)?
   b. The cost for both the construction of a new Administration Building, additions to CH1 and all related site improvements (new parking lot, drop off loop, modifications to existing parking lot) is
Appendix G

approximately $7.2 million. A cost estimate was developed in 2016 based on the scope of the project at that time (Site Plan H dated 9/27/2016) which included escalation factors for the project construction from 2019 - 2020.

2. Where does the money come from to pay for the project(s)?
   a. Funding is provided from the Resales (Property Transfer) Fund, which collects 2% of the sale prices on properties sold in Leisure World, paid by the buyer/seller/split.

3. Is a "resales" fund specific to Leisure World or is this common among these types of communities?
   a. Communities use various methods to accumulate funds for major capital projects including debt financing. Leisure World of Maryland does not have any outstanding debt. LWCC BOD has chosen to use “pay-as-you-go” philosophy where once sufficient funds are available, a project is undertaken.

4. What if the funding source runs out during construction of the project? What if the funds available aren’t enough to cover the cost of the project?
   a. Contractor bids will be obtained prior to start of construction so the cost of construction will be known.
   b. LWCC BOD has historically not begun construction of a project until funding is available.
   c. If available funds are not sufficient to cover the cost of construction, LWCC BOD can defer the start of construction until funds become available.

5. Will residents be assessed a special fee to fund the project?
   a. No. According to the Leisure World of Maryland Trust documents, residents cannot be assessed a special fee to fund Capital Improvement projects. The Leisure World of Maryland governing documents do not have any provisions for special assessments.

6. What other projects can be accomplished with the use of the reserved funds?
   a. Capital improvements to Trust properties are covered under the Resales/Property Transfer Fund.
   b. The Facilities Enhancement Plan (FEP) comprises the projects selected by the LWCC BOD to be constructed with funds available in the Resales/Property Transfer Fund.

7. What controls are or will be in place to reduce cost overruns?
   a. The LWMC project management team controls, monitors and oversees all FEP projects.
   b. All contractor bids include contingencies and allowances to cover unknown conditions.
   c. Contingencies range from 5% to 10% of the total cost of construction.

8. What is the value lost by demolishing the existing building? The building is an asset to Leisure World.
   a. There is no value lost to Leisure World as the new Administration Building, additions to Clubhouse I and associated site improvements replace the value of the existing Administration Building and will add value to the overall Community.

9. Why can’t Leisure World borrow money for funding projects?
   a. Leisure World of Maryland can borrow money to fund projects, but historically, the LWCC BOD has refrained from doing so. See response to Question #3 above.
10. What are the maintenance and operation impact on the budget if a new Administration Building is constructed?
   a. The current assessment is that there will be a net neutral impact on maintenance and operation budgets for the new Administration Building as the systems installed will be more energy efficient.
   b. The building design will comply with all current construction standards/techniques, fire/life safety and building codes as well as be responsive to environmental sustainability regulations.

11. If the project moves forward and the Strategic Plan comes out with new needs for the Community how can these projects be funded?
   a. Depending on the nature and timing of any new projects suggested by the completion of the Strategic Plan, the LWCC BOD can consider the value of the projects, assess the timing of starting the project compared to other projects under consideration and approve the funding source. Options for funding include the Facilities Maintenance Plan, Replacement Reserve, Capital Budget, or annual Operating Budget.

12. What is the impact of a new building on the property tax for Leisure World of Maryland?
   a. Property taxes paid on buildings held in Trust have minimal taxes assessed.

13. What was LWCC BOD’s rationale for selecting construction of a new Administration Building versus renovating the existing?
   a. The LWCC BOD considered all options (renovate, expand/renovate, build new) and concluded building new provided the best long-term solution and investment to the Community.
   b. The selection of the new construction option was based on its meeting two fundamental objectives. One, the rehabilitation of the existing building would not improve access or parking for CH1 facilities (ballroom, meeting rooms, restaurants, or outdoor pool) whereas a new building in an alternate location would provide close in on grade parking for CH1 entrances. Two, a new building would meet all current life safety codes, energy efficiency, and ADA standards. A new building would be designed for current and anticipated space needs and configuration.
   c. Renovate and Expand/Renovate options for the existing Administration Building did not improve access to CH1 through providing close in, on grade parking (handicap and non-handicap parking) to the entrances. Renovate and Expand/Renovate options also did not provide a positive cost-benefit analysis with bringing a 50-year old building in compliance with current building code or industry construction standards. In some instances, renovation would not allow the building to be in compliance with new energy and sustainability codes and would necessitate complete removal of portions of the existing building. Finally, the disruption to staff and services provided would not be beneficial to the residents. Staff and services would need to be moved to trailers that are not user-friendly for residents and all utilities would either need to be re-routed or installed new to the trailers which was not a cost benefit to the community.
14. What happens if there is an emergency in Leisure World and the resale funds are needed for that purpose?
   a. All of the buildings held in Trust are insured for full replacement value.
   b. In addition, LW reserve budgets allocate funding to replace or maintain critical elements of the buildings. Currently, the Trust holds $300,000 in a contingency fund to be used as issues arise that are accounted for in the reserve budgets.

II. Process:
   1. Who participated in developing the Facilities Enhancement Plan?
      a. Project proposals were solicited from residents and Advisory Committees and the LWCC BOD which are made up of residents.
      b. From those proposals, the LWCC BOD selected projects to constitute the Facilities Enhancement Plan and identified project priorities.
   2. Who participates in the scope/design of the projects—specifically the Administration Building/CH1 Site Improvement Plan?
      a. The following Advisory Committees (made up of Leisure World residents) participate in the development of the project:
         i. Community Planning
         ii. Security & Transportation
         iii. Education & Recreation
         iv. Restaurant
         v. Landscape
         vi. Energy
         vii. Golf & Greens
      b. The LWCC BOD makes all final decisions on project scope, design, and construction based on recommendations made by the above Advisory Committees and the Executive Committee.
   3. Why wasn’t a referendum vote called for all residents to vote on the project/FEP? Why can’t Mutual Boards vote individually on the project(s) then have the LWCC BOD act according to the vote? Mutual 17B Fairways North surveyed their residents and they voted down a new Administration Building—why can’t other Mutuals do the same thing?
      a. The LWCC BOD followed/complied with the by-laws of the Corporation on voting for capital improvement projects.
      b. Mutual BODs can discuss and take a vote on a project which would instruct their representative on the LWCC BOD on how to vote.
      c. Other Mutuals can take this action if so desired.
4. Leisure World polled residents for a name change to the community. Why can’t the same be done for this project?
   a. See response to Question 3 above.

5. How does a resident get their opinion heard in relation to the project/FEP?
   a. Residents can volunteer to become a member of an Advisory Committee(s)
   b. Residents can attend any meetings of the LWCC BOD, Executive Committee and Advisory Committees and participate in the discussions as part of the open forum
   c. Residents can become a member of their Mutual Board of Directors
   d. Residents can attend their Mutual Board of Directors meetings and participate in the discussions as part of the open forum
   e. Residents can make written statements addressed to the LWCC BOD, their Mutual BOD and submit to the Leisure World News

6. Why wasn’t a strategic plan done before starting the project(s)?
   a. A strategic plan for Leisure World of Maryland was conducted in 2010 and became the starting point for the Facilities Enhancement Plan.

7. What is the process for bidding? How many bids will be solicited for construction of the project?
   a. A Request for Proposal (RFP) will be developed and issued to a minimum of 8 contractors to participate in the construction bid process.
   b. Management is considering using a construction bid service to notify and access local contractors to participate in the process.
   c. The RFP will include qualifications required of the contractor, permit/construction documents for the project, construction schedule and legal terms.

8. Isn’t this project a fait accompli?
   a. No. LWCC BOD has not yet authorized funding for the construction of the project.

9. Why wasn’t a presentation done to the community as a whole to get more participation?
   a. Community wide presentations were held regarding the FEP and the Administration Building/CH1 Site Improvements project:
      i. FEP development in 2012-2013.
      ii. November 18, 2014 presentation on the status of all FEP projects
      iii. March 29, 2017 presentation of the Site Plan as part of the pre-application requirements for MNCPPC (Park and Planning)
   b. All LWCC BOD, Executive Committee and Advisory Committee meetings are open to all residents to attend and agendas are posted a minimum of 5 days in advance of the meeting
   c. A calendar of all Advisory Committee meetings is posted in the Leisure World News, on the residents’ website, Leisure World TV channels and in the Clubhouses.
   d. Several individual Mutinals requested and received presentations by LWMC Management on the project.
III. Project:

1. How many handicap spaces are being accommodated with the new plan? How many currently exist? How many are required by code?
   a. 31 ADA spaces accommodated in the new site plan.
   b. 14 ADA spaces currently exist in the Administration parking lot.
   c. 12 ADA spaces are required by code.

2. Why are there electric car charging stations, car share spaces and motorcycles spaces when they aren't used by residents?
   a. Montgomery County Zoning code requires a certain number of these designated spaces to be provided as part of any new site improvement plans.
   b. The zoning code is enforced by Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPPC) that reviews and approves all site plans in Montgomery County.

3. Why is there 1-way traffic in the existing parking lot? Why can't there be 2-way traffic flow?
   a. At the time of the presentations to the Mutuals, the Community Planning and Security & Transportation Advisory Committees have discussed the pros and cons of 1-way versus 2-way traffic flow in the current and proposed parking lot(s). Their decisions have been to remain with 1-way traffic flow to maintain consistency, but the Committees are continuing to discuss traffic flow options.
   b. Subsequent to the Mutual presentations, CPAC and S&T did decide to make 1 aisle in the existing parking lot to be in the opposite direction to address concerns raised by residents on traffic flow.

4. Why is a new Administration Building needed? What is the motivation for doing the project? What reports and/or data exist supporting the need for a new Administration Building? Why can't the existing Administration Building be renovated?
   a. Refer to reports contained in the "Administration Building and Clubhouse 1 Site Plan Improvements Project Information" binder located in the Leisure World Library in Clubhouse 1.
   b. The following reports provided to the LWCC BOD may be of significance in addressing the questions above:
      ii. "CPAC Resolution on Administration Building – Space Allocation" dated 6/25/15
      iii. Administration Building and CH 1 Site Plan Package memo dated 9/16/2016 and associated "Design Development" presentations dated 9/27/2016
      iv. Administration Building – Invasive Study memo dated 2/22/2017

5. Was there a space plan assessment of the existing building to see if the building could be renovated?
6. Why wasn’t an “invasive study” done on the existing Administration Building to see if it can be reused/saved?

7. Why can’t a second floor be placed on the existing Administration Building?
   a. The current structural system for the existing Administration Building cannot support a 2nd floor.
   b. The entire existing structural and foundation system would need to be supplemented with new systems or replaced entirely to support a 2nd floor. This is more costly than constructing a new building.

8. Why aren’t there amenities included in the new Administration Building that residents can use such as a convenience store or coffee shop?
   a. The Community Planning Advisory Committee made recommendations for amenities to be included in the new Administration Building and the LWCC BOD provided the final authorization on these amenities.
   b. Recommended amenities included a financial institution and a post office.

9. Why isn’t there covered parking with solar panels?
   a. The Energy Advisory Committee is looking into the feasibility of solar energy in Leisure World and will make recommendations to the LWCC BOD for consideration when the study is completed.

10. What is the size of the new Administration Building compared to the existing Administration Building?
    a. Current Administration Building is 16,643 sq ft
    b. Proposed Administration Building is 20,555 sq ft

11. Are there concerns with the geotechnical conditions of the site? What tests are done to ensure there are no issues with the foundations once construction starts?
    a. A geotechnical analysis has been conducted on the proposed site for the new Administration Building to determine the soil type and capacity. The report is used to inform the type of foundation and structural system to be designed for the new building.
    b. A total of 7 borings were conducted around the site to provide an accurate picture of the soil and subsurface conditions to mitigate any issues once construction starts.
    c. The total number of borings taken is above the typical number taken for a project of this type and size.

12. Is the project going to be LEED accredited?
    a. The project will comply with Montgomery County “Green” Building codes, which is an equivalent to LEED Silver ranking.

13. What is the impact on parking during the construction of the project? What is the impact on services provided by Administration and Clubhouse operations during construction?
    a. An impact plan will be generated with the awarded contractor for construction of the project.
14. Why are there trees inside the parking lot? They create a distraction to drivers. Why are there trees being added to the existing parking lot? This takes away parking spaces and causes leaves to drop on cars and make a mess.
   a. MNCPPC requires trees to be planted in parking lots to provide shade over asphalt areas. The zoning requires shade coverage for every 10 parking spaces. Leisure World negotiated the number of trees and placement with MNCPPC to minimize distractions to sight lines for resident drivers of Leisure World.
   b. The project must also comply with County storm water management requirements.
15. How many trees are being removed and how many are being added? What is the size of the new trees? They won’t be mature so how long will it take for them to provide shade and be effective?
   a. Current estimates are 100 new trees planted and 57 trees removed. The quantity changes depending on the design of the site.
   b. The new trees will be 3” to 4” caliper.
   c. It takes approximately 15 to 25 years for trees to mature – depending on the species.
16. What happens to the bocce and shuffleboard courts?
   a. The E&R Advisory Committee is in discussions regarding the location of the shuffleboard and bocce courts.
   b. Currently, a shuffleboard court will be painted on the concrete deck of the lanai. The bocce court will be relocated to somewhere near the lawn bowling area.
17. What is the distribution of parking? What is the net impact on parking?
   a. Total new parking, including ADA spaces, is 361 spaces. Current parking is 370 spaces.
   b. Parking is distributed to be closer to the entrance of CH1 and the new Administration Building.
18. How does building a new building bring Leisure World into the next 10 years? What does it do to improve Leisure World?
   a. A new building brings a facility that will have the have upgraded efficient energy savings systems, sustainable materials to better the environment, improved stormwater management to reduce flooding and erosion of streams in the community.
   b. The mission of the Community is to be a premiere 55 community and bring all facilities up to current standards to compete with other similar closed communities.
19. Is porous pavement being used in the new plan? What natural stormwater techniques are being implemented?
   a. Yes. Porous pavement is being designed at all new non-handicap parking spaces and at all new secondary walkways.
   b. The site is designed for all new grading to drain into stormwater collection facilities (micro-bioretention ponds, rain gardens, etc.) which naturally dissipate rain water and surface run off. These facilities also reduce overburdening storm water piping which can cause flooding or damage to the underground pipe system.
20. What is the duration of construction? What is the duration of renovation?
   a. New construction is expected to take 14 to 16 months.
   b. Renovation could take 12 months.

21. Why demolish the existing building if there is mold and asbestos that needs to be addressed? Why not renovate and save money?
   a. Mold and hazardous material abatement would need to occur with both renovation and new construction.

22. Are there changes to the Leisure World Bus and Metro Bus routes with the new site plan? Where are drop off locations for Leisure World Buses?
   a. There is no change to the Metro Bus route.
   b. There will be 2 additional stops to the Leisure World Bus route. A drop off will be added outside the Terrace Room/Maryland Room on the north side of Clubhouse 1 and at the entrance to the new Administration Building.

23. What are the pros/cons of renovation, expansion and new construction for the Administration Building?
   a. Refer to Question #13 on page 3

24. Is an outdoor dining patio for the Terrace Room part of the project scope?
   a. Yes.

25. Will EIFS (exterior insulation and finish system) be used on the new building?
   a. This building material is not being considered at this time.

26. How many residents use the Administration Building on a daily basis?
   a. There are approximately 24,000 to 30,000 resident encounters in the Administration building per year.
   b. These encounters or visits include residents, visitors, various Advisory Committee and Mutual meetings, vehicle and guest pass registration, patrons of the bank, post office, and realtor services.

27. What is the flow of construction? What will be constructed first, then second, etc.?
   a. The LWCC BOD voted to have the vestibules for the Clubhouse Grille and Terrace Room and the expansion of the Maryland Room constructed first. Any associated improvements that can be constructed, such as the drop off circle and modifications to the loading dock, would follow.
   b. The new Administration Building and existing parking lot revisions would occur second.
   c. Demolition of the existing Administration Building and construction of the new parking lot would occur last.

28. What is the impact on snow removal with the addition of islands?
   a. McFall & Berry have no issues with the islands and will implement a new plan as needed for snow removal.
IV. Site Plan Comments:

A. Included in design

1. Width of walkways should be able to accommodate at least 2 people in wheelchairs/walkers/scooters to pass by without having to step off into the grass (included in the design).
2. Width of structures covering walkways should be more than the width of the walkway to provide shelter from elements.
3. Covered drop off areas should have overhangs to cover the passenger side of the car to protect passengers when entering or exiting the car.
4. ADA minimum requirements should be exceeded by all projects undertaken in Leisure World.
5. New Administration Building should have redundant systems (HVAC, water, electrical, telecommunications) in case of a natural or man-made disaster.
6. There is concern the drop off circle at the Terrace Room/Maryland Room will be congested and back up to the loading dock or into the parking lot. Engineering of width of circle is wide enough that vehicles can pass those using the drop off areas at the circle.
7. What color is a fire truck lane and where are they required to be located?
   a. Fire lanes are yellow, and locations are dictated by Montgomery Department of Fire and Rescue.
8. Parking lot and walkways need to be well lit for visibility and should be controlled by a timer to not be on when not needed.
9. Signage is essential with the new plan – directional and informational.
10. Due to location of existing loading dock being close to the entrance of the new Administration Building and people walking by, something needs to be installed/constructed to minimize or eliminate smells/odors. Walls are being constructed around the loading dock area to minimize views into the area; proper drainage is designed for removal of water when loading dock is cleaned on a daily basis. More frequent pick up of trash is being implemented as a standard operational practice.
11. Bollards or barriers need to be installed at drop off areas to keep cars from running into the building(s).
12. There should be a way to access Cascade Circle from the new parking lot without having to go through the existing parking lot, out to Leisure World Boulevard, through the main intersection (Rossmoor Boulevard and Leisure World Boulevard) – too far of a drive. New parking lot includes entrance/exit at Cascade Circle.
13. Fix the drop off entrance to Clubhouse 1 to not flood, provide space for Metrobus/Leisure World bus/cars to pass if one is using the drop off, and have canopy overhang the car when dropping off passengers. Design includes redirecting of water away from drop off areas.
14. Provide 2-way traffic flow in the existing lot or at least 1 aisle with 2-way or opposite direction travel. Advisory Committees approved 1 way opposite traffic flow at outer most parking lane at the existing parking lot.
15. Provide seating that overlooks the golf course from the new Administration Building and Clubhouse.

16. Bushes should not block drivers’ views. *Plantings in parking area islands include trees and low plantings only.*

17. Turn radii for trucks (delivery) should be verified.

B. **Considered, but not included in design**

1. If wheel stops are being installed at parking spaces, these can be a tripping hazard for older residents and those with a handicap and should not be included in the plan. *Advisory Committees debated the pros/cons of wheel stops at parking spaces and ultimately decided to maintain the current practice of no wheel stops at parking spaces in open parking areas.*

C. **Not included in design**

1. Valet parking should be considered for restaurant operations. *This is not part of the site plan design and is being considered as an operational service by the Restaurant Operator.*

2. To minimize view of the parking lot from Leisure World Boulevard, create a high berm along the entire length of the existing parking lot. *There is not enough space between Leisure World Boulevard, sidewalk and parking lot to create a berm and maintain the existing trees.*

3. Provide short-term parking for new Administration Building similar to 10-minute parking at the Clubhouse I entrance. *Advisory Committees felt there is enough parking to allow for easy and quick access to the main entrance of the new building.*

4. Library in CH I should be included on signage. *This will be addressed outside of this project.*

5. Provide parking closer to the outdoor pool area. *This will be considered as part of a future FEP project for the outdoor pool complex.*

6. Provide metal benches versus wood – last longer. *Community standard benches are teak.*

V. **Administration Building Comments (comments are addressed as part of the design):**

1. Accessibility within the new building should be paramount.

2. What spaces are inside the new Administration Building? Why does Montgomery Mutual have space inside the Administration Building (existing and new)?
   a. All administrative departments:
      i. Accounting
      ii. Security
      iii. Resales
      iv. Mutual and Trust Assistants
      v. Human Resources
vi. PI'

vii. General Manager and Executive Assistants
   b. Financial Institution
   c. Post Office
   d. Montgomery Mutual (oldest and largest Mutual in LW, does not have space for Property
      Management office on their property, rent office space in the Administration Building)
   e. Meeting Rooms

3. What alternative energy sources are being proposed for the new building?
   a. Energy Advisory Committee is exploring energy sources to be considered in the new building –
      solar for landscape lighting, reclamation of rain water for irrigation.

4. Provide business center in the new building that can be accessed by residents during non-working hours.

5. Bank and Realtor offices (Weichert) should not be included in the new Administration Building.
   a. LWCC BOD voted to have a bank space included and not include real estate office.