# **City of Laguna Beach AGENDA BILL**

**Meeting Date:** 

#### SUBJECT: **PROJECT MANAGER SERVICES FOR VILLAGE ENTRANCE**

#### **SUMMARY OF THE MATTER:**

On November 12, 2013, the City Council conducted a special workshop to receive input from the community regarding the Village Entrance. Following a facilitated conversation, the City Council voted to proceed with a modified concept that does not include a parking structure or require borrowing. Staff requested direction on specific aspects of the scope of work at a subsequent meeting on February 4, 2014. At that meeting, the City Council voted to retain the fuel island behind City Hall as part of the design, but deferred further action on other potential project elements - such as the sewer digester building, car ports, and Laguna Canyon Road median - until further public outreach has been completed. Additionally, the City Council authorized the City Manager to conduct a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process to select a design team consisting of a project manager, landscape architect, civil engineer and environmental consultant, and return to the Council with a timeline for a public input process. This report provides a recommendation for a project manager based on a recent competitive procurement, requests authorization to amend the contract for survey work, and transmits the findings of a recent mold inspection at the historic sewer digester building.

#### **Project Manager**

At a public workshop on June 11, 2013, the City Council directed the City Manager to solicit Statements of Qualifications from consultant firms to provide project management services for the Village Entrance Project, which, at that time, included a parking structure and full park. The stated purpose for retaining a project manager was to help ensure adequate resources and expertise was available to advance the project in a timely manner.

Staff released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) at the beginning of August 2013, with eight firms responding by the August 19 deadline. Interviews were held for the three highest-scoring candidates,

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that the City Council:

See recommendations on page 4.

Appropriations Requested:

Submitted by: <u>fem:</u> <u>Jimp</u> Ben Siegel, Deputy CM/Dir/ of Comm Svcs



Coordinated with:

Approved:

City Manager

Attachments: See page 4

Fund:

Project Manager for Village Entrance April 1, 2014 Page 2 of 4

and Griffin Structures emerged as the top candidate based on its extensive experience leading projects from concept through construction. Further, the firm is locally-based and is well-regarded for its role in managing the Community and Susi Q Center project.

While the scope of the improvements has evolved since the RFQ process was conducted in Summer 2013, staff believes that Griffin Structures remains the most qualified firm to manage the Village Entrance project. Roger Torreiro, president of the firm, has followed the project closely and attended the November 2013 public workshop. In recent meetings with City staff, the Griffin team confirmed their continuing interest in providing project management services. Additionally, they offered insight into conducting an effective outreach effort and selecting a qualified design team.

At staff's request, Griffin has provided an updated proposal (Attachment 1) for project management services. The proposal separates the project into four discrete phases:

- Phase I: Design Team Selection
- Phase II: Community Input
- Phase III: Design
- Phase IV: Construction

Given the preliminary nature of the project, Griffin has only assigned fees to the initial two phases (Design Team Selection and Community Input). The cost for Griffin's services during these phases would be billed on a time-and-materials basis, with a not-to-exceed amount of \$24,420.

Staff believes Griffin's expertise would be beneficial during procurement of the design team, from development of the RFP to review of proposals and in-person interviews. Once a design team has been selected, Griffin (along with the landscape architect and civil engineer) would lead a series of community meetings to solicit input on specific design elements. Feedback from the public would be compiled and presented to the City Council for consideration, along with a recommendation to advance the project. At that juncture, the City Council would have the option of amending the agreement with Griffin to provide project management services through the subsequent (design) phase of the project.

#### **Preliminary Timeline**

Pending City Council authorization to retain Griffin for the Design Team Selection and Community Input phases, staff would immediately begin working with the project manager to finalize the scope of work for the design team. Staff anticipates an RFP could be issued by mid-April. A selection panel consisting of City staff and a Griffin project manager would review the proposals, interview top candidates, and provide a recommendation to the City Council in June 2014.

As noted above, Griffin has recommended that the community outreach process begin once the design team is on board and extend through September 2014. The outreach process would consist of up to three public workshops. Public input would be incorporated into the conceptual design documents, which would be presented to the City Council in November 2014, followed by design development

Project Manager for Village Entrance April 1, 2014 Page 3 of 4

beginning in December. An updated preliminary timeline highlighting key milestones in the entitlement phase is provided as Attachment 2.

#### **Project Budget**

The staff presentation at the November 2013 public workshop indicated a total estimated cost of \$14.4 million. This estimate included \$6.7 million for the acquisition of the properties at 479 Ocean Avenue

(\$1.4 million) and 725 Laguna Canyon Road (\$5.3 million). Subtracting the \$6.7 million in land acquisition costs from the overall \$14.4 million budget leaves \$7.7 million to complete the improvements. At a conceptual level, staff believes this amount to be sufficient to complete the project as currently envisioned, as well as provide some additional flexibility for potential landscaping and circulation improvements to the Employee and Lumberyard parking lots that may be recommended as part of the design process.

The table at right provides a breakdown of preliminary sources and uses. These estimates are very conceptual and will be continually refined as the design process evolves. The existing design budget should be sufficient for all "soft costs" related to the project, including architecture and engineering, planning, testing and inspections, permits, and project management.

#### Survey

On February 4, 2014, the City Council authorized the City Manager to execute an agreement with KDM Meridian to prepare the first phase of a boundary survey, with a cost of up to \$28,300. The boundary survey is necessary to prepare conceptual plans. Pursuant to Council direction, staff has entered into an agreement with KDM; however, the initial proposal did not include survey work at the recently-acquired parcel at 725 Laguna Canyon Road, which will be included as part of the Village Entrance project. To incorporate survey work associated with the 725 Laguna Canyon Road site, staff is recommending the City Council authorize the City Manager to amend the KDM contract by \$1,840, for a total of \$30,140.

#### **Sewer Digester Building**

The historic sewer digester building is currently used for storage of police evidence. Police staff enters the building on an occasional basis throughout the week to drop-off and retrieve evidence. Due to concerns raised at the February 4, 2014, City Council meeting, staff retained AMI Environmental

Concept Budget: Sources &	k Uses
Sources:	
Parking Fund	\$7,800,000
Capital Improvement Fund	\$5,000,000
Sewer Fund	\$500,000
Mid-Year Transfer from Parking Fund	\$700,000
Fiscal Year 2014-15 Funding Request	\$400,000
Total	\$14,400,000
<u>Uses:</u>	
479 Ocean Avenue Acquisition	\$1,400,000
725 Laguna Canyon Road Acquisition	\$5,300,000
Park/Promenade Cost	\$1,500,000
725 Laguna Canyon Road Improvements	\$1,000,000
Historic Digester Renovation	\$1,300,000
Lift Station	\$500,000
Employee/Equipment Relocation	\$1,000,000
Subtotal	\$12,000,000
Design/Project Mgt/Contingency	\$2,400,000
Total	\$14,400,000

Project Manager for Village Entrance April 1, 2014 Page 4 of 4

Testing to inspect both levels of the building. A mold-like substance was observed on a small portion of the ceiling on the ground level. The consultant determined that the painted concrete ceiling was unlikely to support mold growth. However, in an abundance of caution, air samples were taken throughout the building and of the outside air. Laboratory testing of the samples concluded that the indoor air samples were normal and closely matched the outdoor air samples. A copy of the AMI analysis is provided as Attachment 3. The inspection and testing process was observed by several members of the police command staff. The stain on the ceiling has been painted over and the building is continuing to be used for evidence storage.

#### Recommendations

It is recommended that the City Council:

- 1. Authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement with Griffin Structures, Inc., for project management and technical assistance through the design team selection and community outreach phases of the project, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$24,420;
- 2. Authorize the City Manager to work with Griffin to finalize the scope of work and conduct a competitive selection process (RFP) for the consultant design team, including a landscape architect, civil engineer, and environmental consultant;
- 3. Authorize the City Manager to amend the existing contract with KDM Meridian for a first phase boundary survey, to include the property at 725 Laguna Canyon Road, in a total not-to-exceed amount of \$30,140; and
- 4. Authorize the expenditure of up to an additional \$10,000 from the Village Entrance Project budget as a contingency to cover any necessary expenses during these initial phases as determined by the City Manager.

#### Attachments

- 1. Griffin Proposal
- 2. Updated Preliminary Timeline
- 3. Sewer Digester Mold Report



March 18, 2014

Mr. Ben Siegel Deputy City Manager CITY OF LAGUNA BEACH 505 Forest Avenue Laguna Beach, Ca 92651

#### Subject: Village Entrance Program and Construction Management in Laguna Beach, California

Dear Mr. Siegel:

Subsequent to our meeting(s), the Griffin Structures, Inc. (Griffin) Team has met with Staff, walked the site, reviewed the February 4,2014 City Council Agenda and City Council Meeting Recap, viewed the Council Meeting discussion on the City's Web-Site and toured the site(s).

Our Team feels that, at this juncture, it's best to break the project down into "phases", as follows:

**Phase I:** Work with City Staff on an RFP to select a Design Team comprised of a Landscape Architect, Civil Engineer, Environmental Consultant, and others as may be deemed necessary at this time. Assist City Staff with Interviews of the Design Team and make a recommendation to the City Council.

Not to exceed fee for Phase I is proposed at 52 hours at \$185/hr or \$9,620.00.

**Phase II:** Collaborate with the design team, participate with staff and the design team in a maximum of three (3) workshops with the Community, provide *'constructability reviews*,' conceptual budgeting, and scheduling services. Analyze and present the results of the public workshops to the City Council.

Not to exceed fee for Phase II is proposed at 80 hours at \$185/hr or \$14,800.

Phase III: Design Phase; work with the Design Team to complete a set of Conceptual, Schematic, Design Development, and Construction Documents. Prepare updated Budgets and Schedules and the end of each phase of documentation so as to track to the Budget. Attend City Council Meetings as required to provide updates, etc.

Fee to be presented at the conclusion of Phase II when the Project Scope is defined.

**Phase IV:** Construction Phase; scope of services to be determined based on estimated construction schedule and proposed delivery method at the conclusion of Phase III.

The Griffin Team sincerely appreciates this opportunity to partner with the city of Laguna Beach, its elected officials, staff and our community to plan, design and deliver a suitable Village Entrance project. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me anytime at your convenience.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

GRIFFIN STRUCTURES\_INC. Roger Torriero CEO / President c: 949-412-9000

**GRIFFIN STRUCTURES, INC.** 

385 Second Street, Laguna Beach, California 92651 | 949.497.9000 tel • 949.497.8883 fax | v

Arizona

# Village Entrance Preliminary Timeline April 1, 2014

May 2019	September 2018	May 2018	September 2017	Phase 2 Construction – Landscaped Pathway, Lumbervard Lot
May 2018	September 2017	May 2017	September 2016	Phase 1 Construction – 725 LCR, Employee Lot
	March 2017		March 2016	City Council Construction Contract Award
	January 2017		January 2016	City Council Update/Authorization to Bid
December 2017	July 2016	December 2015	July 2015	Final Design
July 2016	August 2015			Coastal Commission Appeal
			July 2015	City Council Confirmation of Design Review Action
			June 2015	Planning Commission Design Review
		June 2015	December 2014	Design Development Drawings and CEQA Process
			November 2014	City Council Review of Conceptual Design
		October 2014	August 2014	Conceptual Design
		September 2014	June 2014	Community Outreach
			June 2014	City Council Award of Design Consultant Team
		June 2014	April 2014	Request for Proposals/Selection of Consultant Team
Eate Finish	Late Start	Finish Finish	Sat	
iission Appeal	<b>Coastal Comm</b>	Timeline	Proposed	Description

# 4061 OCEANSIDE BLVD, STE E OCEANSIDE, CA 92056 760,650,2099

# **Form Information**

**Reference Number:** 

20140227-1811088284

# **Service Information**

Date of Inspection Services Ordered

Date of Report Service Rep Feb 25, 2014 10:41:34 AM PST Limited Cursory Visual Mold Inspection Air Sample Analysis Feb 27, 2014 10:41:34 AM PST EZM

# **Client Information**

Client Name: Client Email: Ordered By: Phone Numbers: Jobsite Contact:

City of Laguna Beach wbrown@lagunabeachcity.net Wade Brown 949-497-0360 949-693-4048 Wade Brown

# **Subject Property Information**

Address: City, State, Zip: Foundation: Topography: Laguna Beach, CA, 92651 Slab On Grade Level Ground

IMPORTANT NOTICE! DO NOT TAKE ANY ACTION UNTIL YOU HAVE READ THIS ENTIRE REPORT! Please review this report thoroughly. Most of your questions will be answered within its pages. If you still have questions or concerns after your review, please call our office at 760.650.2099.

ATTACHMENT 3

# **Explanations**

The following information is provided to help you understand key elements of this report that relate to conditions found in or around the subject property that are or may be associated with indoor mold growth. Please read this first to clarify the content of the report and scope of the inspection.

# **Terms Used**

1. Suspect Area(s): Refers to a physical location in, on or around the subject property, such as the Living Room, Front Office, Front Elevation, etc., where a suspect condition was observed in the course of the inspection. This inspection and testing is not intended to be technically exhaustive. The scope of this inspection is limited to areas that were readily accessible and viewable at the time of inspection. Readily accessible refers to areas that could be inspected from ground level; areas that could be inspected without entering attics or crawlspaces; areas that could be inspected without entering attics or crawlspaces; areas that could be inspected without moving or removing personal contents including storage areas, cabinets, closets, sheds, and garages. Viewable refers to areas of the structure that were in plain view at the time of inspection without moving furniture, appliances, vehicles, or any other personal contents. All areas deemed not readily accessible or viewable by the Inspector according to the above definitions are excluded from the inspection and this report. Neither AMI, nor its inspectors, agents, employees, managers, or owners are responsible for inspecting or reporting on areas deemed inaccessible or conditions deemed not viewable.

2. Suspect Condition(s): Refers to a specific condition in a Suspect Area that, in the judgment of the Inspector, is either evidence of indoor mold growth or commonly associated with indoor mold growth. When suspect conditions are present but no visible mold growth is observed, it is standard AMI policy to recommend testing in order to; (a) confirm or rule out the likelihood of indoor mold growth; and/or (b) identify mold conditions that may negatively impact indoor air quality. If the Inspector's recommendation for testing is declined by the client or the client's representative(s) this report should be considered inconclusive. If testing was performed with the inspection, the Laboratory Results are attached at the end of this report.

3. Inaccessible - Rooms or areas that were inaccessible for viewing at the time of inspection. Any areas or conditions that were inaccessible will be noted in the Suspect Condition column.

4. Suspected Water Intrusion - One or more conditions that in the judgment of the Inspector does not appear normal and that may or may not be associated with a past or present water intrusion event. Indoor mold growth is the result of water intrusion or excessive moisture exposure, therefore, every suspicion of water intrusion is cause for concern.

5. Evidence of Water Intrusion - One or more conditions that in the judgment of the Inspector resulted from a water intrusion event. Indoor mold growth is the result of water intrusion or excessive moisture exposure, therefore, every suspicion of water intrusion is cause for concern.

6. Water Stain(s) - Stains and discolorations on construction materials that in the judgment of the Inspector are the result of a water intrusion event. Indoor mold growth is the result of water intrusion or excessive moisture exposure, therefore, every suspicion of water intrusion is cause for concern

7. Water Damage - Damage, deterioration, and abnormalities in construction materials that in the judgment of the Inspector are the result of a water intrusion event. Indoor mold growth is the result of water intrusion or excessive moisture exposure, therefore, every suspicion of water intrusion is cause for concern.

8. Mold - Refers to stains and/or growth on construction materials that was tested and confirmed to be mold growth by laboratory analysis.

9. Mold-like Substance - Suspected mold growth. Refers to stains and/or growth on construction materials that was not tested or confirmed to be mold growth by laboratory analysis. It is standard AMI policy to not make claims confirming mold growth without laboratory analysis.

10. Mold Odor - Refers to odors inside the subject property that based on the experience of the Inspector are consistent with odors detected in other properties with confirmed mold growth.

11. Licensed contractor certified for mold remediation - Refers to a contractor licensed by the California State Contractors License Board who has been trained and certified specifically for mold remediation work. Go to www.cslb.ca.gov to check on the status of a contractor's license. Mold remediation certifications are obtained through independent training courses, not issued through the State of California. Choose a contractor who is certified by the Institute of Inspection, Cleaning and Restoration Certification (IICRC), or recommended by someone you trust.

# **Interpreting Moisture Retention Readings**

In the event that your report contains Inspector notes indicating moisture retention was detected in construction materials during the inspection, use the following information as a guideline to determine the significance of the numbers shown.

00-17% = Normal: Decay/deterioration are not likely to occur.

18-20% = Borderline: Decay/deterioration may occur under certain conditions.

21-99% = Excessive: Material is wet and in deteriorating condition.

Highest Moisture Reading - Refers to the highest percentage of moisture retention detected in a single substrate, such as a wall, cabinet, floor, etc. Readings are derived from a technology instrument designed specifically for detecting moisture in construction materials. The instrument used in this inspection was a General Electric Protimeter - Survey Master.

Lowest Moisture Reading - Refers to the lowest moisture reading detected in the same substrate where high moisture was detected. The lowest moisture reading establishes the baseline to which the highest moisture reading is compared. The assumption is that the entire substrate should show readings equal to lowest moisture reading found.

# **Inspector Notes**

Suspect Area: Detail: Suspect Conditions:

Picture:

Historic Sewer Tower (Lower) Police evidence storage

Water stain(s), water damage, mold-like substance\* observed on the ceiling and upper walls in random areas. All walls and ceilings are painted concrete.



Testing Recommendations: Air Test Results: Testing recommended by Inspector, accepted by Client. Analytical data from an air sample taken in this area showed spore counts were normal (not elevated) at the time of testing (see Laboratory Results at the end of this report).

These test results do not warranty a mold-free structure. If indoor mold growth was present within the effective test range of the sample, it was not producing enough airborne spores at the time of testing to be considered elevated or unusual. Any further concerns about mold growth resulting from this suspect condition would require invasive inspection or testing procedures.

# **Inspector Notes**

Suspect Area: Detail:

Picture:

#### Cylindrical Digester

An employee stated this area floods out when it rains. There are rust stains on the wall and floor in random areas, however, no visible evidence of mold growth or water damage was observed at the time of this inspection.



# **Inspector Notes**

Suspect Area: Detail:

Picture:

Second Floor (Upper)

Client stated the roof leaks and water comes in thru near the sewage pipes. All walls and ceiling is painted concrete. No visible evidence of mold growth or water damage was observed at the time of this inspection.



Testing recommended by Inspector, accepted by Client. Analytical data from an air sample taken near this suspect condition indicates an insignificantly elevated and/or unusual airborne mold condition existed at the time of testing (see Laboratory Results at the end of this report).

The actual spore counts recorded would not be considered remarkable or rise to the level of an immediate indoor air quality concern. Any further concerns about mold growth would require additional testing and/or invasive inspection procedures. In all cases where indoor mold growth is a factor, individual responses vary with individual sensitivities.

AMI is not qualified to make any statements whatsoever regarding health conditions, symptoms, or reactions to mold exposure. Occupant concerns about these test results in relation to health issues should be discussed with a qualified healthcare professional.

Testing Recommendations: Air Test Results:

# **Understanding Your Air Test Results**

#### APPLICABLE ONLY IF AIR SAMPLES WERE ORDERED

The following information has nothing to do with your actual test results. It is only being provided here as a point of reference for you to compare your air test results to. The data below shows the most common airborne molds found outdoors in the State of California in numbers ranging from lowto-high along with the frequency of their presence. The data that was compiled from the historical database of samples at Environmental Microbiology Lab (EMLab). This data does not attempt to establish any type of standards, threshold limit values (TLV), or acceptable or unacceptable levels of indoor airborne mold spores. At the time of this report there are no established TLVs for indoor airborne mold spore levels. However, according to the ACGH, in non-problem environments, the concentration of fungi in indoor air is typically similar to or lower than the concentration seen outdoors. If fungal concentrations indoors are consistently higher than those outdoors, then indoor sources are indicated. Ultimately it is up to the parties concerned to determine what is and/or is not acceptable.

NOTE: Certain types of mold, such as Aureobasidium, Chaetomium, Fusarium, Stachybotrys, Trichoderma, and Ulocladium are considered markers (indicators) of indoor mold growth. When marker molds are present in a sample, especially in high concentrations, considerations to isolate the room until remedial actions are taken is warranted.

## How Do Your Air Test Results Compare To A Typical Day Outdoors

Alternaria spores are found in 54% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 27. 220 is considered high.

Basidospores spores are found in 92% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 13 on the low side to a medium of 213. 8587 is considered high. Bipolaris/Drechelera spores are found in 12% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 133 is considered high. Botrytis spores are found in 15% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 200 is considered high. Chaetomium spores are found in 19% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 120 is considered high. Cladosporium spores are found in 97% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 53 on the low side to a medium of 587. 7200 is considered high. Curvularia spores are found in 7% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 227 is considered high. Epicoccum spores are found in 19% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 160 is considered high. Nigrospora spores are found in 8% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 175 is considered high. Oidium spores are found in 18% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 200 is considered high. Penicillium/Asperaillus spores are found in 84% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 33 on the low side to a medium of 213. 2400 is considered high.

Rusts spores are found in 25% of samples.

Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 253 is considered high. Spore counts typically range from 8 on the low side to a medium of 40. 533 is considered high. Spore counts typically range from 8 on the low side to a medium of 40. 533 is considered high. Stachybotrys spores are found in 4% of samples. Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 233 is considered high.

Torula spores are found in 11% of samples. Spore counts typically range from 7 on the low side to a medium of 13. 160 is considered high.

# **Understanding Your Surface Test Results**

#### APPLICABLE ONLY IF SURFACE SAMPLES WERE ORDERED

The following charts are not your actual test results. They are only examples being provided here to help you understand your surface or bulk test results. The sole purpose of surface testing is to confirm or rule out the presence of mold on the surface that was sampled. If mold(s) were present in the sample, your report will identify the type of mold(s) but not the specific speciation or quantification.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF NUMBERS

A Rating of <1+ means very light growth of mold found in sample - less than 1+ but still appears to be growth on the surface sampled.

A Rating of 1+ means light growth of mold found in sample. A few spores of one type are found in 10 to 25% of the microscopic field.

A Rating of 2+ means moderate growth of mold found in sample. Spores of one type are found in 25 to 50% of the microscopic field.

A Rating of 3+ means heavy growth of mold found in sample. Spores of one type are found in 50 to 75% of the microscopic field.

A Rating of 4+ means very heavy mold growth found in sample. Spores of one type are nearly confluent in 100% of the microscopic field.

The amount of mold is evaluated and graded on a scale of 1+ to 4+. This scale is used to indicate the quantity of the mold growth on the sample, not the area of mold growth on the surface the sample was collected from. Mold levels graded <1+ and 1+ may not be invisible to the naked eye (microscopic only). Levels of 2+ may or may not be visible to the naked eye. Levels of 3+ and 4+ will be visible.

# What To Do Next

If your report indicates that you do not have a mold problem, the obvious answer to "What To Do Next?" is; nothing. If your report indicates that you do in fact have an indoor mold problem, you will need to make some decisions based on the severity of the problem. The following information will provide you with some practical guidelines and options for proceeding.

You may chose to handle small mold issue yourself. However, in the event of larger mold problems or if are simply not comfortable dealing with mold remediation, AMI offers fee-based project management services that provide start-to-finish oversight of mold remediation jobs, including clearance testing. For more information about these services call 760.650.2099.

#### FIRST THINGS FIRST

Before you even begin a mold remediation project you must be sure the water source that caused the mold growth has been eliminated. Mold is always the result of some form of water intrusion. If the cause is not addressed first the mold growth will be reoccurring. Control the moisture and you will control the mold.

#### -

#### WHO SHOULD DO THE MOLD CLEAN UP WORK?

Who should do the cleanup depends on a number of factors. One consideration is the size of the mold problem. If the moldy area is less than about 10 square feet (less than roughly a 3 ft. by 3 ft. patch), in most cases, you can handle the job yourself. This option assumes that you or any of the building occupants do not have mold sensitivities, especially asthma or other respiratory conditions. Many types of molds exist. All molds have the potential to cause health effects . Molds can produce allergens that can trigger allergic reactions or even asthma attacks in people allergic to mold. Others are known to produce potent toxins and/or irritants. If you have any health concerns, consult with your medical doctor before attempting cleanup work. You should also consider hiring the work out to a qualified professional.

-

If there has been a lot of water damage, and/or mold growth covers more than 10 square feet, you should consider hiring the work out to a qualified professional. If you choose to hire a contractor (or other professional service provider) to do the cleanup, make sure they are licensed State contractors certified in mold remediation. Mold remediation in the State of California is classified as janitorial work and does not require any type of specialized training or licenses. Know your contractor. Check their credentials and references. Call or visit the web site of the California State Contractors License Board and make sure their license is current (not expired). Check them out with the Better Business Bureau. Ask them to provide you with current proof of liability insurance. Any reputable contractor will have no problem providing you with copies of the documents you need to protect yourself and prove the work is handled properly.

If you suspect that the heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC) system may be contaminated with mold, for instance, it is part of an identified moisture problem, or there is mold near the intake to the system, or the airborne mold spore concentrations were very high, it is possible that the duct work and interior components of the heater or air conditioner are contaminated. Do not run the HVAC system if you know or suspect that it is contaminated with mold - it could spread mold throughout the building. Call AMI to have your system tested.

If the water and/or mold damage was caused by sewage or other contaminated water, then call AMI to conduct testing for eColi and other bacterial contaminants. For cleanup use only professional contractors who have experience cleaning and fixing buildings damaged by contaminated water.

# **Post-Remediation Verification (Clearance Testing)**

Regardless of whether you hire a mold removal contractor or perform the work yourself, it is important to confirm that:

• all mold has been removed

all work was completed in such a way as to not cross-contaminate other areas of the structure
all construction materials that were salvaged have been thoroughly dried to prevent a reoccurrence of mold growth.

To insure that this criterion has in fact been met and to document the results for future reference, it is always in your best interest to obtain a clearance report from someone other than the mold removal contractor.

A proper clearance test should always be conducted after the contractor claims the work has been completed but before any new construction materials, such as drywall, insulation, flooring, subflooring, etc. have been installed.

Be advised that some mold removal contractors will apply coatings over salvaged construction materials (also referred to as "encapsulants"). The intended purpose of these coatings is to provide future anti-mold and moisture resistance features to the contractor's service. However, solid color coatings can make it impossible for an inspector to visually confirm that all mold has been removed.

Ask your contractor in advance if he/she intends to encapsulate with coatings. If so, ask them to provide you with the brand name of the product they will use and insist that the covering is clear, not a solid color, so the inspector can visually confirm all mold has been removed.

Be advised the anti-stain products such as KILZ offers no anti-mold or moisture resistance qualities and therefore is not an acceptable encapsulant coating.

AMI offers post-remediation clearance testing and reliable third party documentation that your mold removal job was successful.

For information or to schedule an appointment please call 800-369-8532.

# **General Information**

The following contains general information relating to all reports.

# **Industry Standards For Airborne Mold Spore Concentrations**

At the time this writing there are no indoor airborne mold spore threshold limits or values established. However, according to the ACGH, in non-problem environments, concentrations of fungi in indoor air is typically similar to or lower than the airborne mold spore concentrations seen outdoors. If fungal concentrations indoors are consistently higher than those outdoors, then indoor sources are indicated.

AMI makes no conclusions or opinions, expressed or implied, concerning acceptable or unacceptable, or safe or unsafe levels of indoor airborne mold spores. Furthermore, AMI makes no conclusions or opinions regarding the relationship of mold spores to any disease, illness, or medical condition, or the relationship of mold spores to any legal matter.

# **Industry Standards For Mold Sampling**

All AMI mold sampling protocols are in strict compliance with each of the following traceable standards established by the IESO for the mold sampling of surfaces and air:

IESO Standard 1110;

Standard Practice for Sampling Mold on Surfaces Using Clear Adhesive Tape

IESO Standard 1120;

Standard Practice for Sampling Mold on Surfaces Using Wetted Swabs

IESO Standard 1210;

Standard Practice for Sampling Mold in Air Using a Cassette Slide Impactor

IESO Standard 1220;

Standard Practice for Sampling Mold in Air Using a Viable Impactor

IESO Standard 1310;

Standard Practice for Sampling Dust in Carpet and on Surfaces Using a Vacuum Filtration Device

# Mold Inspection and Sample Limitations and Exclusions

Purpose of Inspection: The purpose of this mold inspection is to identify and report visible suspect conditions, supported by analytical data, which might confirm or rule out the probability of indoor mold growth, or, in the judgment of the Inspector, warrant further evaluation which may include invasive inspection procedures, additional sampling, and/or referral to an appropriate specialist for further investigation and warranted actions.

Scope of Inspection: AMI mold inspections are not intended to be technically exhaustive. Inspections are non-invasive, limited in scope, and precursory to an invasive or in-depth type of inspection. Due to the inherent limitations of a non-invasive inspection, certain suspect conditions may require the collection of one or more samples and subsequent data interpretation in order to confirm or rule out potential mold contamination, potential mold spore amplification sites, potential sources of indoor mold growth, and potential negative impact on indoor air quality.

Without the analytical data that sampling provides, invasive inspection procedures beyond the scope of this inspection may be required to properly assess the likelihood of mold growth resulting from those suspect conditions. In the event the client imposes restrictions upon this inspection, such as limiting access to certain areas or declining sampling recommendations, this report shall

automatically be rendered inconclusive. AMI makes absolutely no warranty, expressed or implied, regarding the presence or absence of mold in properties where access was limited and/or sampling was recommended by the Inspector and declined by the client.

The scope of this inspection is limited to readily accessible areas within the living space of the subject property. Definitions of living space, accessible areas, and inaccessible areas are defines as follows:

#### Living Space:

Living space refers to indoor areas of the subject property that are specifically intended for human occupation. It should be noted that this is not an inspection of the exterior of the subject property; however, the Inspector may elect to examine the exterior of a the structure for conditions which may be the cause of certain suspect conditions found inside the structure.

#### Non-Living Space:

Areas not specifically intended for human occupation, including but not limited to; roofs, attics, crawl spaces, basements, storage sheds, barns, garages, utility rooms, area for appliances, HVAC systems, hot water tanks, utility meters, pool/spa equipment, irrigation equipment, storage closets, and/or any other areas that may be deemed inaccessible or unsafe in the judgment of the Inspector.

#### Accessible Areas:

Rooms and/or areas inside the living space of the subject property that - at the time of inspection: were adequately lighted and in plain view without having to move furniture, appliances, or other personal contents; were not denied access by the client, occupants, or other party; were not locked, or in any way fastened shut, or required dismantling or disassembly to view; were viewable from the floor without ladders, scaffolding, or suspension.

#### Inaccessible Areas:

\* Rooms, closets, cabinets, access doors, inspection panels, that are locked, sealed, nailed, screwed, welded, or bolted or in any way fastened shut. Areas behind doors, vents, plates, or any type of covers that are fixed or cannot be opened without dismantling or other invasive measures.

\*Areas in rooms, closets, and cabinets that cannot be viewed without moving or removing personal contents and property, appliances, furniture, wall decorations, wall coverings, floor coverings, window treatments, electrical fixtures, plumbing fixtures, etc., and/or any other areas that may be deemed inaccessible or unsafe in the judgment of the Inspector.

\*Areas that cannot be inspected without invasive or destructive inspection procedures, including but not limited to; inner-wall cavities, inner-ceiling cavities, inner-floor cavities, HVAC systems and ductwork.

#### Point In Time:

All of the statements, comments, test results, or other information in this report regarding any visual inspection observations, sampling recommendations, and lab results from sampling represent exclusively the moment in time when the inspection/testing occurred. AMI makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that any of the statements, comments, test results, or other information in this report was or is in any way applicable or relevant to any point in time prior to or following the specific date and time when the inspection/testing occurred.

#### Renovated Structures:

AMI makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that recently renovated structures are free from mold problems even though no visible suspect conditions are observed at the time of inspection, and even though air sample results detect no elevated or unusual airborne mold spore condition. If the subject property was renovated prior to this inspection and/or testing there is always a possibility that water damage, mold growth, and other conditions associated with mold were covered up with the application of new paint, cabinets, floor coverings, etc.

It is also possible that air samples collected in a freshly renovated and cleaned structure could show nothing unusual, even though a hidden mold condition exists. For that reason, a sampling protocol of recently renovated structures should include the collection of one or more ERMI samples along with air samples at the time of inspection/testing and a follow up inspection with similar testing be repeated within 60 to 120 days.

#### Vacant Structures:

AMI makes no warranty, expressed or implied, that vacant structures are free from mold problems even though no visible suspect conditions were observed at the time of inspection, and even though air sample results detect no elevated or unusual airborne mold spore condition at the time of sampling. Vacant buildings may have drain pipes or water supply lines that can leak and go undetected during vacancy and not become known until the structure is reoccupied. For that reason, if the subject property has been vacant for an extended period of time, a thorough sampling protocol should include the collection of one or more ERMI samples at the time of inspection along with air samples. It is also recommended that a follow up inspection and similar testing be repeated within 60 to 120 days.

#### **Inspector Credentials**

INDUSTRY CERTIFICATIONS All AMI Mold Inspectors hold one or more of the following certifications: CMI - Certified Mold Inspector Issuing Agency: Pro-Lab, Professional Laboratories 3300 Corporate Ave Bldg: #112 Weston, FL 33331 **CRMI - Certified Residential Mold Inspector** Issuing Agency: IESO - Indoor Environmental Standards Organization 12339 Carroll Avenue Rockville, MD 20852 **CRMI - Certified Residential Mold Inspector** Issuing Agency: ACAC - American Council for Accredited Certification (formerly AmIAOC - The American Indoor Air Quality Council) Post Office Box 11599 Glendale, Arizona 85318 \* Certification accredited by CESB - The Council of Engineering & Scientific Specialty Boards AIEA - Accredited Indoor Environmental Assessor Issuing Agency: IEAQC - Indoor Environmental Air Quality Council 6921 NW 34 Street Margate, FL 33063 CMIA - Certified Mold Inspector & Assessor Issuing Agency: ESA - Environmental Solutions Association 416 Pine Street, Ste.201 Williamsport, PA 17701

If you have any further questions about your report, please call 760-650-2099

# Disclaimers

#### EPA and Indoor Mold

Any molds identified in this report may often be associated with excessive moisture and can be problematic in indoor environments at high levels. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommends that any indoor mold growth be addressed immediately and that all water or moisture sources be eliminated.

#### Mold Growth

Mold can grow on virtually any organic substance, as long as moisture and oxygen are present. When excessive moisture accumulates in buildings or on building materials, mold growth will often occur, particularly if the moisture problem remains undiscovered or unaddressed. Many building materials are made of cellulose, which are highly absorbent and provide favorable conditions for mold growth when wet or moist.

In all instances, any water intrusion must be stopped and the extent of water damage determined. Moisture problems may include roof leaks, plumbing leaks, landscaping sprinklers and drainage, gutters that direct water into or under a building, and un-vented combustion appliances such as gas dryers and stoves. Specific methods of assessing and remediating mold contamination should only be completed by industry professionals who specialize in the remediation and remediation of mold.

#### Data Integrity

The information contained in this report was compiled from a variety of sources including but not limited to Environmental Microbiology Laboratory, Inc. (EMLAB), ProLab, the EPA " Brief Guide to Mold; Moisture, and Your Home", "Mold Remediation in Schools and Commercial Buildings", the New York City Dept of Health "Guidelines on Assessment and Remediation of Fungi in Indoor Environments", the American Conference of Governmental Hygienists "Bioaerosols, Assessment and Control", the Indoor Environmental Standards Organization (IESO).

-

The information contained in this report is general in nature and should not be considered technically exhaustive. Interpretation of mold analysis reports is a scientific work in progress, therefore, the information contained in this report is subject to change without notice as more data regarding fungal contaminants becomes available. Neither AMI nor EMLAB makes any warranties, expressed or implied, as to the use of any interpretive data by anyone associated with the subject property. Neither AMI nor EMLAB makes any warranty or determination as to the environmental soundness, safety or health of any property based on sample data.

Due to the subjective nature of fungal analysis and the mold growth process, laboratory samples can and do change over time relative to the originally sampled material. Both AMI and EMLAB reserve the right to properly dispose of all samples after the testing of such samples are sufficiently completed or after a 7 day period; whichever occurs first. For more information: visit http://www.epa.gov/iaq/mo/ds/index.htm or www.nyc.gov/htm//dohl1ltmllei/eimo/dhtm

#### Analytical Data

All analysis and analytical report generation is performed by EMLAB. AMI Environmental Testing, LLC, its employees, owners, managers, filed inspectors, and contractors make absolutely no warranty, expressed or implied, regarding the accuracy of the statements, opinions, findings and/or conclusions of third party vendors, including EMLAB

#### Advice

AMI does not engage in nor offer any advice or opinions, expressed or implied, regarding building construction services, structural design services, engineering services, mold remediation services, remodeling services, medical services or treatment, legal services, real estate transaction services, tenant-landlord-rights, or microbiology services. For advice or opinions regarding any of these respective areas please refer to a qualified expert.

EN	/ISL	EMSL Analytical, Inc. 7916 Convoy Court,Building 4, Suite A San Dieg Phone/Fax: 858-499-1303 / (858) 499-1304 http://www.EMSL.com / sandiegolab@emsl.com	jo, CA 92111	Order ID: Customer ID: Customer PO: Project ID:	431400580 32AMOI62
Attn:	AMI Env	vironmental Testing, LLC	Phone:	(760) .84-5.7789	
	4061 Oc	zeanside Blvd.	Fax:		
	Suite E		Collected:	02/25/2014	
	Oceansi	ide, CA 92056	Received:	02/25/2014	
			Analvzed:	02/26/2014	

Proj: 5170-Laguna City, 479 Ocean Ave. Laguna Beach, CA

Test Report: Air-O	-Cell(™) Analysis of Fun	gal Spores & Particulates	by Optical Microscopy (	Methods EMSL 05-TP-003	3, ASTM D7391)
Lab Sample Number: Client Sample ID: Volume (L): Sample Location:	431400580-0001 19489253 75 Outside	431400580-0002 19489580 75 Sewer Tower Leaver	431400580-0003 19489297 75 Sewer Tower 2nd		
Spore Types	Count/m <sup>3</sup>	Count/m <sup>3</sup>	Count/m <sup>3</sup>		
Alternaria	-	-	-		
Ascospores	300	300	- 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 199		
Aspergillus/Penicillium	-	-	720		
Basidiospores	550	200	930		
Bipolaris++	-	-	-		
Chaetomium	•	•	•		
Cladosporium	760	200	680		
Curvularia	-	•			
Epicoccum	-	-	-		
Fusarium	ter a de la composition de la	n Allen - Colorado			
Ganoderma	-	-	-		
Myxomycetes++	and the second second		40		
Pithomyces	-	-	-		
Rust	and the <mark>s</mark> tandard s	- · · ·	-		
Scopulariopsis	-	-	-		
Stachybotrys	-	•	•		
Torula	-	-	-		
Ulocladium	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -				
Unidentifiable Spores	-	-	-		
Zygomycetes	-	Real Andreas - Constant	- 2.5	<ul> <li>March 1997</li> </ul>	
Total Fungi	1610	700	2370		
Hyphal Fragment	and the second	and the second second	•		
Insect Fragment	-	-	-		
Pollen	40	40			
Analyt. Sensitivity 600x	42	42	42		
Analyt. Sensitivity 300x	13*	13*	13*		
Skin Fragments (1-4)	2	2	2		
Fibrous Particulate (1-4)	1	1	1		
Background (1-5)	2	2	2		

Myxomycetes++ = Myxomycetes/Periconia/Smut Bipolaris++ = Bipolaris/Drechslera/Exserohilum

No discernable field blank was submitted with this group of samples.

Michelaelle

Michelle LaVallee, Laboratory Manager or Other Approved Signatory

High levels of background particulate can obscure spores and other particulates leading to underestimation. Background levels of 5 indicate an overloading of background particulates, prohibiting accurate detection and quantification. Present = Spores detected on overloaded samples. Results are not blank corrected unless otherwise noted. The detection limit is equal to one fungal spore, structure, pollen, fiber particle or insect fragment. "" Denotes particles found at 300%. "" Denotes nol detected. Due to method stopping rules, raw counts in excess of 100 are extrapolated based on the percentage analyzed. EMSL maintains liability limited to cost of analysis. This report relates only to the samples reported above and may not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval by EMSL. EMSL bears no responsibility for sample collection activities or analytical method limitations. Interpretation and use of test results are the responsibility of the client. Samples received in good condition unless otherwise noted.

Samples analyzed by EMSL Analytical, Inc. San Diego, CA A2LA Accredited Environmental Testing Cert #2845.07

Initial report from: 02/26/2014 16:10:58

For Information on the fungi listed in this report please visit the Resources section at www.emsl.com

5170

4061 Oceanside Blvd., Suite E Oce	eanside, CA 92056
-----------------------------------	-------------------

760.650.2099

Ē	NVI	RON	ME	NT.	AL	TES	TIN	G								SER	vi	CE AG	REEM	ENT	/ INVOI	CE /	SALE	SR	ECEIPT
Orde	er Date	:						inspe	ection	Date:	2	Ţ	25/1	Ч	1	Time: 10		AM	Order	ed By:	CLIE	EN	T		
CL	IEN <sup>-</sup>	r ini	<b>-</b> 0:													SUBJEC	CTI	PROPE	RTY IN	FO:					
Clie	nt Nam	e: C	F	1	0 F	- נ	A	61	JAI	A	6	<u> </u>	104		14	Lab Tracking	g #:								-
Sub	ject Ad	dress:	4-	70	1	00	:8	AA	) /	AV	E	÷.			ľ	Property Typ	<b>90</b> :	SFH Multi-Unit		Co	ndo-Apt		(	Comm	ercial C
City	LA	61	IN	A	B	2	40	'H		State	Ċ	A	Zip: 976	5	1	Payment:	Pre	-Paid CC		Pai Hold Fo	d Check	1	Check #:		<u> </u>
Pho	ne #1:	वर	10	4	7-	70	03	36	Ö						†	Notes:			MIT	0		-			
Pho	ne #2:	91	19	1	10	3	, (	10	24	8						Jobsite Cont other than c	tact:	)	KInn	1			· · ·		
Ema	Ψ	Br	20	in	N)	() ()		16	U N	JA	ß	<u>۶</u>	CHCIT	Y.	.N	Contact Pho	ine:								
Fax				<u>v -</u>		<u> </u>	-		-	<u> </u>	-	<u> </u>				Security:	_	1	Lock Box		······	G C	Gate ode		
Note	<b>95</b> :											- <del>-</del>			P	Gee Qualu			0040.						
								i.																	
SE	RVI	CEC	)ES	CR	IPT	ION	1 -	INS	PE	СТІ	ON:							LO	CATION					A	MOUNT
1)	Bas	sic C	urso	ory	Visi	l lat	Insp	ecti	on a	and	Rep	ort	Generation											\$ <b>(</b>	500
2)	Pos	st-Re	eme	dia	tion	Sur	vey	,																\$	
3)	Sta	ndai	dS	ervi	ice (	Call	Fee	e																\$	
SE	RVI	CEE	ES	CR	IPT	ION	2 -	SA	MPL	LINC	 3:	The	following sar	nple	e reco	ommenda	atior	ns are re	quired to	confi	rm or rule	out th	ne proba	ability	y of
mo	ld gro	owth	and/	or t	he p	oter	ntial	nega	ative	imp	act t	o in	door air qualit	y æ	s the	result of s	sus	oect con	ditions ol	bserve	ed in the v	isual	inspecti	ion.	
0					RIA			Я		So		ust											٦		
IOLI		de	ų	¥	CTE	dab	tter	THE	ad	best	ç	MUC									¥		¥		
2	Ai	Sw	Ľ	Bu	ΒA	ŝ	Š	0	Le	As	2	Ë			LOC	ATION					ACCEPT	DE	CLINE	A	MOUNT
1)	X												OUTS	11	DE						X			\$ }	00
2)	X												STORA	6	<u> U</u>	NDE	R	<u>- RF</u>	MP				$\times$	\$	100
3)	X		_										SEWE	R	D	WER	<u>    t</u>	SW	<u>EF</u>		$\times$	<u> </u>		\$	100
4)	X		_								ļ		SEWE	R	<u>to</u>	WER	2 '	2NF	Aig	R	×			\$	100
5)			-						<u> </u>	L										_	•			\$	
6)										ļ		<u> </u>												\$	
7)	-		$\neg$				-	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<b> </b>										<b> </b>		\$	
8)	$\vdash$		$\dashv$							-										-+-			<u>.</u>	<b>₽</b>	
10		$\left  - \right $	-		<u> </u>			┝		┣──	-											┨──		s	
11	j					-	-			┢		-	<u> </u>							-+		┼──		s.	
12	) 		-							$\vdash$		┢							<u> </u>	-+		<del>  -</del>		\$	
	<u> </u>	L			L	L	L	<b>I</b>	L	<u> </u>	<b>.</b>	-	L.,							-			5 8	0	0-
																					<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

THIS AGREEMENT, by and between the CLIENT and AMI Environmental Testing, LLC (AMI) is subject to the terms and conditions described on the front and backsides of this document. The CLIENT warrants that he/she is the legal owner, or tenant, or agent of the Subject Property with full authority to enter into this agreement and grant AMI access to the property. Client understands and agrees that the inspection performed by AMI is a limited, cursory, non-invasive visual inspection in compliance with IESO standards and may require analytical support data from samples to confirm or rule out the probability of mold growth and/or the potential negative impact on indoor air quality resulting from suspect conditions observed during the inspection. Client further understands and agrees that any areas of the subject property that were inaccessible or blocked from view at the time of inspection are excluded from the inspection and report findings and documents. In the event that invasive testing procedures are used, CLIENT understands and agrees that AMI is not responsible for filling holes or closing any openings created as a result of such procedures.

I have read the terms and conditions of this Service Agreement and agree to all herein.

Wide Birn Signed:

**X. A. A.A.**I

\_\_\_\_ Date: X 2/25/14

#### TERMS AND CONDITIONS INCLUDING MOLD INSPECTION AND SAMPLE LIMITATIONS AND EXCLUSIONS

AMI mold inspections are cursory in nature and are not intended to be technically exhaustive. AMI mold inspections should be considered precursory to secondary inspections of a more invasive type. Client understands and agrees that certain limitations inherent with this non-invasive visual inspection may require subsequent sample collection and data interpretation to confirm or rule out potential mold contamination, mold spore amplification sites, negatively impacted indoor air quality, as well as potential sources and causes of indoor mold growth. Client also understands and agrees that any restrictions placed on the inspection by the Client, including but not limited to declining sampling recommendations, will automatically render the final disposition of the inspection and report documents inconclusive. Client also understands and agrees that AMI is not responsible for inspecting any areas in or around the subject property that were inaccessible at the time of inspection (as describe below in Section 3) and that such areas will not be included in the inspection or report documents. Client also understands and agrees that certain mold conditions may exist in the subject property that can not be identified within the scope and limitations of this type of non-invasive inspection and releases AMI from any liability to report such conditions. It is understood and agreed that any reference to "AMI" includes but is not limited to its employees, agents, owners, or officers.

1. Purpose of Inspection: The purpose of a mold inspection is to identify and report visible suspect conditions, which – supported by analytical data (laboratory test results) – either confirm or rule out the probability of indoor mold growth, or which – in the judgment of the Inspector – may warrant further evaluation that may include additional sampling and/or referral to an appropriate specialist for further investigation and warranted actions.

2. Scope of Inspection: The scope of this inspection is limited to readily accessible areas within the living space of the subject property. Definitions of living space, accessible areas, and inaccessible areas are defined as follows:

#### 2.1 Living Space:

Indoor areas of the subject property that are normal places which people occupy, i.e. living rooms, family rooms, dining rooms, bedrooms, bathrooms, offices, libraries, closets, laundry rooms, etc.

#### 2.2 Non-Living Space:

Areas not considered living space include; roofs, attics, crawl spaces, basements, storage sheds, barns, garages, exterior rooms for appliances, HVAC systems, hot water tanks, utility meters, pool/spa equipment, irrigation equipment, storage closets, and/or any other areas that may be deemed unsafe in the judgment of the Inspector.

#### 2.3. Accessible Areas:

Areas that are unlocked and in plain view at the time of inspection; areas that are adequately lighted at the time of inspection; areas that are viewable at the time of inspection without having to move personal contents or personal property; areas that are viewable from the floor without ladders, scaffolding, or suspension.

# 2.4 Inaccessible areas include, but are not limited to:

Rooms, closets, cabinets, access doors, inspection panels, that are locked, sealed, nailed, screwed, welded, or bolted shut: areas that require causing damage to paint or materials to open: areas behind doors, vents, plates, or any type of covers that are fixed or cannot be opened without invasive measures: areas in rooms, closets, and cabinets that cannot be viewed without moving or removing personal contents and property, appliances, furniture, wall decorations, wall coverings, floor coverings, window treatments, electrical fixtures, plumbing fixtures, etc.: areas that cannot be inspected without invasive or destructive inspection procedures, including but not limited to; inner-wall cavities, inner-ceiling cavities, inner-floor cavities, HVAC systems and ductwork

**3.** Payment: Payment for services provided by AMI in accordance with this agreement is due before or at the time of service in the form of cash, check, or credit card. Payment in full is required prior to releasing a report. Under special circumstances AMI, at its discretion, may elect to extend special payment considerations to a client. Failure to honor the payment terms agreed upon will result in legal proceedings by AMI to lien the subject property according to provisions made available by the State of California to contractors performing services for the improvement of real estate.

6. Report Release: AMI reserves the right to withhold the release of report documents until payment for services have been made in full.

7. Disputes: All disputes shall be resolved by arbitration in San Diego County California.

mac. , , , lander						
Sem 1 2/25/14 1:22	N					Γ
				SAME AS ABOVE		$ \rangle$
		Linu	LAB BAE CHI	BY: DATE:	NQUISHED	NELE
	sq.m		<u> </u>			22
	sq.m.	min	i indi			21
	vi bs	um	ipm			20
	sq in	min	ipm			19
	sq in	min	ipm			18
	şqin	min	lpm			1
	so m	min	lþm			16
	sq.m	min	ipri			15
	sq.m	min	mdt			14
	sq m	min	Ipm			13
	sq.m	min	lpm			12
	sq.in	nim	- Ipm			11
	SA T	min	- Ipm			10
	5	3	End.			g
	sq.in	min	l Ipm			8
	sq.m.	nur,				7
	sq in	mit	, Ipro			6
	sq m	mi	- ipr			сл
L6263her V	ni þs	h	1 1 101			4
A 19489580	5 5 5	1	12 Iou	STATION LITER BANK	A	3
A 19489253	5			SEWER TOWER I AND	N	2
TRAP SAMPLE ID	AREA	TIME	VOLUME	OUTSIDS	$^{\wedge}$	_
RAP TYPE: Air-O-Cell = A Micro 5 = M	T T	ERMI = E	Carpet = C	SAMPLE LOCATION	# TYPE	ē
	LIDAY	END/HO	U WEEK	Air=A Table=T Bulk=B Such=C WILLOW	MPLE TYPE	SAI
					IN-AROUND	
	ß	IT TI	VA SE	ORMATION OCZAIN AVZ. UAVI	NPLE NP	84
	W		TRACKING #	10- LADUNA (TY POMPTEUNIE 2/25/14	TING ADDRESS	TES
						PRO
SULTS TO: accounting@amitesting.com	IL LAB RE:	SEEMA	PLEX			3
		(6 <b>%</b> )		<b>INTERNIRONMENTAL TESTING TO</b>		
						5

and an att the address of the second

. M

31400580

Page 1 Of

1