



During our analysis we gathered the following information: Existing drawings of the subject property sites and buildings, Town of Somerset historical information concerning the original pool installation and lengthy approval process during the period of 1965 through 1970, current Town of Somerset data concerning the surveys, town discussion about the proposed options and a prior study on the flood plain at the swimming pool site. A complete list of the data collected and sources is in Appendix B.

We researched the following applicable codes and ordinances, including direct contacts for clarifications to applicable authorities:

- International Code Council (ICC) International Building Code 2003
- National Fire Protection Association NFPA 101 Life Safety Code 2003
- Montgomery County Zoning Ordinance 2004 - Updates through August 2006.
- Montgomery County Department of Health – Swimming Pool Guidelines ANSI/NSPI – 1 2003
- Maryland Building Code for the Handicapped, State of Maryland Commercial Code (COMAR)
- Mandatory Referral Process, Maryland National Capitol Park & Planning Commission (MNCPPC)
- American Disabilities Act (ADA) including ANSI 117

We consulted the following professionals, experienced industry consultants and government agency representatives:

- Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS): Ms. Robin Ferro (DPS- Zoning Review)
- Montgomery County Department of Health & Human Services: Mr. Jack Mohr (Licensing & Regulatory)
- Maryland National Capitol Park & Planning Commission (MNCPPC): Ms. Marian Clark
- Brown & Knopf Attorneys: Mr. Norman Knopf, Mr. Andrew Strongin
- VIKA Engineering: Mr. Chuck Irish
- Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
- Bethesda Chevy Chase YMCA: Mr. Bill Kuster, Director of Aquatics
- Century Pool Management: Mr. Ed Garcia
- Lavery Pool Management: Mr. Hank Lavery
- Olympia Pools: Mr. Aaron Wood
- Eichberg Construction: Mr. Jay Eichberg
- Heidenberger Construction: Mr. Steve Heidenberger

We prepared the following items:

- Computer models of the existing facilities
- Template floor plans of the proposed options to determine areas
- Spreadsheet for the plumbing fixture counts
- Spreadsheets for the probable estimates of probable construction costs
- Documentation of source information and data

Based upon our review discussions and analysis, it is our opinion that Options 1E, 2 and 3 will have difficulty in achieving jurisdictional approval. Constructing these options will cause significant amounts of soil disturbance, which will complicate and lengthen the approval process. The approval process for these options could take years at considerable legal and design team expense with no guarantee of a positive outcome.

This is because the pool building, deck and pool are within the Little Falls Branch Stream Valley Buffer. Parts of the pool and pool deck also encroach upon the 100-Year Flood Plain building restriction lines as delineated in the VIK A Engineering Report. These options have higher construction costs due to their larger size and commensurately higher operating and maintenance costs. We base our opinion on conversations with staff at Montgomery County DPS, VIK A Engineering and MNCPPC staff. Even if impervious area trade-offs were explored with the County, the individuals that spoke to us were emphatic in their opinions, which indicated a preference for modest change. Their preference was to limit the amount of soil disturbance during construction as well as impervious area. The Town's attorney, Mr. Norman Knopf, concurred with this assessment during the October 30 meeting.

Of the remaining options, it is our opinion that the Options 1C and 1D also have the potential for some approval risks: Option 1D and Option 1C have space requirements that will add impervious area to the site. If Option 1D is two stories, its increased area to accommodate vertical circulation, would expand forward and adversely impact the specimen-sized trees currently to the east and front of the existing bathhouse. If the town wishes to pursue these options, their viability would be improved by reducing the proposed area and activities to keep within the existing impervious pool deck area. Parts of the existing bathhouse may need to be retained to preserve the current grandfathered zoning status.

The remaining swimming pool Options 1A, 1B, Option 4 (1B), Option 5 and Option 6, if constructed upon existing impervious area adjacent to the existing bathhouse, would, in our opinion, have a better chance of achieving approval, as they disturb the least amount of soil in the Stream Valley Buffer. All the swimming pool options are subject to the Mandatory Referral Process that includes adjacent property holder notification and public hearings. The Town's attorney, Mr. Norman Knopf, also concurred with this assessment.

Option 7, which proposes the new community room at the Town Hall site, does not have the environmental sensitivity of the swimming pool complex and better chance of achieving approvals. This project (Option 7) will also be subject to the Mandatory Referral Process.

Regardless which course of action the town chooses to pursue, both the Bathhouse and the Town Hall have significant structural problems that need to be addressed promptly. Both buildings are in urgent need of repair and renovation.

If Option 4, 5 or 6, which include modest improvements, are the course of action the Town of Somerset selects, it is sensible to include those items with the repairs. However, if the town decides that it wants Option 1C, 1D, 1E, 2 or 3, which will require an extensive and probably lengthy review process, we would advise making the necessary repairs and renovations as soon as possible to properly maintain the town's existing buildings.

Following the initial presentation, The Town of Somerset requested an added option, which is herein included as Option 1G.

**ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATING COSTS**

<b>OPTION</b>	<b>ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST (HARD COST ONLY IN PRESENT DOLLARS)</b>	<b>ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS (PRESENT DOLLARS)</b>
OPTION 1A	\$1,231,800	\$128,000
OPTION 1B	\$1,600,800	\$128,000
OPTION 1C	\$2,050,800	\$360,000
OPTION 1D	\$2,778,300	\$480,000
OPTION 1D-2 LEVELS	\$3,055,800	\$480,000
OPTION 1E	\$3,283,800	\$732,000
OPTION 1E-2LEVELS	\$4,099,800	\$732,000
OPTION 1G	\$2,036,400	\$128,000
OPTION 2	\$8,065,800	\$892,000
OPTION 3	\$4,129,800	\$732,000
OPTION 4	\$345,600	0 (as part of 1A or 1B)
OPTION 5	\$182,400	0 (as Part of 1A or 1B)
OPTION 6	\$90,000	0 (as part of 1A or 1B)
OPTION 7	\$1,429,200	\$60,000

**N.B. COSTS TO NOT INCLUDE FEES, SOFT COSTS OR INFLATION ESCALATION**