EXHIBIT 1

THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT DV in green; Renco in Blue	RELEVANT PROJECT AREAS Building Envelope Section	Subsection	PLAINTIFF GALLERY - INITIAL (SBSA & Nautilus) June 23, 2021 & July 23, 2021 Defect/Damages	Repair	Cost of Repair	PLAINTIFF GALLERY - SUPPLEMENTAL – October 15, 2021 (SBSA) & November 8 , 2021 (Nautilus) Defect/Damages	Repair	Cost of Repair	PLAINTIFF GALLERY - REBUTTAL - May 2, 2022 Defect/Damages	Repair	Cost of Repair	DEFENDANT KHOV - INITIAL (BHA) - August 11, 2021 & August 22, 2021 Defect/Damages	Repair	Cost of Repair	Subcontractor Allocation	DEFENDANT KHOV - SUPPLEMENTAL (BHA) February 25, 2022 Defect/Damages	Repair	Cost of Repair	Subcontractor Allocation	THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANTS - INITIAL (DV - HCCI / Renco - MC) - January 31, 2022 Defect/Damages	Repair	Cost of Repair
Desert Vista	Façade - Stucco	Missing Weep Mechanism in Stucco	Weep casing beads were missing at fenestration heads, stucco roof pop-outs, and soffit terminations, which violates the architectural drawings, the stucco manufacturer requirements, and the building code requirements. This creates a system which does not drain moisture to the exterior as required by the architectural drawings and stucco manufacturer requirements. (p. 64 of SBSA report)	Recommends repairs to be performed on all buildings and a full removal and replacement of the stucco and the exterior insulation.	$33,862.76	Stucco issues not addressed in SBSA supplemental report		not changed	SBSA disagrees with BHA that weep mechanisms and flashing are not required at horizontal terminations to provide for a functional water shedding capacity of the veneer. As to BHA's opinion that the contractor is solely responsible for construction means, methods, technique, sequences, and procedure, SBSA distinguishes this by stating the responsibility is limited as it relates to the approved assemblies, not the deviation of the approved assemblies. (p. 14 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Agrees with BHA as to the repairs to the wall-to-soffit locations. Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	BHA stated that SBSA was grouping two different conditions together, missing weep mechanisms at window heads and missing weep mechanisms at wall-to-soffit transitions. all window heads exposed by SBSA were flashed according to installation guidelines. In examining the flashing and WRB tested by SBSA, Khov's expert did not observe any evidence of non-performance. BHA observed some locations with clear evidence of where the lack of a weep mechanism at the soffit has allowed moisture to accumulate behind the stucco system and deteriorate the WRB. (p. 10 of BHA defense report)	Condition should be repaired.	$43,975.00	None	Unchanged (p. 10 of BHA response report)	At all wall-to-soffit locations, remove a 12-inch strip of stucco and install weeps integrated with WRB before restoring stucco system.	$449,355.00	73% = $2,392,931.00	Did not observe any place that would require a weep mechanism; other than garage doors. (p. 8 of HCCI expert report)		Adopted Khov's INITIAL Cost of Repair totaling $49,905.00 for Desert Vista's scope of work.
Desert Vista	Façade - Stucco	Non-Compliant Water Resistance Barrier (WRB) for Stucco System	The applied WRB does not meet the nominal weight, the number of required layers, the water resistance requirements of the applicable building code, and the ESR-3529 report for the Amerimix stucco system, which impairs the functionality of the stucco system. (p. 81 of SBSA report)	Recommends repairs to be performed on all buildings and a full removal and replacement of the stucco and the exterior insulation.	$1,255,881.62	Stucco issues not addressed in this supplemental report			SBSA disagrees with BHA that the WRB used at the Gallery Project site is compliant with the requirements specified on the approved architectural drawings. WRB does not meet the water resistance requirements. (p. 15 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	BHA observed the destructive testing of the stucco and documented the appropriate WRB was installed over open framing. Except for the wall-to-soffit areas discussed above, the WRB installed at this Project is performing and no defect exists, and no repairs needed. (p. 11 of BHA defense report)	Disagreed with SBSA's repair. Removing and replacing the stucco system and WRB at every building is excessive and unnecessary. No repairs necessary.	$0	None	removal of the estimate of "less than $100,000 total to perform this repair at all the buildings" and instead stated that this repair is included in BHA's repair for allegation. (p. 11 of BHA response report)	no repairs	$0	73% = $2,392,931.00	It appears there are deviations from the stucco system in the ESR report but reasonable defenses are: that the deviations are not uncommon, are nominal, and from a performance standpoint, the stucco system is performing as intended. HCCI believes the stucco system was compliant in all areas except limited areas where OSB. (p. 15 of HCCI expert report)		
Desert Vista	Façade - Stucco	Non-Compliant EPS Foam Board for Stucco System	Flat-faced foam boards (lacking vertical grooves) installed tight to the WRB are non-compliant and obstruct drainage of the moisture behind the stucco. Use of non-compliant EPS foam boards in combination with the non-compliant WRB type reduces the overall performance of the moisture-management system. (p. 91 of SBSA report)	Recommends repairs to be performed on all buildings and a full removal and replacement of the stucco and the exterior insulation.	**included in Building Envelope 1.0B repair cost (direct cost $1,255,881.62 for this item).**	Stucco issues not addressed in this supplemental report		**included in Building Envelope 1.0B repair cost (direct cost $1,276,075.15 for this item)**	SBSA disagrees with BHA that no defect exists. SBSA states that BHA agrees with SBSA regarding lack of grooves behind the EPS foam board but fails to realize that lack of drainage mechanisms is a deficiency. (p. 16 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	BHA did not observe any damage that would suggest the lack of grooves in EPS foam over short sections of OSB was not performing as well as the EPS foam on the rest of the wall. A technical deficiency is not a defect; performing as intended. No defect exists. (p. 12 of BHA defense report)	no repairs required.	$0	None	unchanged (p. 12 of BHA response report)	no repairs	$0	73% = $2,392,931.00	HCCI stated the EPS is waterproof, which helps in defense from a water intrusion standpoint. Water can go beyond the EPS from a design standpoint. (p. 21 of HCCI expert report)		
Desert Vista	Façade - Stucco	Non-Compliant Slope of Horizontal Stucco Surfaces	Stucco roof parapet caps, roof pop-out boxes, and pop-out boxes at front and rear elevations with inadequate slope are present at locations across all buildings. The improper slopes combined with cracks in the stucco allows water to penetrate under the stucco system. (p. 99 of SBSA report)	Recommends repairs to be performed on all buildings and a full removal and replacement of the stucco and the exterior insulation.	**included in Building Envelope 1.0B repair cost (direct cost $1,255,881.62 plus $26,200.00 for this item)**	Stucco issues not addressed in this supplemental report		**included in Building Envelope 1.0B repair cost plus additional repairs (direct cost $1,276,075.15 plus $26,200.00 for this item)**	SBSA states that it and BHA disagree that slope of the pop-out boxes and parapet caps are compliant and that it is performing as intended to shed water at both the surface and the waterproofing. SBSA opines that the cracks at the stucco surfaces and the non-compliant slope do not allow the system to function as intended. (p. 17 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	None of the framing was stained or showed any evidence of water damage resulting from inadequate slope. Observed positive slope at roof parapet caps. Did not observe any signs of standing water on top of parapet caps. BHA argues that the intent of the designer was to prevent water from standing on the parapet caps, so it does not matter if the slope at one spot is different than another spot because what matters is the as-constructed condition is performing as intended. No defect exists. (p. 13 of BHA defense report)	no repairs required.	$0	None	unchanged (p. 13 of BHA response report)	no repairs	$0	73% = $2,392,931.00	Agreed with BHA that no defect exists. HCCI stated the tops of the parapet walls appeared to slope properly where he was able to observe. Did not observe non-compliant slopes. Desert Vista's expert opined that since water does not 'pool' or collect in these areas for longer than 24 hours, there are no damages. (p. 25 of HCCI expert report)		
Desert Vista	Facade - Stucco	Deficient Self-Adhered Memrane (SAM) under Horizontal Stucco System	Cracks at horizontally applied stucco surfaces were documented throughout. Cracks and puncture holes due to the staples and nails used to attach the stucco system were documented through the SAM. Rusted fasteners and stains on the framing below at some intrusive examination locations indicate water intrusion occurred through the puncture holes in the SAM. As constructed, all of which will allow moisture intrusion and do not comply with the weather-resistance requirements. (p. 113 of SBSA report)	Recommends repairs to be performed on all buildings and a full removal and replacement of the stucco and the exterior insulation.	included in above				SBSA disagrees with BHA that SAM installed on horizontal surfaces of the stucco is not deficient and that BHA does not account for the condition of the fasteners penetrating the SAM. Intrusive testing found that the self-heal property failed to prevent moisture to penetrate the SAM, which is indicative of water intrusion below the membrane. (p. 20 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	BHA documented the SAM was properly installed. SBSA has not provided any evidence fastener penetrations have caused the SAM to fail. No defect exists. (p. 14 of BHA defense report)	no repairs required.	$0	None	unchanged (p. 14 of BHA response report)	no repairs	$0	73% = $2,392,931.00	Movement joints are not usually installed in residential construction. The cracking in the parapet walls are nominal, crack sizes are well within industry standards. (p. 30 of HCCI expert report)		
Desert Vista	Façade - Stucco	Missing Control/Movement Joints	No horizontal control joints were installed and no vertical control joints were installed on the front and rear elevations at any of the buildings. (p. 122 of SBSA report)	Recommends repairs to be performed on all buildings and a full removal and replacement of the stucco and the exterior insulation.	**included in Building Envelope 1.0B repair cost (direct cost$1,276,075.15 for this item)**	Stucco issues not addressed in this supplemental report		**included in Building Envelope 1.0B repair cost (direct cost $1,276,075.15 for this item)**	SBSA disagrees with BHA that lack of control joints does not constitute a construction defect. SBSA disagrees with BHA that the standards referenced by SBSA do not apply to this stucco system and that the drawings did not specify joints. (p. 22 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	BHA stated that SBSA's stucco allegations cited standards that apply to three-coat stucco systems, however here the project used a one-coat system. BHA maintains there is no practical need for control joints in a one-coat stucco system. No defect exists. (p. 15 of BHA defense report)	no repairs required.	$0	None	unchanged (p. 15 of BHA response report)	no repairs	$0	73% = $2,392,931.00	HCCI agreed with BHA that no defect exists. (p. 33 of HCCI expert report)		
Desert Vista	Moisture-Management System (Barriers, Flashings, Drainage)	Missing Sheet Metal Flashing at Fenestrations	The sheet metal flashings were generally missing at the fenestration heads. As constructed, the moisture-management system at fenestration heads is non-compliant with the architectural drawings. (p. 135 of SBSA report)	SBA recommended repairs to be performed at elevated decks and awnings, remove existing edge flashing and membrane/coating to allow for stucco repairs	$19,732.57	Stucco issues not addressed in this supplemental report		not changed	SBSA disagrees with BHA that sheet metal head flashings are not necessary at horizontal terminations to provide a functional complaint system. (p. 26 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	The windows were flashed following the window manufacturers recommendations, which does not require any metal head flashing. Deviation from non-structural detail is not a defect. No defect exists. (p. 15 of BHA defense report)	no repairs required.	$0	None	unchanged (p. 16 of BHA response report)	no repairs	$0	73% = $2,392,931.00	HCCI agreed with BHA that no defect exists. HCCI does not see a legitimate deficiency and would not recommend flashing be redone. (p. 37 of HCCI expert report)		
Desert Vista	Moisture-Management System (Barriers, Flashings, Drainage)	Non-Compliant Flashing at Stucco Interface	Stains and cracks in the stucco below the edge flashing indicate that water is not diverted away from the stucco. At some locations, the edge flashing is installed over the stucco, which suggests the installer was cognizant of the project specifications. (p. 142 of SBSA report)	Remove existing edge flashing and membrane/coating to allow for stucco repairs. Install new edge flashing at decks.	$48,307.74	Stucco issues not addressed in this supplemental report		not changed	SBSA states that BHA agrees with SBSA that the deck and awning edge metal flashings require repairs where inset above the stucco cladding and that BHA's repair recommendation is generally similar to SBSA's repair recommendations. (p. 27 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	Condition was present at some locations and should be repaired. (p. 17 of BHA defense report)	Disagreed with SBSA's repair as unnecessary and excessive to remove stucco and deck coating to access edge metal and to reflash. Instead, where edge metal buried in stucco, extend edge metal past stucco by installing new sheet metal on existing drip edge.	$4,650.00	None	Now stating to remove existing deck coating over edge metal flashing and remove flashing. (p. 17 of BHA response report)	Remove existing deck coating over edge metal and remove edge metal flashing; adjust stucco to address intersection of deck and stucco surfaces; install new edge metal flashing and restore deck coating.	$18,258.00	73% = $2,392,931.00	HCCI opined that this alleged defect is outside the scope of client's work. (p. 42 of HCCI expert report)		
Desert Vista	Moisture-Management System (Barriers, Flashings, Drainage)	Non-Compliant Isolation Joints at Dissimilar Materials	Where installed, the sealant joint width was inadequate. As a result, cracks and open joints exist between materials, which act as direct paths for water to enter the wall assemblies and overwhelm and damage the underlying components. (p. 153 of SBSA report)	Reinstall cladding as required to address other repair recommendations. Following installation of sealant joints, remove surface-mounted objects in continuous sealant against the face of the cladding.	$13,766.68	Stucco issues not addressed in this supplemental report		not changed	SBSA states that it and BHA disagree that isolation joints are not required at intersections of dissimilar materials That cracking of the stucco around window openings was present in several locations and can be attributed to the missing isolation joints, as such the isolation joints are required because the window does not allow for thermal expansion. (p. 28 of SBSA Rebuttal report - BHA)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	Unchanged	Did not observe any damage resulting from missing isolation joints. Observed finish cracks along the tops of the adjacent CMU stairways at some buildings. Repairs warranted. (p. 17 of BHA defense report)	At junctures between adjacent entry stairways, remove stucco and sealant, add foam back rod and seal the gap with high grade flexible sealant.	$1,280.00	None	unchanged (p. 18 of BHA response report)	Resurface finished coat at stairway where damaged/cracked.	$1,405.00	73% = $2,392,931.00	No damages observed. (p. 46 of HCCI expert report)		
				PLAINTIFF INITIAL TOTAL DIRECT COST OF REPAIR FOR ALL FAÇADE AND MOISTURE MANAGEMENT ISSUES:	$1,398,931.37		PLAINTIFF SUPP COST OF REPAIR FOR ALL FAÇADE AND MOISTURE MANAGEMENT ISSUES:	$1,398,931.37		PLAINTIFF SUPP COST OF REPAIR:	Unchanged		KHOV INITIAL TOTAL DIRECT COST OF REPAIR:	$49,905.00			KHOV SUPP COST OF REPAIR:	$469,018.00			DESERT VISTA COST OF REPAIR:	Adopted Khov's INITIAL Cost of Repair totaling $49,905.00.
Renco Roofing	Moisture-Management System (Barriers, Flashings,	Missing Sheet Metal Flashing at Fenestrations	same as above.	same as above.	same as above.	This report mainly addresses roof leaks in new category.			Agreed with MC that this does not fall within Renco's scope of work. (p. 2 of SBSA Rebuttal report - MC Consultants)		unchanged	same as above.	same as above.	$0	None	same as above.	same as above.	$0	9% = $310,126.00	MC opined that sheet metal not in client's scope of work. (p. 6 of MC defect issue report)	N/A	$0
Renco Roofing	Moisture-Management System (Barriers, Flashings, Drainage)	Non-Compliant Flashing at Stucco Interface	same as above.	same as above.	same as above.	This report mainly addresses roof leaks in new category.			SBSA stated that MC generally agrees with SBSA that improper junction of the stucco and deck edge sheet metal flashing exists, SBSA disagrees with MC's opinion that SBSA has failed to provide evidence of damage at the deck edge flashing interface with the stucco. SBSA agrees with MC that the stucco should have been installed prior to placement of sheet metal deck edge flashing. (p. 2 of SBSA Rebuttal report - MC Consultants)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	unchanged	same as above.	same as above.	$4,650.00	None	same as above.	same as above.	$18,258.00	9% = $310,126.00	MC did observe an improper junction of the stucco and deck edge metal at some, but not all conditions, but plaintiff has not provided evidence of leaks or damages attributable to the deck edge metal installation. (p. 7 of MC defect issue report)	minimal repairs.	$4,475
Renco Roofing	Moisture-Management System (Barriers, Flashings, Drainage)	Non-Compliant Isolation Joints at Dissimilar Materials	same as above.	same as above.	same as above.	This report mainly addresses roof leaks in new category.			Agreed with MC that this does not fall within Renco's scope of work. (p. 3 of SBSA Rebuttal report - MC Consultants)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	unchanged	same as above.	same as above.	$1,280.00	None	same as above.	same as above.	$1,405.00	9% = $310,126.00	MC opined that this is not in client's scope of work. (p. 10 of MC defect issue report)	N/A	$0
Renco Roofing	Roofing System Spray Polyurethane Foam (SPF)	Non-Compliant Slope to Roof Drain	The as-build slope measurements along the roof crickets and adjacent to the drains at the units of the buildings have slopes less than required (non-compliant roof slopes on all buildings). In some cases, the roof is sloped away from the means of drainage. No crickets were installed at upslope locations of air-conditioning unit pads. Stains at low spots indicate ponding water on the roofing system to deteriorate and percolate below the roof. (p. 169 of SBSA report)	SBSA recommended to remove and replace membrane and underlying substrates as necessary to remove and replace damage underlying coverboard and structure, if present. Further, SBSA recommended to install tapered insulation to provide positive drainage and to slope cricket.	$168,616.75	This report mainly addresses roof leaks in new category.		not changed	SBSA discussed the additional repairs and roof leaks reported by the homeowner. SBSA disagrees with MC that the roof decks were constructed with the necessary slope to perform as required. SBSA goes on to state that MC generally agrees with SBSA that roof leaks are present at roof drains. (p. 3 of SBSA Rebuttal report - MC Consultants)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations. SBSA states that MC recommends a limited repair to seal penetrations, cuts, and other damages to the roof membrane and SBSA agrees that such repairs should be performed alone	unchanged	Did not observe any evidence the roofs are not performing. Noted that homeowners reported roof leaks but no conclusion as to cause of leak. No defect exists. (p. 18 of BHA defense report)	no repairs needed.	$0	None	No slope repairs are needed" and that SBSA has not "provided sufficient evidence to support its assertion that all the SPF roofs need to be removed and replaced." (p. 19 of BHA response report)	Perform roof tune up, seal all vertical laps, remove/replace roof membrane and substrate at low spots and slope to drain, seal all open or damaged penetrations	$27,180.00	9% = $310,126.00	MC agreed with BHA that roof slopes to drains are adequate. Plaintiff failed to demonstrate ponding on any roofs lasting over 48-hours. MC observed three ceiling stains in the unit but since Plaintiff did not conduct any water testing, MC was unable to determine if the stains were active or existed before any repairs were made. (p. 11 of MC defect issue report)	No significant roof repairs relevant to client's scope of work are warranted and the roofs are generally performing as intended. Perform a limited roof tune-up to seal penetrations, cuts, and other damages to the roof membrane.	$9,248.33

Renco Roofing	Elevated Decks, Balconies, or Walkways	Non-Compliant Slope of Deck	The inadequate slope should have been identified by Renco and corrected prior to installing roof. The slope of the deck edge was inadequate to promote positive drainage and allows ponding of water (some less than 2% slope). (p. 186 of SBSA report)	Repair all non-compliant decks. SBSA said to remove existing deck edge flashing, membrane, and underlying substrates as necessary to perform repairs. Install new flashing and deck coating. Flush to the existing deck surface and slope properly.	included in item 2.08 ($48,407.74 for this item)	This report mainly addresses roof leaks in new category.		included in item 2.08 ($48,407.74 for this item)	SBSA disagrees with MC that Renco would not be responsible for the non-compliant deck slope. SBSA opined that Renco had a chance to notify the general contractor and architect that the minimum required deck slope was not provided in the framing prior to placement of the deck coating. (p. 5 of SBSA Rebuttal report - MC Consultants)	Maintains its position and repair recommendations.	included in item 2.08 ($48,407.74 for this item)	Plaintiff's experts did not provide any support the decks are unsafe or deteriorating prematurely. KHov's experts conclude the decks did not show evidence of non-performance. ARDC standars allow for minor ponding. No defect exists. (p. 19 of BHA defense report)	no repairs needed.	$0	None	unchanged (p. 20 of BHA response report)	no repairs needed	$0	9% = $310,126.00	This is not relevant to Renco's scope of work; slope to be provided by framing, not the deck membrane. (p. 15 of MC defect issue report)	N/A.	$0	
Renco Roofing	Roof Leaks					New section on roof leaks "C.3.b" added to report. pp. 3-14	C.3.b - installation of reinforcing fabric at transition from SPF and perimiter of roof drain sump at all units of Building B -- apply waterproof coating -- permanent roof repair at Unit 3106 AC unit pad and - at Unit 3014 reinstall light to electricl box, apply sealant joint, coordinate with other repairs	No separate cost estimate item in Nautilus report. Report refers to "Included in Building Envelope 1.a " and "Included in Building Envelope 1.d8". Note these are costs for completed and ongoing repairs. Costs for temporary repairs through September 30, 2021 were produced (GALLERY-NBC-5064-75).	SBSA disagrees with BHA that roof leaks were due to lack of maintenance.		No separate cost estimate in Nautilus report. Note this item relates to completed and ongoing repairs including repairs conducted in December 2021 and June 2022.				BHA observed evidence of roof leaks in connection with observation of emergency repairs, testing for source of leaks was not performed. BHA did not see evidence maintenance was performed. BHA recommended a tune-up and repair of damaged interior finishes.							
				PLAINTIFF INITIAL TOTAL DIRECT COST OF REPAIR FOR ALL MOISTURE MANAGEMENT ROOF AND DECK ISSUES:	**$251,603.69**		**PLAINTIFF SUPP TOTAL DIRECT COST OF REPAIR FOR ALL MOISTURE MANAGEMENT ROOF AND DECK ISSUES:**	**Not Changed**					**KHOV INITIAL TOTAL DIRECT COST OF REPAIR:**	**$5,930.00**			**KHOV SUPP COST OF REPAIR:**	**$46,843.00**			**RENCO COST OF REPAIR:**	**$14,465.00**	(with project set-up costs)