

*mailed
4/16/05*

PLANS FOR THE 2005 SEASON WHAT THEY WERE AND WHAT THEY ARE NOW

Since the inception of a long-range roofing program, Boards learned quickly that plans cannot be cast in stone. We end up going through sometimes daily reanalysis because immediate needs often change.

The original plan for this season was simple.....finish buildings 4 and 5. Those entire roofs needed redoing , but because of more pressing problems in other buildings, only the worst sections on those 2 were done. Hopefully, anything else could wait. Last season and the season before, quite a number of sunrooms were redone and unless something pops with those, we hope to avoid having to redo any this year.

While patching to stop leaks on buildings 6 and 7, it was clear that this plan of attack was not effective or efficient. On the accompanying sheet which deals with the background of roofing here, the problems are noted. It is critical that we must finish buildings 4 and 5, and totally roof buildings 6 and 7.

*mailed
4/16/05*

SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION RE:ROOFING (A NOT SO BRIEF HISTORY) From the Board

For many years, various Boards have been dealing with repeated leak, roof and related problems. In some cases causes were known, in others they were not. Various measures were taken, most of which didn't work. What is known today is that, like many developments of the late 1980's, Long Hill may have been built with more of an eye toward profit than quality and that the construction is rather "unique". As is the case even today, with virtually every condo development nationwide, unrealistic, low monthly fees produce high sales levels while reserve funding suffers.

In the year 2000, the Board embarked upon a roofing plan designed to completely replace the main roofs of all buildings, beginning with the oldest. At the same time they, like previous Boards, dealt with repeated sunroom leaks. A contractor was hired and in 3 years time, 3 buildings were done. Meanwhile various sunrooms were also reroofed. During that 3 year span, we had a particularly brutal winter weather-wise, with ice dams anywhere and everywhere.

The plan needed to be adjusted. It was found that even roofs that had been redone not only had problems during that winter, but units that never experienced a problem prior to reroofing, now had one (or more). In 2002, the Board decided that the services of the contractor we had, who was not a professional roofer, should be terminated and with some legal dealings, that was accomplished along with retrieving the large remaining portion of \$11,000 worth of shingles which we owned that were stored in his garage. Even though the Board knew some of what he had done needed fixing, the members at the time were unanimous in their thinking that we needed a "real" roofer and professionals who knew what they were doing.

A highly recommended construction consultant was hired to assess the situation. It was determined that there was insufficient ventilation in the attics, a major contributing cause of ice dams. An insulation assessment was done. He recommended installation of turbines. He also determined something that was already known. Because these buildings have insulation board siding beneath the clapboards, nails do not stay where they belong unless they happen to be hammered into locations where studs are behind the fiberglass material. Additionally, flashing was missing all over the place, valleys were improperly shingled and a host of other problems existed. Portions of the buildings basically had to be redesigned to allow for proper roofing installation. The consultant recommended a roofer who we hired. He is still with us.

Working together, they devised a system whereby the roofs could be sectioned and priced accordingly. Portions of buildings could be redone on a prioritized basis without sacrificing outside building aesthetics. That gave us some flexibility. That plan has been followed, which is why some buildings have both gray and black shingled sections. Even some sections of buildings finished as late as 1997 needed major work.

They also dealt with problems that existed on the 3 buildings and some sunrooms done by the first contractor. The Board knew it was paying to do what should have been corrected by the original contractor, but the directors did not want him back. We cite the following examples of why that was so. In one unit where inside walls were stained and mushy in three rooms and an upstairs ceiling was hanging down, the roof section, believed to be the "culprit", was removed and it was found that not only was the area improperly roofed, but wood on the roof was rotten, the building was rotted in one area all the way into the floor joists, and much of the siding and insulation board over and next to the slider going all the way to the adjoining unit needed replacement. On another building where an owner was shoveling snow out of the unfinished

room over the garage which sometimes reached almost a foot in certain areas, and all 4 units had leaks with every rainstorm during and after the first roofing job, whole sections had to be redesigned, redone, and every ridge vent on the entire building had to be replaced. In that particular a waterlogged portion of a garage ceiling fell onto a car. Another building had mold in an upstairs closet and leaks in another room caused by improperly done sections. A garage leak was also evident. A sunroom problem ended up in litigation so the new roofer had to redo that one too. And so, on 3 buildings we paid for some sections to be done not once, but twice.

The critical roofs today are on Buildings # 6 and # 7 which have been patched until they can be patched no more. The shingles are cracked, brittle, broken, and missing. Those roofs and any related problems we may find are just waiting to potentially give people living beneath them major problems. In 2 units in Building # 7 there are repeated leaks. The roofs on Buildings #4 and # 5 have each been partially done. Like on Buildings # 6 and # 7, the remaining shingles are basically "gone". In one section done last year, it was almost impossible to remove old shingles because of their adherence to the plywood beneath them. In some areas surface mold is evident and some inside areas show signs of past or current leakage.

The replacement reserve is considered an owner asset and is one of the line items often examined by mortgage lenders. By law, it must be "adequate", "adequate" not being defined, but generally interpreted to mean, kept at a sufficient level to cover capital replacement items at the end of their useful lives. Useful lives vary and obviously, as has happened with our roofs, some replacement may be need to be done before a projected due date. We must continue to fund the reserve. In exercising its' fiduciary duty, the Board believes it is time to be proactive rather than simply reactive. Doing the work for which immediate money is needed allows us to be some of both. It is also the statutory duty of the Board to maintain the property. As we continue to faithfully fund the replacement reserve account, hopefully we and future Boards will not be in this position again.

Everything done thus far has been paid for without additional funds beyond the basic monthly fee. Somehow (and sometimes we wonder how) we have managed to go along holding our breath and praying that we don't have another major problem or crisis. But one can make a dollar go just so far and the time has come when, in order to get the job done that needs to be done, funding beyond the monthly assessment is needed .The money is needed now so we have it to pay the roofer. The Board has agonized over this for quite some time. We have 2 choices. Either we can borrow and pay over 5 years, or we can assess. Since the authority to borrow is not addressed in our documents, legal counsel has offered an opinion that there should be an affirmative vote of owners prior to borrowing. Assessments can be levied by the Board without owner approval. It is our unanimous opinion that borrowing is the way to go. And so we have called this meeting asking for your approval to do that. Otherwise, we will have no choice but to assess.

Note: The makeup of the Board has varied over the years.