I. Meeting called to order at 7:02 P.M.

II. Roll Call:
President: Judy Glazewski
Vice President: James Hansen
Treasurer: Beth Murphy
Secretary: Jerry Spehar (absent)
Director: Debbie Gardner
EPI Management: Jan Wayland

Unit Owners Present: Cindy Belinski, Sherleen Karchut, John & Mary Sokol, Rita Davis, James Gardner

III. Guests – No guests scheduled

IV. Homeowners’ Forum - Comments
1. Cindy Belinski • She was concerned about Landworks cutting the wet/soggy grass behind her unit. Judy stated Landworks has been notified, by EPI, about the problem and is working on a resolution.
2. Sherleen Karchut: • She wanted to let people know there are ticks in the area. • She is concerned about the painters (SMS) spray washing the unit and are they using one unit owner’s water for an entire building or using each unit's water or providing their own water? • She is concerned about outside items being in the way of the painters, mowers and bush trimmers. It was suggested that nothing should be planned for Wednesday: the day the landscaper is on the property. • It was stated, by EPI, that unit owners would be notified when their units were to be painted.
3. John & Mary Sokol • John had a question about the schedule for bush trimming? Because of the weather, everything is behind schedule. Judy asked EPI whether the landscaper, without board approval, could work on Saturday, to catch up, and the association would not be charged weekend rates. EPI suggested, for new business, a motion be presented to authorize the landscaper weekend catch-up work, at no extra cost, and starting after 08:00 AM. • John had a question about stump removal. Judy stated the parkway was the village’s responsibility. With regard to the common-area clean-up, Judy stated the landscape committee is working on a plan to get the remaining dead Ash trees removed and the clean-up of the of the previously removed Ash trees.
4. Rita Davis • She is concerned about dog feces being dumped on the front of her unit on common area and she thinks she knows who is doing it, and is fearful to report it. She stated that when she was walking her dog, an anonymous driver threatened her about picking up after her dog. It was suggested that if she feels threatened, and she knows who it is, she should notify the police. • She is also concerned about people putting their garbage cans out too early. It was suggested that if it’s consistently a particular unit owner, she should notify EPI.

V. Approval of the minutes
1. Beth made a motion to approve the minutes. Debbie seconded the motion.
2. Minutes were approved unanimously.

VI. Treasurer’s Report – Beth Murphy. Beth gave an abbreviated report.
1. Beth asked EPI about registration for the on-line service. Jan replied there have been some registrations, but there are minor problems to be worked out.
2. Beth noted that the income statement shows income of about $31,000 but the income is really about $8,000 due to the reversal of a write-off from the previous year. This will be the case throughout the year until the year-end write-offs are resolved for 2014.
3. Beth asked Jan if any owners signed up for the EPI online system. Beth said a few have and mentioned that some have some problems with it. Jan noted that this payment service, etc., is not
processed by EPI. Thus, when you sign up for the system, you must fill out all information requested (name, address, etc.) since this 3rd party does not have this information on owners from EPI.

4. Beth received the financials and the bank recs.
5. The ACH batch should have been processed on 6/16/14, the day of the board meeting.
6. There were no Accounts Payables as of 5/31/14.
7. The auto pays posted for Com Ed and Waste Management. However, the Waste Management auto pay was too much. Waste Management billed us incorrectly by adding in the increase before the date stated in their contract, and the auto pay processed was for the overstated invoiced amount. Beth noted that she had emailed this info to EPI prior to the board meeting and requested that the correction be made to the invoicing … and now also for the overpayment to Waste Management.
8. Beth did not have time to do a breakdown of the delinquent and the prepaids between the roof and regular assessments prior to the meeting, as is usually done. However, Beth noted that the receivables in total have decreased about $1,000 since the prior month, and thus, going in the right direction.
9. Beth noted that all of the bank transfers discussed and approved at the prior board meeting have been processed.
10. The finalized report will be sent to EPI for inclusion in the July Management Report.
11. Beth also requested a small amount of executive session time.

VII. Roof Replacement Project:
1. There was a lengthy discussion on a 20 point addendum to finalize the Roofing Bid Specifications. The itemized list of issues discussed was provided to the board by Beth in advance of the meeting and are attached as Appendix A to these minutes.
2. There were two points that need further discussion:
   a) Adding specifics about gable vents.
   b) Getting a total count to determine costs for certain items in the contract extras list.

VIII. Management Report – Jan Wayland
1. Judy suggested a blanket ratification of all e-mail approved items listed below for items B through F.
2. Judy made a motion that the board approves all items that have had previous unanimously approval by e-mail.
3. Debbie seconded the motion.
4. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.
5. This included items A thru F of the Management Report.

Exterior Modifications Requests:
A) Sokol (18134 Mockingbird) - Pending. More information requested – not received.
B) Van Vandenburg (18142 Mockingbird) – Window Replacement - Approved
C) Kaffel (18126 Pheasant Lake Drive) – Window Replacement - Approved
D) Wiencek (8901 Bluebird) – Garage Door Replacement - Approved
E) Holly (18216 Mockingbird) – Window Replacement - Approved
F) Sokol (18134 (Mockingbird) – Replace windows and patio door - Approved

Financial
A) Statements: Attached to June 2014 Management Report
B) Delinquency Status: Attached to June 2014 Management Report

Miscellaneous Operation:
A) Siding Replacement - 
   1. Addressed during 20 point Roofing Bid Specification discussion.
B) Roof Replacement Project –
   1. Jan reviewed warranty information and the 5% price increase notification from Lang.

C) Roof Repairs –
   1. 8820 Bluebird: Jan reviewed Lang Home Exterior proposals for $850 and $975, total $1,825.
   2. Beth motioned to approve.
   3. Jim seconded the motion.
   4. Motion approved unanimously.

D) Exterior Painting -
   1. Jan reviewed SMS weather delays.

E) Landscaping -
   1. Lawn repairs:
      a) Jan reviewed Landworks lawn repair proposal and bids for other landscape projects.
      b) Judy explained previous decisions on landscape work priorities.
      c) The Landworks projects are to be put on hold.
   2. Trimming schedule:
      a) Judy motioned to authorize EPI to allow contractors to use days other than Wednesdays and weekends to catch up on delayed work, due to weather, at no extra cost to the association.
      b) Jim seconded the motion.
      c) The motion was approved unanimously.
   3. 18132 Pheasant Lake Drive: Land erosion around the sidewalk.
      a) Beth motioned approval for the work at $100.
      b) Judy seconded the motion.
      c) The motion was approved unanimously.

F) Mulch -
   1. Jan reviewed contractor bids. Two contractors were unable to provide bids.
   2. Judy suggested the mulching not be done until the trimming is complete. That would give additional contractors time to submit bids. Jan agreed.
   3. Item tabled until later.

G) Tree Care –
   1. Jan reviewed bids for the removal of additional dead Ash trees.
      a) After a board discussion, it was agreed that the decision regarding a contractor will be tabled.
   2. Jan reviewed proposals for landscaping by the bench.
      a) After board discussion, this item was tabled until the fall.

H) Lake –
   1. Jan reviewed service tickets for board.

I) Association Responsibility –
   1. Board discussion of Beth’s list was deferred to future board meeting.

**Regarding Dead Bushes Modification Requests:**
A) Judy requested that EPI send a blanket response to homeowners requesting dead bushes be removed and paid for by the association. The letter should state that the Landscape Committee is
reviewing the dead bush issue and will have their recommendations no earlier than this fall about what the association will be funding for removal and replacement.

Also, state, in the letter, that if the owner does not want to wait, they should submit a modification request stating that they will replace the bushes at their expense. No board members objected to this statement made by Judy.

_Miscellaneous Correspondence:_
No activity

Unit Sales Report: Judy questioned why the sale of 18136 PLD was missing from the sales report because new owners have moved in. Jan indicated that EPI waits until they get paid at closing and get notice of the closing since so many fall through.

IX.  **Inspection Report** –
1.  Not reviewed

X.  **New Business**
1.  Judy brought up the subject regarding tuck pointing. There was no discussion.

XI.  **Old Business**
Not discussed

XII.  **Adjourn to Executive Session** 08:59 PM
Appendix A:

Beth’s list of issues from reviewing roofing specs & reviewing contractor answers to questions:

1. Isn’t the labor cost to remove and put gutters back up included in the base contract? Therefore, the extra cost for the gutters should just be for the new materials (gutters, gutter flashings, downspouts), not any added labor cost, right? If yes, then the contract extras list should not refer to any extra labor cost for gutter replacement. See pages 14 and 15 of specs. Also see Section 3.3)A)1) on page 6 of specs.

Page 8 of specs, part J, says all gutters and downspouts are to be replaced with oversized downspouts. However, I thought that we were going to have the gutter & downspout costs bid out separately. The separate bidding for these materials would make it easier for us to compare the most recent bid amounts to the next round of bid amounts that we receive and to determine how much price increases are added to our next round of bids.

I suggest:
- deleting the gutter-related material and labor UNIT costs from the contract extra list on page 14 and include them in new section 12.1 that I added to the specs on page 15
- using the section 12.1 that I added to the specs on page 15 that asks for the total material costs for replacing the gutters, gutter flashing & oversized downspouts
- Also requesting the gutter material costs per linear foot and per downspout in section 12.1 so we can compare bids more readily.

NOTE: Section 12.1 mentioned above is now Section 12.2 due to adding a new 12.1 section.

2. Our roofing specs talks only about replacing the gutters, but does not mention installing oversized downspouts, which Lang mentions is included in their bid for gutter replacement. Shouldn’t we be more specific about the new materials for the gutter replacement portion of the project including new gutters, new gutter flashing, and new oversized downspouts? See page 2 (item 10), and pages 14 and 15 of specs.

For 1&2 above:
  Changed specs to include remove and install new 5” gutters and replace existing 2X3 downspouts.
  Requested separate info on EXTRA cost to install 6” vs 5” new gutters
  Requested separate info on EXTRA cost to replace existing 2X3 downspouts with NEW 3X4 downspouts.
  Also, fixed section 3.3)A)1) on page 6

3. Didn’t some of the contractors say that they would use more than 4 nails per shingle? Yes, Lang said that their minimum standard is 6 nails per shingle. Should we change specs for this? Lang stated that they would use 6 nails per shingle, even though our specs say 4 nails. They view 4 nails as the minimum required, and they don’t want to do just the minimum; however, their bid did not note this difference. See page 4 and page 13 of specs. Changed to 6 nails in the specs.

4. Are we going to still include the performance bond in the bid specification OR are we just going to state that roofing contractor will be paid as each building is completed? (e.g.: Aurora bid would be $15,000 less without a performance bond; Lang did not include the performance bond in their bid, and their bid would be about $30,000 higher with a performance bond. Byrne Johnson said the performance bond was not included in their bid & would make their bid $35,000 higher.) See bottom of page 9. This section is now crossed out.
5. All of the contractors included replacement of all non-powered Master Flow Attic Vents in their bids. (As a result of Q&A: Byrne Johnson included, Aurora bid included, Lang included also). If replacement of all non-powered Master Flow Attic Vents are included in all bids, then the costs for these should not be included in the contract extras list, right? See list of Contract Extras on page 14 where I think that these vents should be deleted.

Lang mentioned that the non-powered vents are included in their bid & replace with 8X8 square mushroom style vents; the slant back vents included in our specs would cost $10 more each. By replacing all of the non-powered vents you can pick the color to match the shingles. So get black (or aluminum, per Scott) vents to go with slate roof. Shouldn’t we add the mushroom style vents to the Materials INCLUDED in Contractor’s Bid on page 13 – I need wording/description verified? I did that already. And shouldn’t the vents specified on page 8 in Section E. Roof Vent be the “mushroom” vents? I didn’t make any changes there until I know the specific description to use; should we specify a brand? Won’t we be specifying a color, too?

I just added black or aluminum to prior edits to page 13. I added black or aluminum and mushroom-style to page 8.

6. We need contractors to get written confirmation from GAF that they are contracting with association, not individual townhomes, so that warranty is not voided if unit is sold. So far, all we have is something verbal from one of the contractors that the warranty won’t be voided. I added Section 10.2 on page 12 of specs. Deleted section 10.2 on page 12 of specs.

7. When doing the siding replacement under the base contract, only some of the siding would have to be removed. However, we are requesting a separate bid for replacing siding on the entire wall if that wall abuts the roof decking. Thus, more labor is involved due to removal of all of the siding rather than just parts of it. Therefore, we should attach the bid specification for the siding to the roofing specs and just ask the contractors to bid that separately. Thus, that amount should include the siding cost, labor, and ice and water shield, as per the separate specs. Section 12.2 added on page 15 of specs. We could then delete the siding cost from the contract extra section on page 14. No comment by Scott, no new changes made.

8. The Aluminum Siding Replacement Specifications Schedule A seems to include a different type of water shield than is included in the roofing specs. Tyvek house wrap is in siding specs; GAF Weather Watch Ice/Water Shield is shown in the roofing specs on page 13. Should these be the same? Scott says that Tyvek and Ice/Water Shield are 2 different product with 2 different uses. Scott says leave as is, so I didn’t change anything.

9. Lang’s bid for siding replacement bid mentions replacing round gable vents; gable vents for non-ranch units are on the wall intersecting the garage portion of the roof. The ranch units’ siding in the front of the garage is not getting replaced, and that is where their gable vent is located. Should we include anything specific about the gable vents (in terms of materials) in the siding replacement specifications, especially since we’ll need to match them to the ranch units’ gable vents when they get replaced in the future? Scott says gable vents should be a separate bid and that Lang will replace with SMALLER plastic vents (but SMS would rebuild). Beth added new section 12.3 and renumbered those parts of section 12 following it.

Why smaller vents? Why not same size? Couldn’t smaller size impact venting?

Beth thinks that the non-ranch units will have their gable vents replaced because they are on walls with siding that intersect with the roofs. However, the gable vents for the ranch units is on the front of their garages and that siding is not being replaced now. So, why would there be traffic on the roof for these
10. Lang talked about their installation for ice shield and shingles in valleys being different than our specs. They do not have any seams in the valley with the ice shield, and for the shingles, they have a “no-cut” valley. Should our specs be changed to follow this approach for all bidders? On page 2 of specs, we refer to “Boston Style” Method of Application. Should we keep this the same in the specs? Scott says to keep Boston style in specs even though he says Lang’s approach is better. Why not have all bid on the same type of work?

11. Lang: Use ground drop delivery, not put shingles on roofs. Don’t put equipment/trucks in driveways. Deliver on flat bed semi and use forklift. Load one bundle at a time, but not put $2,000 worth of shingles on the roof at a time. Should we change specs to not allow equipment on property and not allow storage of shingles on roofs? See item 13 on page 2 & item M on page 8. Scott said dumpster should be allowed on driveways if plywood is placed underneath. Scott said that specs should prohibit loading roofs with material. Scott says specs should also state all materials will be stored per manufacturer specs & secured. I made these changes to the specs.

12. Lang also goes into each attic to make sure that soffit vents are clear; they remove one sheet of plywood to get in and check. They make sure that all bathroom vents are vented to outside, not to the attic. Should this be added to specs for all contractors? Scott suggested we add to specs. I inserted new Section N on page 8.

13. Usually use ridge vent or mushroom vent, but not both. Our specs talk about use of ridge vents. Lang says that they would put in mushroom vents, not ridge vents. Again, these can be colored, per Lang. Do we need to change specs where ridge vents mentioned? Section 3.1)B)8) on page 5. Scott says ridge vent should be taken out of specs. I crossed this out on the specs.

14. Lang says that they cannot complete all buildings within 14 weeks, but they could commit to completing all buildings in 20 weeks. Should we change that item on the specs? See Section 15.10 on page 16 of specs. Section 1.2 of the specs on page 3 of specs says there will be a minimum of 2 crews and each crew should complete one building per week. Thus, if 2 buildings get done each week, and we have a total of 27 buildings, the roofs should be done in 13.5 weeks. NO comment from Scott. Board should discuss.

15. Should we add to specs that we want a lien waiver from roofer and Suppliers when project is done? (this is what Lang said that they do.) I added it as Item 16.0 on page 16. Changed wording to say lien waiver should be provided prior to the payout for each building. I also moved it to be shown right below payment schedule, so now it is item 14.0 on page 16.

16. None of the bidders indicated they would be using subcontractors. Should we exclude this information from our specs on page 3 – see yellow highlighted items, especially with the section 15.0 on page 16 that states work can be done in 14 weeks without using subcontractors? Per Scott suggestion, I added this on page 3 in item B: However, if subcontractors are used, they must be approved by the Association in writing prior to their use on this roofing project.

17. For contract extras, shouldn’t B vent & B vent flashing be specified as the color black? Are all of these going to be replaced? If not, the ones not replaced would need to be painted black, right? See page 14 list of Contract Extras. Scott recommends staying with existing B vent used on our property for furnace exhaust. They only come in metal and should not be painted, per Scott, since they look bad and are hard
to maintain paint. Scott recommends staying with metal B vent we currently have. I crossed out the painting of the B-vent on page 14 under the contract extras.

18. For Section 14.0 on page 16 of specs, I indicated that bids are due no later the 8/29/14 so that the board would have the bids to review and discuss at their September 8, 2014 board meeting; if there are any questions for the roofers, then there will be enough time to get questions answered prior to the 2015 budget preparation discussions conducted at the October 13, 2014 board meeting (assuming we can meet at the Village of Tinley Park on the day that Columbus Day is celebrated). (assumes that board meetings will still be the 2nd Monday of the month.)

I indicated that the Contractor selected would be notified by Nov. 14, 2014 since the budget would be officially approved at the November 10, 2014 board meeting (after the owners have received the 2015 budget in a newsletter, and thus would know the 2015 regular and roof assessments).

Roofers should be able to work with their shingle suppliers/GAF to find out pricing if orders placed in 2014 for 2015 job.
No comment from Scott.

19. Should we ask for the total cost to replace ALL of these items on the contract extras list so that we have a sense of the total possible cost? Here’s the list:
   - B Vent & B Vent flashing and caps
   - Skylight Flashing Kits
   - GAF Master Flow Roof Louver (exhaust)
   - Dryer Exhaust Hood
No Comment from Scott; Board should discuss.

20. We should add a cover letter going to roofers bidding the project. The cover letter should explain our timetable needed for bidding the 2015 work and any other specifics from the bids that we want to emphasize. I suggest that we be very specific about what we want to bid out separately … i.e., the gutter material replacement and the siding work, as well as replacing soffit & fascia boards … and anything else we come up with from the contract extras list where we think we’d like to know the total cost if all materials replaced.
No comment from Scott; Board should discuss.

Added issue from Scott:

I also found under Section 11.2 that it refers to Dryer Exhaust; however, the details talk about satellite dishes. These should be separated to avoid contractor confusion.

Beth moved question about satellite dishes to section 12.1 and renumbered the sections below it.