Park East Square Homeowners Association

MONTHLY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

July 14th 2026 (via Zoom)

Call to Order

The monthly Board meeting was called to order at 7:03. A quorum of the Board was present.

Board members present included:

- Steve Haymes – President
- Mark Liebendorfer – Treasurer
- Roxanne Royce – Secretary

Also present:

- Also present: Allan Orendorff -Trio Community Association Manager.
- William Kerr – Formula Roofing entered the meeting at 7:15pm

Homeowners in attendance: Lois Bennett, Karen Fassler, David Longenecker, Christianne Audi, Theresa Spears, Angelika Schroeder, M. McMillan, Treecia Ramey, Rene Sotola, David Bartelt, Karen ?, Caroline Conselman, Michelle, Mary Newell, Aisling, Pigott, Greg Butt, Bryan Shank, Joe Ramsey, Janice Allan, Jane Christoph, Paula Blum

Roof Replacement Discussion

The Board discussed the condition of the community's roofs, recent wind damage, insurance considerations, and a proposed roof replacement project.

Steve provided background regarding the current roof condition. He stated that the buildings are experiencing roof issues and described problems with soft or spongy decking conditions. He also described a “blowout/bursting balloon" effect of higher air pressure in the attics and lower pressure outside during high wind events.

Steve reviewed information obtained from the insurance agent and Formula Roofing regarding possible roof replacement costs. He stated that:

- The current wind/hail insurance deductible is approximately $3.2 million.
- The estimated cost of a complete roof replacement is approximately $2.5 million.
- GAF, the manufacturer of the current roofing materials, may provide approximately $1 million in materials.
- The estimated out-of-pocket cost to the Association would be approximately $1.3 million.

Steve explained that filing an insurance claim may not be beneficial because the claim could become part of the Association’s loss history and could affect future insurance underwriting, renewal discussions, and premiums.

Steve also discussed the proposed roofing materials, including an upgraded Class 4 hail-impact-resistant shingle with a 130 mph wind resistance rating. He stated that the proposed roofing system would include a 50-year warranty and a 40-year workmanship warranty.

Brent discussed the history of roof damage following December wind events. He stated that Formula Roofing responded to previous issues, completed temporary repairs, and assisted with the manufacturer claim process. He explained that Formula Roofing worked with GAF to evaluate roof samples and obtain approval for a full roof replacement rather than only repairs.

Will from Formula Roofing addressed questions regarding the proposed replacement project. He explained that:

- GAF tested samples from roofs throughout the property.
- Approximately 20% of tested shingles showed adhesion failures.
- The proposed project would replace the current roof systems rather than perform limited repairs.
- The manufacturer contribution would cover materials, while the Association would be responsible for labor, disposal, and permits.

- Replacing only damaged areas could leave the Association vulnerable to future failures and loss of warranty protection.

Will stated that the new roofing system would include upgraded shingles required by current City of Boulder building requirements. He explained that adding plywood over existing decking is a common roofing practice and stated that the additional weight would not create structural concerns. He also stated that the project would require City of Boulder permitting.

Per-Unit Cost Discussion

A discussion occurred regarding the estimated cost per homeowner.

Steve initially referenced an estimated cost of approximately $14,800 per homeowner based on the insurance deductible scenario.

Another participant noted that dividing the estimated $1.351 million project cost by approximately 220 units resulted in a figure of approximately $6,142 per unit.

Will clarified that the $14,800 figure related to the insurance deductible scenario and not the proposed manufacturer-supported replacement project.

Owner Questions and Discussion

A homeowner asked whether a list of damaged units or buildings would be provided.

The Board and Will discussed that damage assessments had been compiled. They explained that damage varied by building due to factors including building orientation, roof slope, and wind exposure.

The Board agreed that providing additional information to homeowners regarding affected buildings and transparency would be appropriate.

Will explained that the manufacturer approval applied to replacement of the roof systems throughout the community.

Construction Defect Discussion

A homeowner asked whether the roof issues could be addressed as a construction defect claim.

Will explained that the current approach was not a construction defect claim. He stated that the issue was being addressed through the manufacturer due to a material defect and that GAF had acknowledged the issue and offered assistance.

Special Assessment Discussion

The Board discussed that a special assessment would likely be required to fund the project.

Steve stated that the Association has historically attempted to avoid special assessments but that the current roof situation requires addressing.

Board members discussed holding an additional informational meeting for homeowners to review:

- The roof condition
- The proposed replacement project
- Costs
- Available options

The Board stated that homeowner approval would be required before proceeding.

Questions Regarding Warranty and Future Insurance

Owners asked questions regarding:

- Warranty coverage
- Whether the 50-year warranty was prorated
- Whether the workmanship warranty covered installation errors
- Whether Class 4 shingles could affect insurance premiums

Will stated that the proposed warranty was a full-value warranty and that the upgraded roofing system may provide insurance benefits.

Action Items

- Board to provide additional homeowner information regarding roof damage assessments.

- Board to schedule further homeowner discussion regarding the proposed roof replacement and special assessment.
- Board to continue reviewing project details with Formula Roofing and insurance representatives.

Meeting discussion concluded and the Board moved to the next agenda item.

Roof Project Discussion – Additional Questions and Follow-Up

A homeowner asked whether a structural engineer's opinion should be obtained regarding the future installation of solar panels and the impact of additional roof weight. The homeowner suggested obtaining written confirmation from a structural engineer regarding structural impacts.

The roofing contractor representative stated that this was not an issue and that structural engineers could be consulted if needed. He explained that adding plywood over existing plywood is a common practice used to bring existing structures up to current code requirements. He stated that the additional weight of plywood is a fraction of the referenced 3 pounds per square foot loading and that solar panels would also fall well below that threshold.

He clarified that the 3 pounds per square foot discussion was primarily relevant to heavier materials such as concrete tile roofs, which can add approximately 8–11 pounds per square foot to structures not originally designed for that load. He stated that most structures are capable of handling significantly more weight than they currently support, with minimal reinforcement sometimes required.

Roof Replacement Timeline Discussion

A homeowner asked about the anticipated timeline for completing roof replacements throughout the community.

The roofing contractor representative explained that the timeline would depend on how the project is divided into work zones and the number of crews assigned. He stated that each building is not a difficult roof replacement and that a crew of approximately 8–10 workers should be able to complete an individual building in less than two days, with the goal of completing buildings in approximately one day when crews are properly organized.

He explained that the community could potentially be divided into zones, using the cul-de-sac layout to allow multiple crews to work simultaneously. With two teams working in different zones, the contractor estimated that approximately two to four buildings per day could potentially be completed.

Request for Written Roof Information and FAQ

A homeowner requested that the roof presentation be prepared in writing and provided to homeowners before a future community meeting so residents would have specific information regarding the project.

Board members agreed that written information would be beneficial. It was discussed that the roofing proposal, presentation materials, and supporting information should be compiled and made available.

A homeowner requested written answers regarding:

- Installation of new plywood over existing plywood
- Potential hidden rot
- Whether uneven existing roof surfaces could create future issues
- Potential moisture trapping between plywood layers
- Long-term effects on shingle performance

The roofing contractor representative explained that the primary concern identified in similar properties from the 1970s is typically plywood delamination rather than widespread rot. He explained that new 5/8-inch plywood would be attached directly to rafters using ring-shank nails, which should prevent the new decking from following existing deflection. He stated that any areas with excessive water damage or rot would be removed rather than covered.

The homeowner reiterated that written responses would help residents understand the project and requested that homeowner questions be collected and answered formally.

The contractor agreed to provide written responses and a more comprehensive presentation.

It was proposed that an FAQ be developed and posted on the Association website so all homeowners could access common questions and answers.

Action Item:

- Board to collect homeowner roof questions and coordinate written responses/Q&A with the roofing contractor.
- Board to develop and publish roof-related FAQ information for homeowners.

The Board thanked homeowners, including former board members and residents who participated in the discussion. The roof discussion was closed.

Appointment of Board Members

The Board discussed filling two vacancies created by board resignations.

The Board President explained that:

- One vacancy would be filled for approximately six months, ending December 2026.
- One vacancy would be filled for approximately eighteen months, ending December 2027.

The President briefly explained the circumstances surrounding the resignations:

- Greg resigned after increased job responsibilities and business travel made it difficult to attend meetings consistently.
- Ruli resigned after selling his unit.

Five candidates were identified for consideration, with four candidates present at the meeting.

Candidates were invited to provide brief statements regarding their qualifications and interest in serving on the Board.

Candidate Statements

Christiane discussed her desire to help improve the community, restore property values, and contribute his previous Board experience. He referenced prior service on the Board, including involvement with building repairs, engineering issues, and service as Treasurer.

Dave stated that he wanted to focus on the Association's physical infrastructure, including roofs, water systems, sewer systems, irrigation, siding, painting, stairs, railings, bath house issues, and parking lot paving. He emphasized collaboration and maintaining property values.

Karen discussed her long history as a Park East Square homeowner, knowledge of Association challenges, HOA regulations, and best practices. She stated that she could provide continuity, stability, ethical decision-making, and balanced leadership.

Rene discussed his background as a retired high-tech CEO and homeowner. He emphasized financial responsibility, transparency, legal compliance, stewardship, and ensuring Board decisions clearly benefit homeowners.

Board Appointment Votes

The Board discussed whether to ask additional questions or proceed directly to voting. The Board decided to proceed with individual votes for each candidate.

The voting order was:

1. Rene
2. Dave
3. Karen
4. Christiane

Results:

- **Rene:** Roxanne Royce and Steve Haymes voted in favor, Mark Liebendorfer opposed
- **Dave:** Mark Liebendorfer voted in favor, Roxanne Royce and Steve Haymes opposed
- **Karen:** Mark Liebendorfer voted in favor, Roxanne Royce and Steve Haymes opposed
- **Christian:** Roxanne Royce and Steve Haymes voted in favor, Mark Liebendorfer opposed

IT Transition Update

The Board President provided an update regarding the planned transition to Google Workspace.

He reported that, with assistance from Greg, he had been communicating with an IT consultant specializing in Google Workspace. The consultant and Board President were aligned on the general project approach.

A meeting with the consultant was expected later in the week to formally define the scope of work and obtain cost estimates.

Action Item:

- Continue development of Google Workspace transition plan and obtain cost estimates.

Future Board Meeting and Agenda Items

The Board President stated that an executive session would not be held that evening due to the length and intensity of the meeting.

He proposed scheduling another open Board meeting within approximately two weeks.

Potential agenda items identified included:

- Selection of a new HOA law firm
- Discussion of Architectural Controls Committee concerns regarding the annual survey
- Additional Association business requiring Board attention

A motion was made to schedule another special open Board meeting within approximately two weeks, subject to coordination of availability.

Motion: Schedule a special open Board meeting within approximately two weeks.
Second: Motion seconded.
Vote: Approved.

The Board President noted that required written notice would be provided.

A request was made for the legal firm evaluation spreadsheet to be resent to Board members.

Action Item:

- Resend legal firm evaluation spreadsheet to Board members.

Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Adjourn meeting.
Second: Motion seconded.
Vote: Approved.

The meeting was adjourned.

The Board thanked homeowners, roofing representatives, and participants for their contributions, particularly those who raised questions regarding the roof project.

Meeting adjourned.