

## **Antigua Condominium Association**

### **Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors**

October 16, 2024

The meeting of the Board of Directors of the Antigua Condominium Association was called to order by Randy Ditch, president, on October 16, 2024, at 7:01 p.m. The meeting was held via conference call. The following directors were present: Randy Ditch, Mike Falkner, Kat Ilkhani, Mike Keenan, Robert Mayer, Bonnie Medford, Sheri Miller and Ellen Schweiger. Mary Dischinger was not present. A quorum was present.

The following unit owners were present: Dennis Marsalek (408); Cindy Frederick (901); Robert Rosner (1007); Ingrid Miller (1302); Charles Ziegler (202); Randee Baumohl (1102); Steven Karlow (1204); Barbara Emden (403); Andrew Olson (402); Chris/Helen Vallone (904); Peggy Sheer (406); Robert Fitzgerald (806); Betty DeBold (1106); Patty Brann (301).

#### **Owner Comments and Concerns**

Ingrid Miller (1302) asked about Atlantic Refrigeration's service on October 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>. It was for a filter change only. The preventive maintenance will be done in November.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Robert presented the minutes for the last regular board meeting held on September 18, 2024 and the subsequent meetings. Robert moved that the minutes of the board meeting of September 18, 2024 be approved with two corrections, to correct the percent of responses in favor of removing the showers to 67% (page 5) and the date of the next meeting to October 16, 2024 (page 7). Mike F. seconded the motion. Kat said that there were a number of minutes sent to the board and that there was not enough time to review them. The motion was passed and the minutes approved as corrected on a voice vote. Kat announced that she had voted against the motion.

Robert moved that the minutes of the board meeting of September 18, 2024 held in executive session be approved and released. Ellen seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote. Kat announced that she had voted against the motion.

Robert moved that the minutes of the board meeting of September 30, 2024 held in executive session be approved and released. Ellen seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote. Kat announced that she had voted against the motion.

Robert moved that the minutes of the board meeting of October 4, 2024 held in executive session be approved and that redacted minutes be released. Ellen seconded the motion. Robert stated that the redactions concerned the balances and projected balances in

the Reserve Fund and should be kept confidential until the change order with East Coast Contracting is concluded.

Kat stated that she did not have sufficient notice of the October 4<sup>th</sup> meeting that was held in person at the Antigua condominium. At the board meeting held on Monday, September 30, 2024 it was agreed that the members of the board would meet that Friday, October 4, 2024 at the mockups of the coating that had been prepared by East Coast Contracting to review them. The following day, October 1, 2024, a notice was sent to all directors of a board meeting to be held on October 4, 2024 following the viewing of the mockups and before the owners' meeting the following day. This was not enough notice to arrange for her to travel to Ocean City to attend the meeting. Moreover, the option for her to participate telephonically was not offered.

Kat noted that the minutes stated that the existing coating on the building was originally installed about 1977 or 1978. She thought it was removed and reapplied in 2000. The matter was discussed briefly. Kat also noted that the minutes refer to the ground level vertical walls as being coated with the silicone coating only and not being stripped to the bare concrete and repared. She questioned why they were not being stripped to the concrete like the rest of the exterior.

The motion to approve the minutes passed on a voice vote. A redacted version was approved for release. Kat announced that she had abstained since she was not present at the meeting.

Robert moved that the minutes of the board meeting of October 11, 2024 held in executive session be approved and released. Sheri seconded the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote. Kat announced that she had voted against the motion.

### **President's Report**

Randy opened his report by thanking the owners who were present at the Fall Owners' Meeting held on October 5, 2024 and those who have helped around the building doing various jobs such as pulling weeds in the oceanside area, cleaning it up and painting the picnic tables. The participants did not want to be publicly acknowledged but are entitled to our appreciation nonetheless. He thanked Ellen for organizing the Pot Luck after the owners meeting and Robert for hosting it in his unit. He thanked Mary for organizing the beach bonfire on the Friday night before the owners' meeting.

The off-season office hours have started. Jeff's hours are Monday to Friday from 9:00 to 3:00. Shore Management is available when the office is closed if there is an emergency. Resort to Us, the custodial company, will also have new hours and days. It will provide custodial services three days a week.

Randy reminded everyone that only owners are allowed to have dogs in the condominium and that we need to be mindful about cleaning up after them. We also need to remember that there is no staff to put items left next to the dumpsters into the dumpsters. He asked that larger items be placed in the dumpsters, not left next to them. He also asked that shopping carts and luggage carts be returned from the parking lot and floors.

Trash chutes get clogged. An IKEA box and a cooler got stuck in the trash chute. Resort to Us will clear the clogs, but they charge for this. One cost about \$120. Large items should be taken down to the dumpster, not put in the trash chute or left by the trash chute door.

There are door mats in the trash rooms. They were put there during the spring power washing. If they are not claimed, they are probably abandoned and will, at some point, be disposed of.

Patty Brann (301) asked about the missed spring service. Randy said that Atlantic Refrigeration had given us a credit of \$3,105 for the missed service.

Steve Karlow (1204) noted that non-owners had dogs in the building and had not cleanup up after their pets. Randy noted that registration of owners' pet was fairly good, but non-owner pets did not get registered. To help identify them, perhaps a larger, more noticeable registration collar is needed. Non-owner pets would not have them.

### **Treasurer's Report**

Mary was away so there was no Treasurer's Report this month. Randy noted that the financial reports from Shore had been received the day before the meeting. Mary reviews them before they are sent out. She will review them when she returns and they will be sent out.

There were two changes in personnel at Shore Management. One person retired and the other moved to California. Both were responsible for doing Shore's accounting work for all the condominiums that Shore manages. Cindy has been interviewing to fill the positions and expects to fill the positions by the end of the month.

Ingrid Miller (1302) asked about Linda Johnson who Shore had hired. She was hired to do the bank reconciliations for the properties Shore manages, not to do the bookkeeping or prepare reports. There is no additional charge to the association related to this. Overall, Randy reported, reports are being completed, but right now, they are late. If there are questions about the Reserve Report Mary prepares, Mary will answer them when she returns, or if they are urgent, an email can be sent to her although she may not be in a position to answer it.

### **Secretary's Report**

Robert reported on events scheduled in Ocean City during the periods we normally hold our spring and fall owners' meetings. Springfest was moved up a week for 2025. It will be held

from April 24 to 27. Crusin' Ocean City was also moved up a week to May 1 to 4. After discussion it was felt that April 26 was the better date for the spring meeting.

The schedule for events in the fall has not been released by Ocean City. It is very likely that Ocean Calling and Country Calling will be held again in October. It was decided that October 18 was the best date for the fall meeting. It was suggested that the date not be selected until Ocean City announces its schedule. It was decided that it was best to secure the venues to hold the meetings now. If necessary, the fall meeting can be changed, if a new venue is available.

The Elks Club upstairs worked well and we will see if that is available. The cost was \$100 an hour for the last meeting. The fee is \$150 for nonmembers.

Robert moved and Ellen seconded that the spring owners' meeting be held on April 26, 2025 and that the fall owners' meeting be held on October 18, 2025. The motion passed on a voice vote without opposition.

### **Maintenance Report**

Mike K. reported on maintenance matters. The Stanley lobby door was not latching properly and, therefore, not closing properly. It was repaired. The top latch had rotted and along with the rollers was replaced. The damage was caused, in part, from luggage carts hitting the door and dislodging it. The invoice for the repairs has not been received.

The lock on the men's bathroom door did not self-lock when the door closed. The women's bathroom door lock was replaced with a self-locking one, but the men's was not. It has now been done. The lobby door key which also allows pool access works both the men's and women's bathroom door locks. The self-locking will help keep non-owners and non-renters from using the bathrooms.

The pool is closed and the pool company will be looking at the leaks. A report is expected about the leaks.

The season is over and unit doors can now be painted. Paint is available in the office.

### **Coating Project**

Robert reported on the status of the coating project. There have been a number of reports. To be sure everyone is up-to-date, he said he would be overinclusive and add the current developments.

The board met four times from September 30<sup>th</sup> to October 11<sup>th</sup> and the negotiating team met twice. The board members met at the mockups East Coast Contracting made on the building on the wall across from the pool on October 4<sup>th</sup>. The various mockups were viewed and discussed as to application and finished appearance. A mockup on a separate plywood board that was prepared by Ev-

Air-Tight in October 2023 when it recoated three panels to fix leaks was also viewed. Kirk Parsons, the condominium's engineer, was present via phone to explain the mockups and processes.

### "Skim Coat Method"

The "skim coat method" was East Coast's proposal to apply the texture in the silicone coating itself. One silicone coating would be applied to the bare concrete wall; an aggregate would be blown onto the first coating; when the first coat has sufficiently cured, the area would be brushed to remove any aggregate that had not adhered to the silicone coating; and, finally, a second coat of silicone would be applied. Different aggregate could be used, from a fine aggregate such as sand to larger aggregate. The finer aggregate would result in a smoother final texture and a larger aggregate would result in a coarser final texture. This method would require a skim coat on the concrete before the application of the first silicone coating to cover the imperfections in the concrete. East Coast did not include a skim coat in its bid. A skim coat is a different material than the material in a parge coat and is about half the thickness of a parge coat.

Silicone can be applied directly to concrete and properly adhere, Kirk advised. The question of the final appearance is a factor. An example is the Atlantis Condominium on 103<sup>rd</sup> Street in Ocean City. Several board members viewed it. The question is the finish. The Atlantis was built from pre-cast concrete, not poured concrete. Our building is poured concrete. Pre-cast concrete is made in factories under controlled conditions. The finish is more consistent and smoother than poured concrete. It has fewer imperfections. Poured concrete is poured on-site and not in controlled conditions. It is subject to the weather and other factors. This results in more bug holes and imperfections.

East Coast removed the coating on two panels as part of the asbestos testing. The bare concrete was painted with regular paint for the summer. While paint is thinner than the silicone coating and there will be two coats of the silicone coating applied, the imperfections are clear. The panels are several floors above ground level. The imperfections are better seen from a photograph that is enlarged. While a silicone coating will cover some of the smaller imperfections, it will not cover larger ones. The final finish without a skim coat is not acceptable.

We could not get a reference for the application of this method. Kirk concluded that it is "not a common practice." The method has been successfully used with acrylic-based coatings, but Kirk has no experience with it using silicone and was unable to locate anyone with experience in it. The method has been done with acrylic-based coatings. The aggregate is added to acrylic-based coatings by the manufacturer. The proper amount of aggregate is mixed in each container of coating and the material, as mixed, is then applied to the surface. This will not be done with the silicone and the amount of aggregate added will depend on the skill level of the worker applying it. The risks are that there will be too much or too little. If there is too much, it can be too heavy for the silicone coating and cause the silicone to pull off the wall. If

there is not enough, the texture may not look as expected. There is also the risk that it is not applied uniformly, especially with multiple workers applying it.

An additional problem which is the time within which the aggregate can be broadcast onto the first silicone coating. There is a limited time within which this can be done. The silicone has a quick flash point, the point at which a thin crust forms on the silicone coating. It is a part of the curing process. At this point the silicone has not cured, but the thin crust that has formed prevents the aggregate from adhering to the first silicone coat. This means that the first coat of the silicone can only be applied in relatively small areas so that the aggregate can be applied before the silicone reaches its flash point. This will result in a lot of smaller areas that will meet. The concern is for the appearances of the finished wall and how obvious the lines where the various areas meet will be when the panels and walls are finished.

The Dow warranty was discussed. Kirk's view is that we look at it as purchasing a product that comes with a warranty and not as purchasing a warranty that comes with a product. The silicone product is, he says, a very good product that he has not had problems with. He is looking at how it adheres, whether it cracks and whether it is watertight, among other factors. On these, he has had good results. The warranty does not cover workmanship. That part of the warranty is provided by the contractor, in our case, East Coast. Kirk cautioned that it is not unusual for a manufacturer to assert that the product performed, and the any failure was the result of the contractor not following the manufacturer's specifications.

The Dow warranty does not clearly cover this manner of application and there are too many potential issues with the actual application that Dow could point to as workmanship issues, not issues with the silicone product. They could assert that the manner in which it was applied caused any failure, not the product itself. There are no specs or instructions on this method.

The board eliminated this proposal because of the imperfections in our building, the lack of clear evidence that it works, and concerns over the Dow warranty.

#### "Parge Coat Method"

The "parge coat method" is the manner in which the coating on the building is presently made. A parge coat is applied to the bare concrete and, before the parge has set, the texture is created in the parge itself by various tools, such as brushes or sponges. A parge is a cementitious material that covers the imperfections in the concrete and creates the final texture.

There is a modification of the parge coat method, applying a skim coat rather than a parge coat. The board considered a skim coat rather than a parge coat with the texture built into to the skim coat rather than being made of aggregate broadcast into to first silicone coat. Two coats of silicone would be applied over the skim coat. This skim coat alternative was also rejected. The mockups with skim coats hid some, but not all the imperfections in the concrete.

A skim coat is half the thickness of a parge coat. There is less material to work with to create a texture. Basically, we would be limited to the smoothest finishes. It was asked whether East Coast's proposed smoothest finish with the aggregate added could be reproduced in a skim coat without aggregate added. This was questionable because of the amount of material in the skim coat that could be used to achieve a uniform, consistent finish.

Applying the silicone on a skim coat without any texture was also discussed. It would be very smooth. There are questions of the final appearance and subsequent repairs which would be more visible without some texture.

The board concluded that the parge coat was the best alternative for the Antigua. It is the method originally used on the building. It has been tried and shown to work. It hides the imperfections and permits various finishes from which we can select. We will not get a second opportunity if the method chosen does not perform as expected.

#### Performance Bond

The performance bond was discussed. Seth Merson said that the cost would be 1.5%, but Tom Merson recently thought it could be 3%.

#### Related Work

Additional related work was discussed. The wash-off stations need to be rehabilitated. The pipes should be removed before the coating is done so the walls behind the pipes will be coated. These walls are on the ground level and will not be stripped to bare concrete. They will only be coated with the silicone coating. Lighting and signs should also be addressed for the same reasons. There are also lockboxes used by owners who rent their units attached to pipes.

#### The Change Order

The change order East Coast presented after the meeting with the negotiating team was for \$225,000. East Coast's first two change orders were for about \$125,000 for the skim coat and \$265,000 for the parge coat.

#### Funding the Change Order

The payment for the change order was discussed by the board. The coating project can be paid for without a further special assessment.

The project budget included a 10% contingency reserve and an additional amount as well. Without any further contingencies, there is almost enough money in the project budget to absorb the cost of a parge coat. However, an allowance for further contingencies is necessary. For example, there is an allowance for repairing cracks and spalls in the concrete. While a reasonable estimate of the amount of repair work is included in the bid price, it is an allowance. If there are more cracks than anticipated, the condominium will pay for the additional work. On the other hand, if the allowance was overestimated, the condominium will not pay the full

allowance and additional funds are available. Kirk made the estimate based on the condition of the concrete exposed in the three panels Ev-Air-Tight recoated during its leak repairs in October 2023. In any event, there is enough money in the Reserve Fund to fully pay for the parge change order without a further assessment.

The Reserve Fund has sufficient funds to pay any additional cost beyond the contingencies in the projects budget. Robert was sensitive to publicly releasing sensitive financial information before the change order is signed and everything is under way. We do not want this information to influence East Coast. All the information was discussed at the board meeting and is available to all members with a little bit of analysis of information the members already have.

In addition to knowing if we have sufficient cash resources to pay for the change order, the board also looked at the status of the Reserve Fund at the end of 2025. We started with the December 31, 2024 projected balance in the Reserve Fund, not including the special assessment for the coating project. The project budget already anticipates withdrawing \$400,000 from the Reserve Fund. Additional funds will be added to the Reserve Fund in 2025 from the regular condominium fee. There will also be antenna rent and interest income. Without considering the additional antenna rent and interest income, the December 31, 2025 balance in the Reserve Fund was projected. For our initial purposes, we assumed that the parge change order would be \$265,000, and then projected the December 31, 2025 Reserve Balance.

This projected balance needs to be adjusted for projects to be done in 2024 and 2025 that have not yet been done. These are replacement security cameras; bathroom renovations; and parking lot asphalt repaving. The amounts are those in the Reserve Study. The camera number in the Reserve Study is actually higher than the proposal. Work scheduled for prior years was deferred. If these projects are completed in 2024-2025 at the Reserve Fund amounts, the projected December 31, 2025 balance would be higher than the Reserve Study projects for the 2025 year-end balance. The bathroom renovations and the repaving of the parking lot will likely cost more than the Reserve Study anticipated because of the inflation assumption. Even with these considerations, the Reserve Fund appears to be in good shape as projected to December 31, 2025; there are sufficient funds in the Reserve Fund to fully pay for the proposed change order without using any of the contingency funds in the original coating project budget; and the December 31, 2025 balance in the Reserve Fund meets or is close to the required fund balance.

The favorable outlook for the Reserve Fund is due in part because the Reserve Study annual contribution was based on tearing out the existing modified bitumen roof and rebuilding it at a projected cost of \$337,372 in 2022. We did not do that. Instead, we put a roof coating on the existing roof for \$88,000 plus additional required repairs. There was a savings of about \$200,000. In addition, all the antenna rents went into the Reserve Fund. These were contributions in addition to the Reserve Fund required contributions for several years.

When the coating project is completed, it will be necessary to commission an update Reserve Study. One purpose is to determine the 2025 year-end funding level for the Reserve Fund. The present Reserve Study assumed an annual inflation rate of 2% which has been exceeded. The coating project itself will cause a change in the required Reserve Fund annual contribution by reducing the annual amortization of future re-applications of the silicone coating. Presently, the acrylic-based elastomeric coating is re-applied every seven years. The new silicone-based coating will be re-applied every 15 to 20 years. Estimates have been made for additional inflation, re-amortization of the periodic re-coatings, deferred projects, and potential additional projects. The outlook is encouraging, but a fuller and better analysis requires the completion of the coating project and a revised Reserve Study.

#### Legal versus Practical Approaches

The board discussed at several meetings the legal considerations. Parties to a contract are entitled to their contractual expectations. We do not want to make East Coast's defenses for them. East Coast says that the word "parge" is not in the contract so they did not bid a parge coat. To fully evaluate the respective legal positions, we need more information such as internal communications, bid worksheets, the standards in the industry, and more.

Pragmatically, we need to consider the next lowest bid; when the work would be done; increases because of delays; and such factors.

There are many possible ways to view what happened. It appears that East Coast may simply have made a mistake. They found a different way to do the job; put blinders on; ignored Kirk's warnings; and had poor communications within the company. It is likely that the costs of a parge coat were not included in the original bid and, had it been done correctly, the bid would have been higher. We will never know for sure.

The board chose the pragmatic approach. The board voted unanimously to proceed with the parge coat alternative. Kat Ilkhani and Sheri Miller were absent.

#### Negotiating Issues

The board discussed the confidence that we needed in East Coast to proceed further. The issues of performing on time, without further change orders, and the quality of their work were discussed. It was noted that confidence is difficult to gauge.

Issues to be discussed are the performance bond and its cost; the cost of the parge change order; start dates and the expected completion date; whether there will be 10 swings fully staffed; the site supervisor; coordination with East Coast Shutters; and confidence in East Coast Contracting.

The authority of the negotiating team was discussed. It was discussed whether the board would delegate to the negotiating team the authority to agree on the change order and the price or whether any proposal would have to be brought back to the board for approval. It

was thought that we would get the best proposal if the negotiating team had final authority to reach an agreement. Otherwise, East Coast would likely feel that the board would come back with a lower cost proposal and would, therefore, not start with its best and lowest proposal, expecting further negotiations and requests for concessions.

The negotiating team was Randy, Mike Keenan, Bonnie and Robert. It was given authority to agree on a change order price. East Coast proposed \$225,000. The negotiating team was in agreement on it, but took it to the board for approval. The board agreed to it.

The question about the due dates for the special assessments was raised. Robert felt that it was best to continue with the November 1 payment as scheduled but when the job is underway, that the January 1 and March 1 installments could be looked at. It is a matter of cashflow, matching the income to the expenses.

Randy had further discussions with East Coast. East Coast is hopeful that it can begin before December 1<sup>st</sup>. Balconies should be cleared before December 1, 2024.

Robert reported that East Coast very recently sent an email saying that they were waiting for the change order so that they could finalize the bond. The bond will cover two years of the five-year warranty that East Coast is giving. Kirk says that this is normal in the industry. The warranty commences on substantial completion of the project. Ellen asked when the warranty period begins. Substantial completion is, speaking generally, when the work is done. There may be small punch list items to be done. If the work stops for the summer, the project is not substantially completed until East Coast returns and finished it.

Dennis Marsalek (408) asked if doing the balcony work was optional for those units that have permanently installed windows but the sliding doors are still present. These units are considered exterior space and are included in the contract. The owners may not opt out.

Patty Brann (301) asked if the floor of the balconies would be done. They will be done. The conditions will vary and, if necessary, the floors will be prepared for the coating by grinding out spots as needed or the whole floor depending on the condition.

Kat asked if owners with windows could decline to have their balconies coated. Robert said that if the sliding doors have been removed, the balcony is considered interior space and no work will be done. Otherwise, the work will be done. An owner cannot decline to have the work done.

Kat suggested that the entire project be postponed until at least next fall. She thought that all the ducks were not lined up — the AT&T antennas; the meaning of substantial completion; the possibility that if East Coast Contracting does not finish by Memorial Day, the project will be done in three phases (exterior this season; rest of exterior next fall; and the rotunda later); the potential group purchase for new shutters with better pricing for the owners who wanted to participate; and that by doing the interior rotunda with the exterior the condominium could get a better price than if they were done separately.

Randy thought there were not as many open issues as Kat suggested; that we have the project under control now; the plan has come together and we are comfortable with it; and that it is time to move forward.

Robert moved and Mike Keenan seconded that the draft change order Kirk prepared be approved and that Kirk proceed with obtaining East Coast's agreement and the execution of the change order. On a roll call vote, the motion passed with seven directors in favor, one opposed and one absent. The directors voting in favor of the motion were: Randy Ditch, Mike Falkner, Mike Keenan, Robert Mayer, Bonnie Medford, Sheri Miller and Ellen Schweiger. The director voting against motion was Kat Ilkhani. Mary Dischinger was not present.

Randy and Robert raised the issue of approval of potential future change orders. The objective is to keep the project going forward in an orderly and efficient manner so as to prevent unnecessary delays. The matter was discussed. Kat questioned whether the board could delegate this authority to an executive committee. It was agreed that if the motion passed, we would request an opinion from the condominium's attorney, Jim Almand, on the ability of the board to delegate this authority. If he was of the opinion that it could not, the executive committee would not operate and all change orders would go to the whole board.

Robert moved and Mike K. seconded that a four-person Executive Committee be appointed with the authority to approve future change orders that do not exceed \$10,000 with notice of each change order being considered to be sent to all board members; and that Bonnie, Randy, Mike K. and Robert be appointed to the Executive Committee.

On a roll call vote, the motion passed with all directors present voting in favor and with one absent. The directors voting in favor of the motion were: Randy Ditch, Mike Falkner, Kat Ilkhani, Mike Keenan, Robert Mayer, Bonnie Medford, Sheri Miller and Ellen Schweiger. Mary Dischinger was not present.

### **Old Business**

Three items on the agenda were carried over to the November 20, 2024 meeting: trash compactor preventive maintenance proposal; pool furniture proposal; and the security camera proposals.

#### AT&T Lease Proposal

Mike F. reported that there were two pending matters with respect to the AT&T lease. The first was an unsolicited proposal to renegotiate the current lease by extending the term and reducing the rent, including removing the rent escalator. The second is a proposal to install 5G antennas when the current antennas are replaced.

The current lease runs to 2029 although there is a reciprocal 60-day termination provision. There was little interest in renegotiating the lease at this time. AT&T says that the reduced rent is justified because there are more spots available and rents are more competitive.

Obtaining information about the real estate market for cell towers from a professional who is experienced in that market was discussed.

On the 5G issue, Mike F. said that he had not received, although he had asked for, the Maximum Personal Exposure (MPE) report. When this was last discussed with AT&T, the MPE report showed radiation exceeding FCC regulations on the roof and the balconies for units 1301 and 1308. There was discussion of the dangers of 5G emissions. Vertical Consultants represented the condominium in its prior negotiations. Mike F. was not satisfied with their services particularly since they did not seem to know enough about the emissions. The sentiment was that we would rather forgo all antenna rent rather than place any owner's health at risk or limit access to units, balconies or the roof.

Mike F. moved and Sheri seconded that AT&T's proposal to renegotiate the lease be declined. On a roll call vote, the motion passed with all directors present voting in favor and with one absent. The directors voting in favor of the motion were: Randy Ditch, Mike Falkner, Kat Ilkhani, Mike Keenan, Robert Mayer, Bonnie Medford, Sheri Miller and Ellen Schweiger. Mary Dischinger was not present.

Mike F. will request the MPE documentation and we can consider the matter further when it is obtained. The report should be prepared by a third party, not AT&T.

#### Bathroom Renovations

Mike F. reported that the Bathroom Renovation Committee consisted of Bonnie Medford, Ingrid Miller (1302) and himself. The committee met to look at the condition of the bathrooms. He spoke with the Health Department about our pool. Showers are not required in the bathrooms because everyone has access to a shower within 500 feet of the pool, that is, within their own unit. He will begin to look for a contractor to further this project along.

#### **New Business**

Ellen withdrew her request that the board meeting format be considered.

#### **Next Board Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the board will be November 20, 2024 at 7:00 p.m.

#### **Adjournment**

Robert moved and Sheri seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was passed on a voice vote without objection. The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert Mayer  
Robert Mayer  
Secretary