

Phone conference call with Chuck Jewett, Hull Roofing 03/01/21, 2:00 PM
Attending: Ann Wallace, Jeff Boland

In answer to question from Ann, Chuck said that neither he nor EverRoof had ever seen anything like the cracking etc we have.

He spoke to the CEO of EverRoof, Finlay Gow, re remarks from Leslie Baker (letter on file). Per Chuck: Our roof, installed in 2002, is a common high quality installation of APP modified bitumen (MB). This roof had a granulated top layer (grey ceramic granules) about the thickness of ten pages of a legal pad; the underlying layers are more like the thickness of a full legal pad..The tiny granules on the original roof serve as a reflective element to protect the dark surface from ultra violet light. They can, however, flake off over time with the attendant loss of protection.

In 2013/2014, Hull Bros. presented a bid for an aromatic urethane roof coating. Within 3 years, this coating was showing odd cracking. EverRoof acknowledged that the coating had problems (without offering an explanation for the cracking) and provided materials and had a 3rd party do repairs. About 90% of the repairs were along the long seam lines, about 3ft apart.

Finding those repairs did not cure the cracking problem still occurring, EverRoof hired Hull in 2018 to do a second urethane coating, this time with aliphatic urethane. For this layer, Hull power washed the roof, primed it, and applied the new coating. However, eventually the cracking continued, although to a lesser degree. Chuck noted that in 2018, Hull advocated using a silicone coating (a more expensive product), but EverRoof insisted on the aliphatic urethane.

Hull's current theory of our problem is that for some reason, there was shrinkage in the aromatic urethane coating that pulled the grey granules away from the APP modified bitumen roof, causing cracking. There are far fewer cracks occurring now than occurred prior to the second urethane layer. EverRoof acknowledged this as a product flaw ("something wrong with the urethane") as they fully covered the repairs. Hull believes that the cracks are only in the urethane itself and the original roof is not affected except for missing granules.

No tear off should be required for our roof. The cracks are per the granules, not the underlying MB surface. Hull believes that the second urethane coating has performed successfully, and that the cracks which continue to present are due to the first urethane coating continuing to shrink. Hull believes that EverRoof acknowledged that the aromatic urethane product must have been flawed, because EverRoof bore the cost of the application of the aliphatic urethane.

Mr. Gow at EverRoof has asked to return for additional samples so they can continue to analyze it. They (Hull and EverRoof) do not believe that the "infiltration of moisture" is a factor as described in the email from Ms Baker. This would manifest in a clogging of the

material which has not happened. When there are moisture issues from BELOW, large blisters or bubbles appear. This also has not happened.

EverRoof and Hull want to fix the problems. EverRoof is offering to pay for labor and materials to wash, prime, repair and repair the cracks with the aliphatic urethane material and to monitor yearly for follow up repairs.

The existing urethane coatings cannot be removed without fully replacing the entire roof. The coatings are separating but not peeling and the cracking is diminishing. Hull believes that there are about 6 feet worth of cracks over 21,000 square feet of roof and that just the surface layer is damaged, i.e. not the APP MB roof itself. They also say that the urethane coatings have stopped the aging of the original roof and preserved it, even as things are now.

Hull further says that almost all (“99.99%”) roofs that they have coated have been done with silicone, a more expensive material. They have done one other roof with aromatic urethane (at 405 and El Segundo) where there was limited cracking that was repaired and eventually stabilized.

We note that TWL (per Howie Stover) reported a meeting with EverRoof in the summer of 2018 during which EverRoof’s subcontractor Javier Chavez stated that the roof required a silicone surfacing to repair the material failure condition. Chuck included this information in his written letter to Finley Gow of July 23, 2018. Howie requested Silicon but the EverRoof salesman, David Luna, said urethane was the way to go. Hull agrees with us.

Hull and EverRoof request 2 to 3 weeks for analysis. They do not think there will be any danger to the roof over this period, given season and weather to- date.

Chuck emphasized again that EverRoof is picking up the tab for analysis, repairs and on- going monitoring.