

October 9, 2026

Via Electronic Mail

Board of Directors
Cantrice Court Condominium Owners' Association
Simi Valley, California

Re: Formal Request to Reconsider and Reduce the \$1,999,999.60 Roofing Special Assessment

Dear Board Members:

I respectfully request that the Board reconsider the recently approved **\$1,999,999.60 special assessment** and reduce it to the cost of the final approved roofing contract, together with necessary, reasonable, and documented project-related expenses. I am not asking the Board to abandon the roofing project or disregard the vote. I am asking for a fair, transparent funding plan that minimizes the burden on all 98 homeowners.

The assessment passed with **41 owners voting in favor and 35 against**. I respect that outcome. The close division nevertheless deserves careful attention. The Board represents every homeowner, including those who supported the assessment and those who opposed it.

The contract price and the nearly \$600,000 difference

The Association previously disclosed a roofing estimate of approximately \$1.6 million and has reportedly approved a final roofing contract of approximately **\$1.4 million**. That is approximately **\$600,000 less** than the assessment, or roughly **\$6,122 per unit** across 98 units, before legitimate additional expenses. I ask the Board to disclose the final contract and an itemized reconciliation of every additional cost, contingency, and funding component comprising the assessment.

Roof replacement and general reserve replenishment

I understand that the Board may also wish to replenish Association reserves, and I recognize the importance of prudent reserve funding. But **paying for the roof replacement and replenishing general reserves are distinct financial objectives**. In my view, homeowners should have been offered separately explained ballot questions or another appropriately authorized process that allowed them to consider those objectives independently. An owner could reasonably favor replacing the roofs while opposing additional general reserve funding.

I ask that the assessment be confined to properly supported roofing-project costs and that any proposed general reserve replenishment be separately identified, justified, and addressed through an appropriate lawful process. This is a request for transparency and reconsideration, not an assertion that every combined assessment necessarily violates election law.

Financial hardship and fair financing

An assessment approaching **\$20,408 per unit** is an extraordinary obligation, particularly for retirees and neighbors living on fixed incomes. Even a reduced assessment will be difficult for many. The monthly payment can be as consequential as the principal amount. Owners deserve a payment plan calculated from **the actual amount borrowed, the final interest rate, the repayment term, and all financing fees**, rather than preliminary assumptions or borrowing beyond what is needed.

Please disclose whether the interest rate is fixed or variable, the total repayment obligation and monthly payment per unit, whether owners may pay in full without financing charges, and whether early repayment

carries a penalty. Any reduction in project cost should be reflected in the financing and owner payment obligations. Please also consider reasonable arrangements to ease hardship for fixed-income owners.

Formal requests for Board action

1. Recalculate and reduce the special assessment to the final roofing contract amount plus necessary, reasonable, and documented project-related expenses.
2. Provide owners with the approved contract and a complete accounting reconciling project costs and the nearly \$2 million assessment.
3. Separately identify any proposed general reserve replenishment and pursue it through an appropriate, transparent authorization process.
4. Publish the actual financing terms and a revised per-unit installment schedule reflecting the final loan principal, interest rate, term, and charges.
5. Consider reasonable payment arrangements for homeowners facing significant financial hardship.
6. Place this request on the next open Board meeting agenda, consider it formally, and provide owners a written response explaining the decision.

Civil Code section 5600(b) limits assessments to the amount necessary to defray the costs for which they are levied. I ask the Board to evaluate the assessment against its stated purposes and substantiate the amounts charged, including any legitimately related expenses.

A practical opportunity for compromise

The 41 owners who supported the assessment deserve a completed roofing project. The 35 who opposed it deserve meaningful consideration of their financial concerns. Those interests are not mutually exclusive. **A revised assessment based on demonstrated roofing costs, transparent treatment of reserves, and fair financing could help bring our community together.**

I would much prefer a cooperative solution to further disputes and legal expense, which would ultimately burden the same homeowners already facing this assessment. I respectfully ask the Board to take this opportunity to protect our buildings, preserve homeowners' financial stability, and rebuild confidence through a clear and reasonable plan.

Thank you for considering this formal request. I look forward to a written response.

Sincerely,

William Mills

Cantrice Court Homeowner