



ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP, INC.
ENGINEERING, ARCHITECTURE AND SURVEYING, PC

April 12, 2010

Mr. Jack Nelson
Concord Construction
200 Bulls Bridge Road
South Kent, Connecticut 06785-1103

Subject: Building Inspection
RASCO Materials Buildings A & B
Dover Plains, NY
SPECTRA File #G0105248

Dear Mr. Nelson:

Spectra Engineering, Architecture and Surveying, P.C., (SPECTRA) is pleased to submit this addendum to the Structural Evaluations of Buildings A & B at your facility in Dover Plains, NY.

On August 28, 2006, a licensed Professional Engineer from SPECTRA conducted a structural evaluation of Buildings A & B, and the Building A Extension. That evaluation was based on a comprehensive visual inspection of each building. No sampling or testing of structural elements was performed. The conclusions presented in the Engineering Report (October 10, 2006) found that the structural steel framing inside the buildings was found to be relatively sound with very little corrosion and no significant section loss to any structural elements. Five items of concern were noted:

1. Holes in the roofs of both buildings;
2. Four missing diagonal braces, one missing and one detached knee brace affecting four of the roof trusses in Building A;
3. Damage to four interior columns in Building A;
4. Movement of the outer foundation wall in Building A Extension; and
5. Removal of an exterior shed roof on the north side of Building A Extension.

The Engineering Report made the following four recommendations:

1. Replace the missing truss diagonals and knee braces in Building A roof trusses;
2. Protect and strengthen the interior columns of panels 3 & 4 of Building A from further impacts by constructing concrete encasement around each;
3. Remove and replace the failing west foundation wall of Building A Extension; and
4. Consider making repairs to the roof panels of both buildings to prevent future deterioration.

On March 29, 2010, a licensed Professional Engineer from SPECTRA conducted a follow-up structural evaluation of Buildings A & B, and the Building A Extension. Once again, the evaluation was based on a comprehensive visual inspection of the two buildings, no sampling or testing of structural elements was performed, the inspection was conducted solely from standing at ground level, and no equipment was used to access roof elements or to excavate walls or foundations. Heavy rains were falling throughout the duration of the inspection.

Building A

The March 29, 2010 inspection confirmed the findings and conclusions of the previous inspection. The type and condition of structural components was observed to be fully consistent with the observations made in August, 2006. The deficiencies identified previously were observed and were found to be unchanged:

1. Roof leakage;
2. Four missing second truss diagonals, one missing and one detached knee brace;
3. Damage to interior beams at Panels 3 and 4; and
4. Bent lateral braces between trusses.

Building A Extension

The March 29, 2010 inspection confirmed the findings and conclusions of the previous inspection. The type and condition of structural components was observed to be consistent with the observations made in August, 2006. The deficiencies identified previously were observed and were found to be unchanged:

1. Rain infiltration;
2. Outer foundation movement, columns not centered over the supporting wall; and
3. Collapsed exterior shed roof.

Building B

The March 29, 2010 inspection confirmed the findings and conclusions of the previous inspection. The type and condition of structural components was observed to be consistent with the observations made in August, 2006. The deficiencies identified previously were observed and were found to be unchanged:

1. Openings in the roof and rain infiltration;
2. Door frame damage; and
3. Concrete damage on columns at the south end of the west end of the building (Panel 9).

New Findings

During the March 2010 inspection, the following conditions were noted:

1. Stockpiled soil stored in Building A is putting a lateral bearing load on the east wall of the Building.
2. Contact between an interior block retaining wall with the west wall of Building A. Immediately adjacent to the doorway between the main building and the extension, tires have been placed between an interior block retaining wall and the building wall. The interior block retaining wall encloses a stockpile bin, protecting the building wall from inadvertent contact by heavy equipment used to move soil inside the building. The tires transmit lateral bearing load to the building wall when the block wall is used as a push wall by loaders. No displacement or deterioration of the building wall was noted.
3. Lattice columns in Building B are exposed to the elements from the top of the north and south knee walls up to the lower sill of the window panels. The lattice columns are built up with angle

brackets. Soil material stored in the building is in contact with this structure when the pile height reaches the top of the knee wall.

New Recommendations

1. Avoid stockpiling soil against the walls in Building A, and remove the tires behind the block retaining wall north of the processing equipment.
2. Limit the height of soil stockpiles in Building B such that soil does not contact the lattice columns above the knee wall or protect the columns from soil contact. From the top of the knee wall to the lower sill of the window panel, de-scale the lattice columns (north and south sides), repair/replace damaged bars, and apply a rust resistant surface coat, or protect these portions of the columns from weathering.

Vibration

The buildings were designed and constructed for the purpose of operating manufacturing or industrial processes inside the buildings. The buildings have remained structurally sound despite decades of use for manufacturing or industrial processes. Operation of soil processing equipment inside the buildings is consistent with the building design and intended use. Good engineering practice dictates that rigid connections between processing equipment and the walls be avoided.

The conclusions and recommendations of the August 2006 report are here reiterated by reference. Buildings A & B remain in satisfactory condition for their intended use. Implementation of the recommendations will prolong the useful life of the buildings.

Please call me at (518)782-0882 if you have any questions.



Very truly yours,

SPECTRA ENGINEERING, ARCHITECTURE
AND SURVEYING, P.C.

Paul M. Adel, P.E.
V.P., Director of Technical Services

cc: Joseph Berger, P.E., Town of Dover
Jon Adams, Esq., Corbally, Gartland and Rappleyea, LLP

VIA First Class Mail

PMA/FP/em

G:\2005\05248-RASCO\Correspondence\RASCO Bldg Insp 04_12_2010 Final.doc