

Wyatt,

This will be my final response to you regarding this matter. Any further action will proceed through formal channels. Your most recent email contains several inaccurate statements, which I will address below for clarity.

Your statement that there are only “a couple areas” where flake did not adhere is not accurate. There are multiple areas of missing or incomplete flake coverage along each of the three main garage walls, including the stem walls and ledges, with more than a few visible defects on each wall. Reducing that condition to “a couple areas” substantially minimizes the extent of the problem. These defects are documented in the photographs and video previously provided and on the project website.

More importantly, the lack of flake material in certain areas is only one of several defects. The primary issues include excessive roughness, sharp protruding flakes, mounding and buildup, inconsistent flake distribution resulting in visible color variation across the floor, improper edge work, and damage to adjacent trim and vertical surfaces.

Multiple independent contractors have also identified that the surface was not properly “knocked down” prior to the topcoat being applied, meaning excess flake material that should have been removed or flattened was instead left protruding and then sealed in place. This directly contributes to the sharp, abrasive surface condition and is not consistent with a properly finished installation.

Based on the overall condition of the installation, we are not willing to have any additional work performed by you at the property under any circumstance. This decision is based not only on the quality of the work currently in place, but also on your continued position that the existing condition is “normal” and acceptable for the system installed. Given that position, we do not have confidence that any further work performed by you would result in a proper or complete correction of the issues.

You state that the website was created “specifically to cause defamation” to your business. That is not accurate.

The website was created to document the condition of the work performed at my residence, including a factual timeline, photographs, video, and third-party assessments. It is being used to organize information for review by contractors, product manufacturers, other homeowners, and, if necessary, legal professionals.

All content presented is based on documented observations, photographic evidence, and third-party input. Truthful documentation of a project and its outcome does not constitute defamation.

You also stated that your responses are not represented. The purpose of the website is to document the condition of the work and the sequence of events based on verifiable information, including photographs, video, and written communication.

Your responses have been received and are part of the documented record. At your request, your correspondence will be included as part of that record and presented accurately and without alteration.

You also state that I did not allow you the opportunity to correct the issues. That is not accurate.

Our first opportunity to inspect the floor occurred on April 23, 2026, after the coating had cured sufficiently to be walked on. The defects were immediately apparent at that time, including a surface condition that cuts skin during normal contact, inconsistent flake distribution, excessive buildup in certain areas, and poor workmanship on the stem walls, ledges, and adjacent trim.

You returned to the property on April 24, 2026, inspected the floor in person, and stated that the condition was “normal” for the selected flake size. At that time, you proposed additional work for an added cost of \$700 and indicated that areas that are significant problem areas — including the stem walls, ledges, and trim — would largely remain as-is.

Based on those statements, it was clear that the proposed work would not correct the primary defects. You also declined to perform the work contingent on a satisfactory result.

Under those circumstances, it is not accurate to claim that you were not given an opportunity to address the issues.

In my prior correspondence, I also asked a series of specific questions regarding safety, usability, and whether the observed conditions reflect acceptable workmanship and professional standards. Those questions have not been answered in any meaningful way. Your failure to address those questions further supports the conclusion that the condition of the installation cannot be justified as “normal” or professionally acceptable.

You state that, as a business owner, I would want to resolve issues as professionally as possible. I agree.

In my experience owning and operating a technology business for over 21 years, acting professionally includes performing work to an acceptable standard, accurately representing the condition of that work, addressing legitimate concerns when they are raised, and providing a reasonable and complete path to correction when defects are identified.

Based on the condition of the installation and your continued position that the current result is “normal” and acceptable, those standards have not been met in this instance.

You state that this is your “final offer.” We do not accept that offer.

As previously stated, based on the quality of the work currently in place and your continued position that the condition is “normal” and acceptable, we are not willing to have you perform any additional work at the property under any circumstance.

Your proposed repair does not address the full scope of the defects, and your position that the current condition is acceptable leaves no reasonable basis to believe that further work performed by you would result in a proper or complete correction.

We are also in the process of working directly with the product manufacturer and pursuing a warranty evaluation to determine whether the condition of the floor is consistent with a properly installed system using their product.

As part of that process, the manufacturer will be provided with the same documentation, including photographs, video, and a detailed timeline of the installation. They will also be referred to the project website, which contains a complete and organized record of the condition of the work.

That process is intended to formally document whether the issues are related to installation, product application, or both, and will be included as part of the overall record.

The required resolution remains:

1. Full refund of \$3,498.00; or
2. Payment sufficient to cover the cost of correction by a qualified independent contractor.

A written estimate for correction in the amount of \$4,100 has been obtained. That estimate can be provided upon request or included as part of any formal proceeding.

This will be our final attempt to resolve this matter directly.

If this matter is not resolved within twenty-four (24) hours of this notice, we will proceed with filing a claim in small claims court without further notice.

In addition, we will continue to document the condition of the work and our experience through appropriate and lawful channels, including providing factual accounts supported by photographs, video, and third-party assessments, and continuing communication with the product manufacturer regarding the installation and potential warranty implications.

Ryan