

**ROOFING TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TELECONFERENCE MEETING FROM TALLAHASSEE
PLEASE JOIN MY MEETING FROM YOUR COMPUTER, TABLET OR SMARTPHONE**

[HTTPS://GLOBAL.GOTOMEETING.COM/JOIN/533378925](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/533378925)

UNITED STATES (TOLL FREE): 1 866 899 4679

ACCESS CODE: 533-378-925

April 2, 2021

10:00 a.m.

Minutes

ROOFING TAC PRESENT:

Brian Swope, Chairman
Jim Batts
Bob Boyer
Jimmy Buckner
George Ebersold

Charlie Kennedy for Burt Logan
Gaspar Rodriguez
William Schultz
John Garra for Karen Warseck
Mark Zehnal

ROOFING TAC NOT PRESENT:

Lorraine Ross

STAFF PRESENT:

Mo Madani
Justin Vogel
Robert Benbow

Thomas Campbell
Chris Howell
Jim Hammers

MEETING FACILITATION:

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from Facilitated Solutions, LLC. Consultation, Process Design & Facilitation. Information at: facilitatedsolutions.org

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Blair welcomed everyone to the teleconference meeting of the Roofing Technical Advisory Committee.

Roll Call:

Mr. Blair performed roll call for the Roofing TAC. A quorum was determined with 10 members present at roll call.

Agenda Approval:

Commissioner Batts entered a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting as posted. Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 10 to 0.

Approval of Minutes from July 27, 2020:

Mr. Boyer entered a motion to approve the minutes from July 27, 2020 as posted. Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 10 to 0.

To review and accept interim draft report for research project titled "Evaluation of the Cost Impact and Benefit of the 2021 I-Code Changes (Prescriptive Code Changes)."

Mr. Madani provided the background on this research project for the Committees.

Dr. Raymond Issa, UF provided a detailed summary of the report that included the IBC Roofing Assembly changes and the cost impact, if any, of those changes.

Committee Comments:

Chairman Swope asked if roofing professionals were contacted to allow input on cost evaluations.

Dr. Issa advised they used RS Means for this breakdown, he reminded the Committee this is just the first draft and information will continue to change as the project continues and there will be other reporting provided to the group. In addition, he stated yes, they would be including professionals in the cost analysis.

To review and accept interim draft report for research project titled “Evaluation of the Cost Impact and Benefit of the 2021 I-Code Changes (Prescriptive Code Changes).” (cont.):

Public Comments:

Mike Silvers, FRSA questioned how some of the increase in costs were determined and stated that there could be additional costs associated with administrative cost changes that should be included in the breakdown, along with the permit valuation section that states there are cost breakdowns required.

Mr. Madani addressed the Committee and advised this is just the first stage of this project. He advised the members if they had specific questions or concerns, they could send them to him and he would in turn forward them to Dr. Issa to address.

Motion:

Mr. Zehnal entered a motion to accept the interim draft report titled Evaluation of the Cost Impact and Benefit of the 2021 I-Code Changes (Prescriptive Code Changes).” Mr. Boyer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 10 to 0.

To Consider and discuss the following Declaratory Statement:

DS 2021-007 by Chris Casagrande of sdii Global Corporation:

Mr. Vogel, Commission legal counsel, stated there is a petition to Intervene which will be addressed at the Commission’s April meeting. He stated that today the TAC should focus on the technical questions posed in the declaratory statement.

Jeff Fazer stated he is an employee of the Petitioner and would be representing it. He stated the petition is self-explanatory and that they agree with the staff analysis.

Public Comment:

Mr. Silvers, FRSA stated he agreed with the staff analysis, however he felt it was being made more complicated than needed. He stated he felt the answer be “yes,” and just leave the other data out.

DS 2021-007 by Chris Casagrande of sdii Global Corporation (cont.):

Mr. Madani provided a detailed background of the declaratory request with a full staff analysis based on the facts presented.

Staff Analysis:

Question: When determining if a roof repair exceeds the 25 percent threshold specified in Section 706.1.1 of the 7th Edition of the FBC - Existing Building, should work on non-damaged components still be omitted from the repair area calculation?

Answer:

Option #1/Petitioner: SDII has reviewed pertinent sections of the FBC and respectfully believes that the answer to the question is "YES." We do not believe that the intention of the FBC is to burden the property owner with unnecessary costs for repair. If the removal and reinstallation of nondamaged components are counted toward the 25 percent threshold stated in Section 706.1.1, a relatively small roof repair could trigger a complete roof section replacement, depending on the area of non-damaged roofing components removed and reinstalled as part of the repair. If the answer is "NO" and work on non-damaged components is intended to be counted toward the 25 percent threshold, then the area of the roof that requires repair becomes subjective and is not necessarily quantifiable. The result is that the repair of a roof that sustained a relatively small area of damage can necessitate removal and reinstallation of non-damaged components, triggering the 25 percent threshold stated in Section 706.1.1, and thereby requiring full replacement of an otherwise competent roofing system. It is the opinion of SDII that the intention of the FBC is not to require unnecessary work and costs and that the omission of Section 502.3 Related Work from the FBC - Existing Building, 7th Edition presents the potential for unintended consequences to the property owner

Option #2/Staff: The answer to the Petitioner's question is yes. As per the definition of the terms "Roof Repair", "Repair" and "Roof Section" of Chapter 2 Definitions and Section 706.1.1 of the 7th Edition (2020) Florida Building Code (FBC), Existing Building, the level of repair as it relates to the project in question is limited in scope to the repair work on the damaged roof components that involves reconstruction and/or the removal and replacement of the damaged roof components. Related work which involves the removal and reinstallation of non-damaged components for the purpose of connecting repaired areas to unrepaired areas (roof areas required for a proper tie off) shall not be considered part of the roof repair in question and therefore such related work shall not be counted toward the 25 percent threshold stated in Section 705.1.1 of the 7th Edition (2020) FBC, Existing Building.

DS 2021-007 by Chris Casagrande of sdii Global Corporation (cont.):

Committee Comments:

Chairman Swope and Mr. Rodriguez requested clarification in the answer for Option #2. Discussion followed among the Committee on language changes.

Mr. Ebersole entered a motion to accept staff analysis, option #2 with amendments. Commissioner Batts seconded the motion.

There was continued conversation among the Committee for the correct language changes. Mr. Ebersole withdrew the prior motion with Commissioner Batts in agreement of the withdrawal.

Final Motion:

Mr. Ebersole entered a motion to accept Option #2/Staff as Amended by the Roofing TAC: The answer to the Petitioner's question is yes. As per the definition of the terms "~~Roof Repair~~", "~~Repair~~" and "Roof Section" of Chapter 2 Definitions and Section 706.1.1 of the 7th Edition (2020) Florida Building Code (FBC), Existing Building, ~~the level of repair as it relates to the project in question is limited in scope to the repair work on the damaged roof components that involves reconstruction and/or the removal and replacement of the damaged roof components.~~ Related work which involves the removal and installation ~~reinstallation~~ of non-damaged ~~removed~~ components for the purpose of connecting repaired areas to unrepaired areas (roof areas required for a proper tie-off) shall not be considered part of the roof repair in question and therefore such related work shall not be counted toward the 25 percent threshold stated in Section 706.1.1 of the 7th Edition (2020) FBC, Existing Building. Mr. Boyer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 10 to 0.

Public Comments: None

Adjournment:

There being no further business before the TAC, Chairman Swope adjourned the meeting at 10:53 a.m.