

**ROOFING WORKSHOP
BOARD RESPONSES**

8/28/20

OBSERVATION 1 – ROOFING DESIGN AND PLAN REVIEW

OCP should address requirement of designers to conduct site inspections and maintain evidence the inspections were completed.

Design firms are required by contract to conduct site visits and testing. Performance of these inspections is recorded and evidenced in the resulting design deliverables, such as the project drawings and specifications.

BD should commit to working with the designers

[Building Department to Respond]

OBSERVATION 2 – STRATEGIC LONG-TERM BCPS ROOFING PLAN

OCP should comment on the long-range plan

We have taken steps toward developing a long-range roofing plan that centers on the engagement of a third-party asset management company, who will be instrumental in devising the final plan and in performing key functions in the overall maintenance and evaluation of the District's entire roofing program. Such functions include analysis and prioritization of future projects, as well as ongoing inspections and upkeep on completed projects for maximum sustainability which will ultimately optimize roof warranties. The focus is getting the current work completed now to maximize these warranties.

OBSERVATION 5 – ROOF SUB-PERMITTING PROCESS IS MANUAL / PRINTED

BD should address consideration of Maximo as a tool for facilitating electronic submissions of sub-permit binders

[Building Department to Respond]

OBSERVATION 6 – LACK OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ROOFING SUB-PERMITTING

BD should say that they will analyze the staffing and that there will be a request for staffing that the Board will need to consider approving

[Building Department to Respond]

OBSERVATION 7 – LACK OF FORMALIZED PROCEDURES AND RESOURCES FOR INSPECTIONS

BD should say that they will analyze the staffing and that there will be a request for staffing that the Board will need to consider approving

[Building Department to Respond]

BD response mentions “could look into addition of a roofing phone line for inspections” (This should be more definitive on whether they do/do not intend

[Building Department to Respond]

OBSERVATION 8 - BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION AND DISTRICT DESIGN STANDARDS

OCP and BD need to opine on whether the District’s design standards are too high

The mutual position of OCP and BD is that the District’s design standards are not too high. BCPS design standards are consistent with Florida Building Code (HVHZ).

DESCRIPTION	FLORIDA BUILDING CODE	BCPS DESIGN STANDARDS	COMMENTS
WIND SPEED	180 mph	180 mph	High-Velocity Hurricane Zones
NOA	Roof Assembly	Roof Assembly	Test Protocols for High-Velocity Hurricane Zones
FLAT ROOF/SLOPE	1/4”/12	1/4”/12	For all new roofs by code definitions, including Roof Replacement – (roof replacement with a "New Roof" as interpreted by CBO).
MATERIALS	Same	Same	Several materials are allowed by code; District Standards select the best performing materials

A recommendation from the Board was to pursue benchmarking of the multiple NOA approach. OCP and BD should affirm whether this is part of their action plan

The interpretation of the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) requires use of a single Notice of Acceptance (NOA) for complete assemblies, which does not support an approach involving multiple NOAs.

OCP and BD should make a statement that the primary decision to go with Soprema is because they were the only manufacturer that tested the entire system

Currently, Soprema is the sole manufacturer to have completed the full testing requirements for obtaining a Notice of Acceptance (NOA). Several other manufacturers are now in the process of completing these tests and will be made available as additional options once they too have received the required NOA.

OCP and BD should make a statement about the warranty

A statement regarding the warranty has been provided by Risk Management. (Please reference attachment)

OCP and BD to comment on what MPH they feel the District is balancing regarding risk and assessment

A statement regarding the wind rider has been provided by Risk Management. (Please reference attachment)

OTHER

OCP and BD to comment on why they think some of the permitting time is excessive and what they will do to improve it

A focus of the new PMOR will be to develop strategies and apply industry best-practices to improve the roofing sub-permit process. To positively impact timing, dedicated roofing personnel on the program management team will be assigned to maintain schedules and hold both the roofing subconsultants and the Prime contractors to tighter deadlines and higher quality standards. The PMOR and the Building Department will continue to expand the training of roofing contractors in an effort to reduce multiple resubmissions and generally improve understanding and efficiency where possible.

Additionally and as part of the long-range plan, the Asset Management company can train in-house roofing personnel to assist in roof repairs/maintenance, and also assist in training small roofing companies who may be interested in pursuing work with the District, which can contribute to expanding the contractor base.

Topic: Roofing – Wind Riders

Staff Follow up: P2. Chief of Staff to meet with the District's Director of Risk Management and insurance brokers to review the roofing wind rider and make a determination of whether it is worth the investment in light of exclusions that may apply to coverage. **W-081120-01 (LRL)**

Response: The Director of Risk Management met with our insurance broker via a telephone conference to discuss purchasing roofing wind riders. Sample, standard roofing warranties and wind riders from roofing manufacturers Johns Manville (JM) and Soprema were obtained from the Office of the General Counsel. As a point of clarification, wind riders serve to modify the standard form of a roofing manufacturer's product warranty, and are not insurance policies. As of this date, there are no insurance policies, which provide coverage similar in nature to wind riders.

Currently, the District carries a named storm self-insured retention of one-million dollars (\$1,000,000) and a seventy-five million dollar (\$75,000,000) hurricane self-insured retention per occurrence. The District will be required to fulfill its self-insured obligation prior to seeking recovery from insurance carriers and syndicates.

Both insurance policies and warranties have limitations and exclusions to coverages. Additionally, owners have certain responsibilities which must be upheld such as routine inspections, maintenance, major repairs or modifications to the roof assembly in which a manufacturer must be notified and grant approval.

Soprema's standard warranty requires that claims be submitted to the manufacturer within two business days after a leak or other issues are discovered. Wind related claims must be reported within 14 days. Photos of damages are required after an event.

JM's standard warranty requires written notice must be provided within 30 days after a leak or major defect is discovered or should have been discovered. The failure to exercise normal diligence, such as performing maintenance and repairs, or the performance of modifications without prior approval from JM, could void this warranty. Both standard warranties contain multiple limitations and exclusions from coverage, including but not limited to tornados, hurricanes or other extraordinary natural occurrences and/or winds speeds in excess of 55 miles per hour. Without a wind rider, the standard warranty excludes a manufactures obligation to repair or replace a roofing system damaged as a result, in whole or in part, of wind speeds exceeding 55 miles per hour.

Tropical storms may exhibit maximum sustained surface winds ranging from 39-73 miles per hour. Without a wind rider, roof damage resulting from even a minor tropical storm would be excluded from coverage by a standard warranty should wind speeds exceed 55 miles per hour.

The purchase of wind riders increases warranty coverage up to a nominal wind speed of 180 miles per hour. Wind riders are an addendum to JM's and Soprema's standard form of warranty. Both wind riders are expressly limited in scope to obligate these manufacturers to address leaks, damages and/or blow off to existing roofing systems, which result from wind speeds exceeding 180 miles per hour and which generate associated negative pressures.

Please note that tornados, earthquakes, wind-borne debris and lack of maintenance remain exclusions to warranty coverage regardless of the purchase of a wind rider.

Our Facilities Department has purchased wind riders at a cost of approximately \$2,000 per roof. There are 200 roofs slated for replacement. The District's wind rider total cost is estimated to be approximately \$400,000.

As stated earlier, the District has certain contract obligations which must be upheld in order to benefit from this wind rider purchase. A structured maintenance program which adheres to both manufacturers specifications outlined in their wind rider warranties must be in place in order to garner benefits from this purchase.

AAH/tc