



THE ADHESIVE AND SEALANT COUNCIL, INC.

January 11, 2008

Luis Borray
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Policy Development and Research, Room 8134
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410

SUBJECT: Progress Report for December 2007

Contract No. H-21521CA, Investigation of Adhesive Applications for Strong and More Disaster-Resistant Roof Assemblies – Phase 1

Period of Performance: 4/7/06 – 5/7/08

Contractor: The Adhesive and Sealant Council, Inc.
7979 Old Georgetown Road, Suite 500
Bethesda, MD 20814

Email Attachments which Accompany this Report:

- None

SECTION I – INTRODUCTION

The HUD Office of Policy Development and Research has been extensively involved in supporting research and development on building technology innovations, construction systems, products, standards, regulations, and code issues which affect the affordability, safety and livability of the nation's housing. As the interrelationships of these topics become more complex, the continued need to conduct research and demonstrations becomes even more critical.

In addition to the research and demonstration efforts administered directly by the Office of Policy Development and Research, HUD administers the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) program. PATH provides private and public sectors for the U.S. housing industry an unprecedented opportunity to advance state of the art practices in the design and construction of affordable housing for the public by accelerating the process of developing and introducing new and innovative technologies and new materials through demonstrations and pilot projects throughout the nation.

This cooperative agreement with the PATH program will investigate and characterize the use of adhesives to fasten roof sheathing materials to underlying roof structures in residential buildings.

This application of adhesives holds the potential for improvements in roof system durability and disaster resistance, and applies to both new and existing construction.

SECTION II – PROGRESS AND SCHEDULE

Phase 1 of this project consists of 4 tasks. The status of each task is presented below.

Task 1. Assess Performance Requirements and Develop Criteria for Adhesive Consideration

Complete

Summary:

Task 1 called for ASC and its subcontractor Newport Partners (NP) to better understand the performance requirements needed from adhesives used in roof assemblies by a) canvassing building code and product standards, and b) investigating related research and product testing. Together ASC and NP have completed this task by engaging dozens of industry stakeholders, including ASC members and non-member adhesive manufacturers, researchers from academia and private firms, industry associations, building code bodies, and international groups involved in research and testing. Findings can be grouped into the following categories:

- Similar research and product development efforts
- Findings on the most suitable applications for similar systems (e.g. retrofit of existing roofs)
- Relevant building code issues that affect the application (e.g. issues with fire blocking for foam plastics)
- Relevant building performance and installation issues which have been raised (e.g. restricting ability of sheathing panels to expand/contract with ambient humidity changes)

The results of these research efforts are presented in the Task 1 summary report submitted to HUD in August 2006.

Task 2: Assessment of Industry and Market Factors

Complete

Summary:

In March 2007 we submitted the summary report “Insurance Incentives for Wind Mitigation Measures.” While the summary report on insurance incentives is now complete, we will continue work under this area as the project moves forward and we continue to work with stakeholder groups. In December 2007 and January 2008 – we are renewing our research of state-level programs which involve insurance incentives for building owners to “harden” their buildings against wind damage. Such efforts at the state level are becoming more common as insurance coverage for homeowners becomes increasingly expensive and/or difficult to obtain in hurricane-prone regions.

The table below summarizes our current findings in this area:

State	Programs & Policies
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance Incentives: Statute 627.0629 requires residential property insurance providers in FL to provide “discounts, credits, or other rate differentials, or other appropriate reductions in deductibles” for residential properties where construction methods that have been shown to reduce loss caused by windstorms are employed. Adhesives are recognized as a wind mitigation measure affecting roof deck attachment in retrofit construction, but not construction in or after 2002. See this site: http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdem/mitdb/index.cfm • Code Regulations for Existing Homes: In mid-2007 Florida’s legislature passed a statute to require that the Florida Building Commission (FBC) develop language to enable older homes to be retrofitted with code-recognized wind and hurricane resistant measures. The rule was to go into effect October 1, 2007 and be adopted into the Florida codes during the spring of 2008. In order to represent adhesives applications in this effort, Newport become involved with the drafting and review of the wind mitigation rule and participated in a public meeting in August 2007. IBHS, DOW, and FLASH were also represented. However, given the timeframe and the volume of comments received on the proposed language, FBC decided to keep their initial language (which does not address adhesives), unchanged except for editorial changes, and adopted that as the rule that is scheduled to go into effect October 1, 2007. However they are now considering some of the original comments in a current round of public meetings. There is a meeting in late January 2008 on this topic, where we will either participate or submit comments related to the benefits of adhesives in roof systems.
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Department of Insurance (TDI) regulates the insurance industry within the state. TDI cannot require private insurers to offer wind damage mitigation incentives. However, due to recent losses in the state, insurers in Texas are generally becoming more proactive. • We are currently re-connecting with TDI to see what policy developments have occurred over the last 6-9 months. When we last spoke with them, they were very interested in mitigation techniques which proved effective on existing homes, potentially for application in the highest risk areas of Texas (insured by the Texas Windstorm Insurance Association) or for use in voluntary incentive programs
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC insurers are not required by law/regulation to provide homeowner incentives for mitigation efforts, but at the same time there is a great deal of attention being paid to bolstering the storm resistance of homes in the area. • South Carolina’s Safe Home program provides matching grants to home owners who pursue wind mitigation measures for their existing homes. The program was created through the SC Omnibus Coastal Property Insurance Act of 2007, engrossed June 2007, and is administered by the SC Department of Insurance (DOI). Use of adhesives in the attachment of roof sheathing to roof framing is one of the mitigation measures eligible for the funding match. • Insurers in the state are also starting to recognize “code plus” programs for new residential construction – specifically the Institute for Business and Home Safety’s (IBHS) “Fortified for Safer Living” program. The program specifications are “code plus” requirements for all types of perils including hurricanes and flooding, and require a secondary water resistant barrier but do not recognize adhesives used to bolster uplift resistance in new homes. One SC insurer, South Carolina Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company, currently recognizes and offers an insurance discount for homes meeting the program.
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maryland recently established a task force to examine options for helping low income homeowners in coastal regions to obtain hazard insurance. Initial hearings were heard in October-November 2007. We are currently contacting the state to determine their next steps.
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are contacting state currently.
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are contacting state currently.
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are contacting state currently.

Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state had previously considered legislation which would require insurers to provide incentives for mitigation measures. We are currently checking with the Mississippi Insurance Commission to determine status.
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are contacting state currently.

As a second part of this task, we have assessed jobsite factors which need to be considered for the successful use of adhesives in both new and retrofit applications. These items are considerations for this application which may affect the installation of adhesive or related materials, as well as long-term performance and maintenance. A summary of jobsite factors was submitted in the monthly report dated April 19, 2007.

Task 3: Code Evaluation and Preliminary Tests

Complete by February 1, 2008

The objectives of this task are to:

- Conduct preliminary testing (in conjunction with ASC members or other manufacturers) to evaluate system performance and assess potential solutions to constructability issues. For example, testing of mocked-up new construction roof systems might employ a pre-applied adhesive tape applied to the top surface of the truss.
- Explore solutions to code issues for the chosen applications: including the fire protection issue and the pathway for meeting performance-based suction load requirements.

Task 3 Deliverables:

- Summary of preliminary testing
- Summary of relevant code issues and strategies for compliance

Testing activities are laid out in Phase I and Phase II activities below. Phase I activities allow us to better understand the application and potential market segments where it would provide the most value for housing durability. Phase II testing needs, which are subject to additional project funding by HUD, will provide more complete technical performance data, which will enhance the likelihood of integrating this application into regulatory and insurance programs.

Phase I Testing & Evaluation

1. Field Trial of Applying Adhesives in Site Built Single-Family Housing (completed in August 2006)
2. Explore potential applications in the factory-built housing segment
 - Conduct in-house factory assessment using adhesives in roof systems
 - Assess performance enhancements (e.g. reduced damage during transport) and product implications
3. Research of traditional construction techniques

- Conduct background research and preliminary field testing as deemed necessary on the reliability of typical roof deck installations (e.g. nail misses, adherence to spacing requirements)
- 4. National demonstration of enhanced roof systems using adhesives
 - Conduct planning and manufacturer coordination leading to demonstration of adhesive-based roof system in a national demonstration house in the Southeast US

Phase II Testing (Subject to Additional HUD Funding)

- 5. Conduct technology demonstration from Item #4
 - Conduct time & motion studies of the application of multiple types of adhesive systems (e.g. tapes, caulk gun applied adhesives)
 - Capture field installation on video for education/outreach
- 6. Examine one or more of the following technical performance issues. Funding levels and manufacturer input will help form final priorities:
 - Long-term performance of adhesives in an attic environment. What are the impacts on uplift resistance from temperature and humidity cycling?
 - Effectiveness as a redundant system to make up for inconsistent fastener application. How effective are adhesives, used in either new or existing construction, in mitigating the reduction in uplift strength caused by nail misses or other shortcomings of standard installations?
 - Improved tooling for retrofit installations. Explore tooling solutions that allow installation of adhesives all the way out to the edges of the roof?
 - Investigation of adhesives applied at roof deck seams for waterproofing as well as improved uplift. Is there a minimum deck thickness required to prevent warping of deck panels as moisture content of framing and panels equilibrates? What happens to seam-applied adhesives when the adjacent wood becomes saturated?

Phase I – Part 2

In June 2007 we met with a modular home builder at their production facility in Pennsylvania. The meeting summary was provided in the monthly progress report dated July 18, 2007. Overall, the modular builder did see value in the performance benefits offered by adhesive-based roof systems, but would not consider incorporating this technology unless it provided a significant incentive (e.g. first-cost savings, a trade-off in some other code-required building detail). The builder, as well as the adhesive supplier to the builder, are both interested in the progress of this research and will be kept informed as we move forward.

We will pulse other modular builders for their views on this technology but at the current time have no further plans to initiate an actual product trial in a modular plant.

Phase I – Task 3

Following a literature review of research into the reliability of nailing decking to roof framing, we have found:

- “Common [roof sheathing installation] mistakes include using the wrong size fasteners, missing the framing members when installing fasteners, overdriving nails, and using too many or too few fasteners.” (FEMA Technical Fact Sheet #18 – Roof Sheathing Installation).
- Pneumatic nail guns are more likely to “miss” than hand nailing, because the installer cannot sense the miss as easily with the powered nail gun
- The impact from nail misses (or other fastener mistakes like overdriving) really depends on the location of the nail. If the missed nail is on the edge, gable or ridge then the roof’s overall uplift performance is decreased more than if the nail was in the middle of the roof.
- Qualitative conclusions from post-disaster inspections have pointed at installation errors such as nail misses as root causes for building failures in hurricane events.

Despite this awareness of the critical importance of accurate nailing of roof sheathing to framing, there is no readily available field research that focuses quantitatively on the frequency of nail misses, nail overdriving, inaccurate spacing, or improper fastener selection. This conclusion was confirmed with groups such as APA and the National Roofing Contractors Association.

We are currently planning a field trial of relatively new housing (less than 15 years old) to gain a rough estimate of how frequently nail misses do indeed occur. Builder and site locations will not be specifically identified, although the characteristics of the construction will be reported (e.g. age, style of production, roof type).

Phase 1 – Task 4

We are in the design stages of planning to deploy adhesives in a demonstration and field trial for a national show house in South Carolina. Our plans for this demonstration include utilizing adhesive products to secure sheathing to framing, and demonstrating this application as a viable code-plus measure for high wind regions. The overall project is a showcase of innovative building systems and technologies for builders, contractors, designers, and consumers, so it will serve as an excellent platform to explore and exhibit this application to a wide audience.

The current design and specifications call for a closed-cell spray polyurethane foam insulation product to be blown into the roof assembly, creating a conditioned attic. This system also provides a secondary water barrier under the roof deck and adds strength to the overall roof system. This type of assembly is a recent addition to the International Residential Code (IRC).

This activity will provide ideal content, including photographs and an educational video segment, for the outreach and educational materials discussed below under Task 4.

Task 4: Analysis and Outreach

Complete by May 1, 2008

The objectives of this task are to:

- Summarize, based on results of Task 3, current “gaps” in adhesive-based roof sheathing attachment systems in three core areas: 1) performance testing, 2) codes, and 3) solutions to constructability issues.

- Develop a primer on using adhesives to strengthen roof systems. Guidance document would be aimed at the appropriate audience, e.g. if the application is new construction the audience would be builders and contractors; for retrofit applications the audience would be contractors, roofers, and DIY homeowners. The short (~ 2 page) primer will explain the benefits of using an adhesive-based system, the intended application, and recommendations for materials.

Deliverables:

- Report on findings and remaining information gaps
- Primer on using adhesives to strengthen roof systems

Task 4 Progress:

We are in the initial design stage for the house, and the site has been selected. The design will call for a single-family detached structure along with a detached garage (most likely a rear-loading garage fed through an alley way). In December 2007 the design will be further developed and we will begin technology selections for the many building systems.

SECTION III – PLANNED EFFORT

Activity for January 2008 includes coordinating with the Department of Insurance in South Carolina, participating in the Florida code hearings, and canvassing other states in the southeast to update our information on insurance incentive programs and policies.