

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED CODE CHANGES (This form must be submitted electronically)

IRC-59, R905.2.8.5 (REV 2-17-2012)

Author/requestor: **1309 Committee (2-14-2012 meeting)**

Email address:

Telephone number:

Firm/Association affiliation, if any:

Proposed Code Change - Language

~~**R905.2.8.5 Drip edge.** A drip edge shall be provided at eaves and gables of shingle roofs. Adjacent pieces of drip edge shall be overlapped a minimum of 2 inches (51 mm). Drip edges shall extend a minimum of 0.25 inch (6.4 mm) below the roof sheathing and extend up the roof deck a minimum of 2 inches (51 mm). Drip edges shall be mechanically fastened to the roof deck at a maximum of 12 inches (305 mm) o.c. with fasteners as specified in Section R905.2.5. Underlayment shall be installed over the drip edge along eaves and under the underlayment on gables. Unless specified differently by the shingle manufacturer, shingles are permitted to be flush with the drip edge.~~

Proposed Code Change – Need and Reason

The requirement for drip edge was placed in the code during the past cycle. Following is the reason given by the proponent for the change:

Reason: Unlike the IBC, the IRC does not include drip edge requirements for shingle roofs. This new text brings the IRC into uniformity with the IBC, reflects manufacturers' requirements for shingle roof installations, and uses identical wording and placement as found in IBC 1507.2.9.3.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction.

The proponent's arguments are somewhat conflicted. Although the IBC does require drip edge, the solution for consistency should have been to remove it from the IBC rather than add it to the IRC. The proponent stated that it reflects manufacturer's requirements for shingle roof installations. The proponent provided no evidence of this in support of the statement and, if manufacturers do require drip edge, it would be required by existing language in the IRC (see end of section). In fact, the Asphalt Roofing Manufacturer's Association only **recommends** the use of drip edge; they do not say it is required. Then the proponent stated that requiring drip edge where it wasn't previously required would **not** increase the cost of construction.

While the committee approved this proposal, their reason statement makes little sense. They state that the drip edge "will provide protection of the shingles and give(s) rigidity to the shingle edges".

I'm not sure how drip edge protects the shingles and the projection of the shingles over the roof edge is governed by the manufacturer's installation instructions. Sometimes finding a good reason to approve something is a struggle.

Committee Reason: This is a good change that will provide protection of the shingles and gives rigidity to the shingle edges. This is consistent with the IBC.

The code language also creates a number of problems that need to be considered. The 2012 IRC has been amended to permit overlays (again). The question that comes up is how drip edge can or should be installed in an overlay situation. The Asphalt Roofing Manufacture's Association and drip edge manufacturers don't address that situation. Also, installing drip edge on existing homes with gutters creates a unique problem. Many of the attachment methods for gutters make it virtually impossible to install drip edge along an eave without cutting the drip edge to pieces. The folks at DOLI will need to prepare themselves for the questions that this language will generate if it is not deleted.

SECTION R905 REQUIREMENTS FOR ROOF COVERINGS

R905.1 Roof covering application. *Roof coverings shall be applied in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section and the manufacturer's installation instructions. Unless otherwise specified in this section, roof coverings shall be installed to resist the component and cladding loads specified in Table R301.2(2), adjusted for height and exposure in accordance with Table R301.2(3).*

It is reasonable that this proposal be approved because the language in the IRC is not well thought out, will create conflicts for reroofing, was not shown to be necessary or to serve any useful purpose, and will increase the cost of construction.

Proposed Code Change – Cost/Benefit Analysis

This proposal will reduce the cost of construction.

Other Factors to Consider Related to Proposed Code Change

1. Is this proposed code change meant to:

change language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).

R905.2.8.5 Drip edge.

change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

delete language contained in a published code book? If so, list section(s).

delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

neither; this language will be new language, not found in the code book or in Minnesota Rule.

2. Is this proposed code change required by a Minnesota Statute or new legislation? If so, please provide the citation to the Statute or legislation.

No

3. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a published code book or of an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

No

4. Will this proposed code change impact other parts of the Minnesota State Building Code? If so, please list the affected parts of the Minnesota State Building Code.

No

5. Who are the parties affected or segments of industry affected by this proposed code change?

Code officials, building designers, contractors, building owners

6. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? If so, please explain what they are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.

No

7. Are you aware of any federal requirement or regulation related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the regulation or requirement.

No