

Oregon Roof Consulting and Inspection

No-Nonsense Roofing Advice for Property Owners: Affordable ~ Thorough ~ Versatile ~ Capable

Serving the Portland Metro area and all of Oregon: (503) 654-4612

Oregon CCB: 199121 ~ WA Lic: OREGORC871MR

PO Box 220190, Milwaukie, OR 97222

Roof inspection for:

St. Portland Oregon

I was Contacted by David and asked to inspect this roof on 6/13/14 & 6/14/14. Two visits were necessary. On 6/13 I met with both David and his wife and also their realtor. The roof is a one layer new IKO 30 year laminated composition shingle in the black color installed over a solid CDX plywood deck which is installed over spaced or skip sheathing. Photo documentation has been sent to both

There are many examples of basic installation methods/techniques set forth by the shingle manufacturer and the industry itself that were not followed. The various items noticed are as follows:

- Different colors and profiles of rake/gable edge and drip/gutter edge metal flashings were used. Green-white-black-gray-galvanized. Normally similar flashing is used throughout the roof for continuity. While this does not affect shingle performance it could be considered aesthetically objectionable. Counter flashing at sidewalls mangled and unsightly.
- 2. On a rear dormer shingles were applied on a 1/12 pitch section. No manufacturer allows this regardless of the underlayment. If shingles are applied on a pitch between 2/12 & 4/12 then an 'Ice & Water' membrane must be installed. Shingles must not be applied on any pitch LESS than 2/12.
- 3. Shingles at various points on the roof had end joints in preceding and succeeding rows were too close; shingles are overlapping at the ends instead of butting together; end joints in the field were apart and covered by scrap strips of shingle (photos sent); end joints were observed with no nail at all; nails were observed directly in the shingle joint; starter course and 1st shingle row end joints in some areas are too close.
- 4. Two front soffit intake screens were removed at the front entry area with present to observe. One bay was completely blocked by framing therefore zero air intake here. All manufacturers require proper flow from bottom to top. At the adjacent overhang the other screen removed was placed over two 3/4" holes. A rectangular hole to accommodate the screen should have been cut. Also at this drip edge/overhang there was only 1 screen on a 24' run. The air intake here very inadequate.
- 5. Dozens of shingles were lifted at various points of the roof to check for proper fastening. All shingle manufacturers have nearly identical requirements and specifications regarding proper fastening which is crucial. If these requirements are not followed then part of the material warranty could well be void. At least 85% of all

Revised: 02/14/2013

nails observed were not remotely close to manufacturers and industry specifications. Most were overdriven and/or angle driven. Nails must be perpendicular to the deck surface with nail heads flush with the surface and never cutting into the shingle. With thousands of nails in the roof it is to be expected that a few will not be correct but when such a high percentage of fasteners are incorrect then the install is considered incorrectly installed by both manufacturer and industry standards, requirements, and specifications. These bad nails were not spaced far apart but were all close to each other wherever I looked so I must conclude that this is the case throughout the roof. I am available to inspect further if necessary.

Thank you,

Owner / operator ~ Oregon Roof Consulting

Revised: 02/14/2013