Permissible Clarifying Questions:

1. Why is there a need to destroy 30%+ of the existing tile to replace 3-4% broken tile per "section"? (Swope)
2. Do you have to render the non-damaged tile useless due to your particular workmanship techniques/procedures? (Ebersold)
3. The petitioner has submitted their roof drawing showing “different roof sections” and according to the definition (see below) of a roof section the petitioner has it wrong. According to the definition that entire roof would be considered one roof section. (Ebersold, Swope)
4. Is there any sort of real-time aerial imaging of the building or more specific diagram/drawings? (Swope, Zehnal)
5. I would like to have more information about how many roof tiles are damaged and how the petitioner determined the additional percentages of roof cover in yellow (Zehnal).
6. It appears that the petitioner has not inquired about obtaining replacement tiles for this project. He offered no evidence of attempts to find them. (Ebersold, Swope)

Questions for Legal:

1. Do we have to expand on our reasons for an answer? Will simple yes or no answers alone be acceptable (Ebersold)?
   1. Answer: Some explanation would probably be good to have, but the extent of what is necessary depends on the question.
2. Do we need to limit the questions asked by the petitioner to only the building being referenced by them? What about questions related to the HVHZ? (Ebersold, Boyer)?
   1. Answer: The questions should be limited to the project/scenario that the Petitioner has presented in his petition.
3. Wouldn’t the two questions ask apply to any building located outside the HVHZ (Ebersold)?
   1. Answer: The answer to the questions would apply to projects with the same conditions/circumstances.
4. The damaged tile that is being replaced should be able to be installed under 706.5, reinstallation of materials (Swope).
   1. Comment: if the TAC feels that this is part of the answer to the question, then it can include it in its recommendation.

Likely Impermissible Questions:

1. We have no REAL verification of the damaged tiles other than his submitted drawing and analysis. (Ebersold)
2. Are you trying to inflate the percentage of damage to exceed 25% to facilitate an insurance claim? Or a reroof sale (Ebersold)?
3. I would like to know if the Building Official has commented on the project (Zehnal)?
4. Where two sections of the code are in conflict, as in FEBC 502.3 with FEBC 601.1, which is applicable according to FBC 102.1, the more specific or the more restrictive? (Gaspar Rodriguez)
5. Where FBC section 1521.2 indicates that the definition of a roofing component (found on FBC page 453) is a roofing product that is incorporated into various roofing assemblies, would a concrete roof tile that is solely incorporated in one roofing assembly require a current product approval? (Gaspar Rodriguez)
6. Where the Building Official invokes FEBC 706.1.1 and the repair contemplated is greater than 25% of roof or roof section, are you in agreement the entire roof or roof section must be replaced? (Gaspar Rodriguez)
7. Can you replace the tile on a separate small roof section or sections with new tile that is close to matching the remaining sections and then reuse the removed tile to replace the damaged tile in other sections? (Ebersold)