Weathercraft Co. OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Inc.
P.O. Box 16039 Colorado Springs, CO 80935
Telephone (719) 382-8511 Fax (719) 382-5725

November 17, 2025

Brian Jackson
Olgoonik Specialty Contractors
5055 Mark Dabling Blvd.
Colorado Springs CO 80918

RE: TDKA 24-2510 Renovation Building 140
Response 11-14-2025

Brian,

We are responding to the two issues presented in your email attachment, Friday. Please see our responses below:

End of Day Lapping Issue:
When required to install the cap sheet daily by the SOW, all cap sheet plies will end at the "tie-in" to the old roof. At the end of the day's work, the insulation, base ply and cap ply all terminate within 18" – 24" of each other. This was a concern we expressed in our phasing rationale. We submitted a detail to Garland; they approved the detail.

The photo showing the "End of Day Lapping Issue" does not show finished work. After this photo was taken and before the gravel, we installed a "header" ply over the stacked end laps as shown in our detail approved by Garland. Staggering the cap sheet at this "end of day" location would result in back water laps or areas of the base ply not being capped.

Number of Coats/Embedment Issue:
For the final flood coat and gravel, the SOW 2.14.23.2.5 calls for a total of 4 gallons per 100 sq. ft. applied in two applications with 24 hours between applications. Garland's written documentation requires 4 to 5 gallons per 100 sq. ft. for the proper embedment of the gravel. As you noted, we provided a letter from Garland confirming the full 4 to 5 gallons per 100 sq. ft. rather than two application.

We have several concerns with the method described in the SOW.

1. The adhesive becomes tack-free within four to five hours and very likely is no longer chemically reactive after 24 hours.

2. While the adhesive is tacky, it is more susceptible to trapping foreign matter introducing contaminates to the assembly.

3. Having the flood coat rest overnight (24 hours) introduces the risk of moisture from dew or frost.

4. This installation method described in the SOW is untested. Garland's design has the flood coat adhesive installed in one layer over an aggressive (granule) surfaced cap sheet. The SOW method has the final flood coat installed over a smooth surface of a chemically cured adhesive with possible foreign contamination. Essentially, the method prescribed in the SOW creates potential bonding issues between the two layers of the adhesive.

5. From the beginning, we have communicated our concerns about installing gravel on a building adjacent to the flight line. We expect gravel will come off the building overtime; regardless of the installation method but more so if the installation method is unproven.

As discussed, it is unusual for a specifier to insist on methods that are untested, contrary to industry's best practices and conflict with manufacturer's written requirements. The last thing any of us want is to see this roof fail prematurely.

From our perspective, we are stuck between two entities, the Government and Garland and neither are responsive to our questions. The government has a SOW with specific installation requirements and Garland has installation requirements that are third-party tested. We must deliver a roof that is warrantable; typically, a specifier defaults to the manufacturer's requirements. We are certainly in new territory.

Sincerely,

John Fleming
President