

**Florida Board of Professional Engineers
Evaluation of Damaged Structures Committee Minutes
November 6, 2025, at 11 am
via video conference**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Determination of Quorum, and Address Absences

Mr. Pistorino called the meeting to order. Ms. Sammons called the roll.

Committee Members Present:

John Pistorino, P.E., S.I., Committee Chair
Dylan Albergo, P.E.
Christopher Dawson, Public Member
Jeb Mulock, P.E.
Pankaj Shah, P.E.

Attorney General's Office:

Lawrence Harris, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Counsel to the Board

Staff Members Present:

Zana Raybon, Executive Director
John J. Rimes, III, Chief Prosecuting Attorney
Rebecca Sammons, Assistant Executive Director

2. Introduction of Guests and Announcements

Wendy Anderson, FEMC Investigator
Andrew Lovenstein, P.E., FSEA
Jamie Graham, P.E., FES
Jaime Ghitelman, P.E., FES
Andrew Lovenstein, P.E., FSEA
Dave Compton, P.E.

3. Review of Proposed Rules

Mr. Harris discussed the proposed rules.

Mr. Pistorino discussed the proposed rules.

Mr. Harris explained the need for minimum standards in engineering reports, particularly for evaluating damaged structures, to ensure consistency and clarity in legal proceedings. Mr. Harris highlighted that engineers who sign and seal such reports must adhere to these

standards to avoid potential negligence claims. Mr. Pistorino shared his experience with engineering reports in insurance claims, noting the controversy over the quality of reports and the financial impact on insurance companies, which often leads to increased rates. Both emphasized that these standards would not limit the scope of practice for non-engineers but would hold engineers accountable for their work.

Mr. Pistorino explained his extensive experience in developing roofing codes following Hurricane Andrew, which led to the creation of the South Florida Building Code and its subsequent inclusion in the Florida Building Code as a high-velocity hurricane zone. Mr. Pistorino emphasized the importance of engineering expertise when assessing roofing damage, highlighting issues with insurance company reports that lack specific knowledge of roofing systems. Mr. Pistorino also discussed the impact of hurricane-related damage claims on condominium associations, particularly regarding windows, doors, and stucco, and shared his detailed guidelines for evaluating such damage.

Mr. Pistorino presented proposed responsibility rules for engineers conducting damage evaluations, which include general requirements for damage evaluation reports and specific requirements for different types of structures, such as roofs and wall openings. Mr. Rimes raised concerns about the financial impact of these new standards, suggesting that the board should consider conducting an economic analysis and be prepared for potential legislative approval. Mr. Pistorino acknowledged these concerns and emphasized the importance of incorporating existing industry standards into the rules. The committee members and guests were invited to provide comments before further discussion of the rules took place.

Mr. Pistorino explained that Florida's hurricane damage assessment standards were unique to the state due to its geographic location and frequent hurricanes, and he had not researched similar standards in other Gulf states. Mr. Mulock inquired about potential standards in different states, but Mr. Pistorino confirmed their uniqueness to Florida. Mr. Pistorino also mentioned that he had initially planned to include additional standards related to flooding and water intrusion, but decided to focus on the current report first. Mr. Shah raised concerns about unethical roofing contractors exploiting insurance claims, questioning how to prevent such practices, even with engineer-signed reports.

Mr. Pistorino explained that insurance companies typically investigate legitimate roof damage claims themselves, often sending engineers to inspect the property. When homeowners dispute insurance denials, attorneys are commonly involved, who then retain engineers to support the claim. Mr. Shah and Mr. Albergo discussed how engineers are often retained by attorneys rather than directly by homeowners, with Mr. Pistorino confirming that while homeowners can hire engineers directly, it's more common for attorneys to do so in insurance disputes.

The committee discussed concerns about engineering reports, particularly the lack of complete documentation and coherent analysis frameworks. Mr. Pistorino proposed developing rules for

engineering reports to improve transparency and consistency, which the industry would critique before adoption. Mr. Pistorino raised questions about the cost implications of these requirements, and Mr. Mulock expressed concerns about the financial burden on homeowners. Mr. Lovenstein clarified that most insurance claims do not involve engineers, and Mr. Mulock emphasized that the proposed rules would only apply to professional engineers writing reports.

The committee discussed proposed rules for engineering damage evaluation reports, focusing on concerns about testing requirements and costs. Mr. Pistorino presented his draft rules, which include requirements for basic information about roof damage assessments but do not mandate specific tests.

Upon motion by Mr. Shah, seconded by Mr. Pistorino, to present the proposed rules to the full board for discussion and possible action, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Harris advised that if the board adopts technical standards, they should expect pushback and be prepared for a SERC analysis. The group agreed to notify relevant industry groups about the proposed rules and solicit comments during the board's December meeting.

4. Next steps for the committee
5. Adjourn

