



March 20, 2018

Ohio House Economic Development, Labor, and Commerce Committee  
House Bill 164 / Commercial Roofing

Opposition Testimony of Dan Moore, Executive Vice President  
Able Roof

Chairman Young, Vice Chair Riedel, Ranking Member Lepore-Hagan, and members of the Ohio House Economic Development, Commerce, and Labor Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Dan Moore, Executive Vice President of **Able Roof**. I respectfully testify today in opposition to HB 164, a bill that would require all commercial roofing contractors to obtain a license through the Ohio Construction Industry Licensing Board. Our analysis suggests the bill could significantly hinder our business by creating burdensome regulations and significantly driving up consumer costs for our services.

Established in 1986 as a one-man chimney sweep, Able Roof has grown to become the “go to” roofing business for both residential and commercial customers across central Ohio. As a subsidiary of the Crane Group, we specialize in roofing repair and installation. We also work with manufacturers to provide our own unique and proprietary roofing, siding, and window products. *Columbus Business First* recently listed our company as one of the city’s “Fast 50,” a group that represents the area’s most high growth companies for their contributions to the community. In addition, we were named 2016 Contractor of the Year in the residential category by Roofing Contractor Magazine. We are proud of our team and our partners for helping the company earn these designations.

Our primary concern with HB 164 is that it would require each and every subcontracting entity that performs work on our commercial roofing projects to individually obtain a state license.<sup>1</sup> This new regulation would effectively shrink an already tight labor market and drive up costs for our business and consumers. Currently, as a licensed general contractor, Able must obtain a state or local permit prior to the commencement of our work. The permit allows us to enlist subcontractors to perform specified duties under our contracting license. Mandating a roofing license at the subcontractor level would add significant red tape and expense to the process. Some subcontractors may even seek to avoid the burdensome licensure process altogether and exit these construction spaces, minimizing our available partners and shrinking our already-challenged labor pool.

In short, if passed in its current form, we believe this legislation could force us to fundamentally alter our internal operations. Costs could escalate, and as our costs increase, so do prices for consumers. We do not believe this is sound state policy.

Thank you for your consideration. Happy to answer any questions you may have.

---

<sup>1</sup> HB 164 (As Introduced), Line 215. We have confirmed with the Construction Industry Licensing Board that the current definition of “contractor” in the Revised Code would capture all subcontractors on a commercial roofing project.