

MINUTES

THE SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES COMMITTEE GUIDE REVIEW MEETING

Rutledge Building, Room 1105
Columbia, South Carolina

March 8, 2012
10:00 A.M.

Voting Members Present:

Jacqueline Myers, Chair; Delisa Clark, PE
K. Mark Faulk (Proxy for Ashley Johnson)
Donza Mattison, AIA

Voting Member Not Present:

John Butler, CPA; H. Ashley Johnson, PE
Eddie Rodelsperger; Emma Souder, AIA

Advisory Member Present:

David Blackwell, Jim Britton, CCM
Ronnie Hall, Greg Hughes
Michael T. James, Steven Jenkins, PE
Cindy Wright, AIA

Advisory Members Not Present:

Kim Aydlette, Esq.; Michael Chewning, AIA
Catherine Graham, MEBME; Rick Holt,
David Lindsay, Jeffrey Reynolds, AGC
Chris Whitley

Others Present:

Joe Burch, Matt Dean, Mark Koll

Recorder:

Juliet Berry

OPENING - WELCOME

Ms. Myers, Chair, introduced herself and welcomed everyone to the South Carolina Public School Facilities Committee Guide Review meeting on March 8, 2012.

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Ms. Myers declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Clark made a motion for approval of the agenda. Seconded by Ms. Mattison. The Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Donza made a motion for approval of the minutes. Seconded by Mr. Faulk. The Motion carried.

DISCUSSION OF REVISIONS TO 2012 SC SCHOOL FACILITIES PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION GUIDE

Changes noted in the meeting minutes from the previous meeting were discussed.

DIVISION 1

Section 107

There was no additional discussion on the section and the consensus was to accept the changes as shown in the draft.

Section 108

There was no additional discussion on the section and the consensus was to accept the changes as shown in the draft.

Section 110

Ms. Wright suggested that the italics be removed from 110.1. They had originally been inserted by the committee to help draft language and just never removed. The consensus of the group was to change to regular typeface.

By email dated March 7, 2012, Ms. Wright and Mr. Blackwell proposed language for 110.5 for the committee's consideration. The proposed language reads:

"110.5 Alterations, repairs, additions, and rehabilitation to an existing building or structure shall comply with the State Fire Marshal's Rules and Regulations and the International Existing Building Code as applicable. The term "building value" referred to in the State Fire Marshal's Rules and Regulations shall be the insured value of the structure."

The consensus of the group was to accept the proposed language.

Mr. Holt requested a change to 110.3 by email dated 3/6/12 that would extend the time a building could remain unoccupied before requiring the building to be brought up to code from the one year as currently written to 16 months to address a building that could be unoccupied for a year plus a summer. Ms. Clark noted that the change to one year was made to match the Fire Marshal Rules and Regulations and one of the objectives of the review of the Guide is to remove conflicts with other laws and regulations. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to leave the time period at one year.

There was no additional discussion on the section and the consensus was to accept the remainder of the changes as shown in the draft.

Section 112

There was no additional discussion on the section and the consensus was to accept the changes as shown in the draft.

Section 113

There was no additional discussion on the section and the consensus was to accept the changes as shown in the draft.

Section 115

There was no additional discussion on the section and the consensus was to accept the changes as shown in the draft.

DIVISION 6

Section 605

There was no additional discussion on the section and the consensus was to accept the changes as shown in the draft.

TABLE OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION RELATED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

Ms. Mattison suggested removing “Hospitals & Infirmaries” and “Ambulatory Surgical Facilities” from the list because they were not really applicable to school construction. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to remove those two permits from the list.

Ms. Wright suggested removing “Community Residential Care Facilities” for similar reasons. Ms. Clark suggested that it is needed because of the overlapping jurisdictions between SCDHEC and OSF in residential treatment facilities. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to leave this permit on the list.

There was no additional discussion on the table and the consensus was to accept the remainder of the changes as shown in the draft.

New changes proposed were discussed.

DIVISION 6

General Discussion

Ms. Clark proposed the submittal process be relocated to a new Division 2 because this is administrative information and would consolidate the information in a more easily located format. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the changes.

Section 602

The information in this section is proposed to be moved to section 109. Since not all permits will be in hand at the time of final review, it was proposed that the status of the permits be provided instead of copies. The second sentence of 602.2 was proposed to be deleted because a

zoning permit is required and the procedures will be dictated by the local authority. Because not all of the permits that could be applicable to a project are construction permits, it was proposed that the word “Construction” be deleted. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the changes.

Section 603

The information in this section was discussed. Ms. Clark proposed separating information in the paragraph for clarity and Ms. Mattison proposed including an http link to the regulations. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the changes.

Section 604

Language was proposed for 604.1 to create consistency between the sections. Information that should be submitted at this stage was discussed and it was suggested that a list of items be provided in the place of the existing narrative format. Ms. Clark proposed providing language for the committee’s consideration. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to consider the new language.

Section 605

Language was proposed to create consistency between the sections. Information that should be submitted at this stage was discussed and it was suggested that a list of items be provided in the place of the existing narrative format. Ms. Clark proposed providing language for the committee’s consideration. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to consider the new language.

Section 606

It was proposed to delete 606.1.1 because it repeated information located elsewhere in the division. The information in 606.1.2 and 606.2 is recommended to be moved to the submittal details. The information in 606.3 was proposed to be moved to Section 110 with language provided by Ms. Clark for the committee’s consideration. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to consider the changes and to consider the new language.

Section 607

Ms. Clark proposed the information in this section be relocated to Section 105 and proposed revised language for the committee’s consideration. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to consider the changes and to consider the new language.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Clark mad a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. Mattison. The meeting adjourned at 12:10 PM.