

MINUTES

THE SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES COMMITTEE GUIDE REVIEW MEETING

**Rutledge Building, Room 806
Columbia, South Carolina**

**February 23, 2012
10:00 A.M.**

Voting Members Present: Jacqueline Myers, Chair; Delisa Clark, PE
John Butler, CPA; H. Ashley Johnson, PE
Donza Mattison, AIA; Eddie Rodelsperger
Emma Souder, AIA

Advisory Member Present: Kim Aydlette, Esq.; Jim Britton, CCM
K. Mark Faulk; Ronnie Hall; Michael T. James
Steven Jenkins, PE; Chris Whitley

Advisory Members By Phone: Bruce Kritz, Ed Roper

Advisory Members Not Present: Michael Chewning, AIA, Catherine Graham, MEBME
Rick Holt, Greg Hughes, David Lindsay
Jeffrey Reynolds, AGC, Cindy Wright, AIA

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 February 23, 2012. Everyone introduced themselves.

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Ms. Myers announced the names of the voting members. A quorum was present.

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

DIVISION 1

Section 102

Ms. Clark proposed deletion of 102.1 because the referenced statute was not applicable to the authority to establish and enforce the Guide. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the change.

Ms. Clark proposed new wording for 102.2 that extracted more relevant language from the statute to clarify the authority established. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the change.

Ms. Clark proposed deferring discussion on section 103 until all of the subcommittees have completed their work and all potential changes can be considered at one time. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Section 103

There were no proposed changes for this section

Section 104

There were no proposed changes for this section

Section 105

Ms. Myers discussed having consistency using “the OSF” or just “OSF” throughout the Guide. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept use “the OSF” and changes will be made throughout the Guide accordingly.

Ms. Meyers noted that 105.5.3 and 105.5.5 were not a part of the scope of the OSF and should be moved to a more appropriate location in the Guide. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to move the two paragraphs to a section referencing requirements for other State agencies.

Mr. Roper expressed concern for the wording in 105.5.3 because it appeared to allow submittal of sprinkler drawings after construction starts. Ms. Clark proposed a change referencing compliance with Fire Marshal Regulations. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the change.

Ms. Clark proposed adding IT and security to examples listed in 105.5.4 because those areas were ones with the most issues in the districts. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Ms. Meyers noted that the formatting seems to indicate that the exceptions listed for the section appears to be for roofing instead of for the OSF scope and proposed they be moved out and assigned sections numbers. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Mr. Roper expressed concerns for the language for the paragraph currently numbered “A”. Although furnishings and portable equipment are not a capital or construction item, there are still building code considerations. Ms. Clark proposed language identifying the code considerations involved. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Section 106

Ms. Clark proposed language for 106.5.4 that required districts to identify the certified party to the OSF so that credentials can be verified before the start of work. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Ms. Clark proposed deleting the language in 106.5.3 because it appears redundant with 106.5.4 and substitute language noting inspection requirements for construction by a school district. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Ms. Clark proposed deleting 106.6.4 because it is redundant to the new language included in Section 105 A. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Ms. Myers noted that 106.7 does not appear to be properly located in the Guide and proposed moving this paragraph to a new section. Ms. Clark noted that in addition to re-occupying building, changing the use of building should also be included in the new section. Mr. Roper noted that the two year limit noted in 106.7 is in conflict with Fire Marshal regulations requiring building to be brought up to code if they have been unoccupied for more than one year. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the change in 106.7 to one year and Ms. Clark will propose language for changing the use of buildings and a new location for the two items for the committee’s consideration at the next meeting.

Section 107

Ms. Clark noted a conflict between the Guide and the information published in the State Register for 107.1.17 and 107.1.18. The wording in the Guide will be changed to match the State Register.

Ms. Clark proposed deleting 107.3.1 through 107.3.2 because this information is repeating requirements for the code. Mr. Jenkins noted that currently any structure with combustible construction is required to be sprinklered, a requirement that exceeds the requirements of the code. The committee discussed the need for this additional requirement at length. Mr. Roper recommended that we follow the code without additional requirements. After additional discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal to delete the sections.

Ms. Myers proposed moving 107.3.3 to Division 3 where it appears to be better located. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Section 108

Ms. Clark proposed combining the relevant information in 802.1 into 108.1. Mr. Rodelsperger proposed removing the restriction for design build in 108.2.2 to allow the delivery method for any project. Ms. Mattison expressed concern for the potential negative effects on life safety provisions when the architect is not acting as the districts agent. Because requirements in the Guide presumed a design-bid-build project, Ms. Clark requested language to require the districts using a delivery method other than design-bid-build to coordinate with the OSF prior to solicitation for any contracts. It was noted by Ms. Clark that this would provide an opportunity to talk with the districts to be sure they had complete their due diligence before starting the solicitation process. After a lengthy discussion, the consensus of the committee was to allow design build for any type of building and for Ms. Clark to propose language for the committee's consideration.

Section 109

Ms. Clark proposed that discussion for this section be deferred. Although Chapter One of the ICC requires an appeal process and a board had been assembled to hear disputes in the past, there was really no formal process documented. In addition, the State Board of Education also heard appeals. Ms. Clark requested the opportunity to consult the Department of Education Legal Division and propose language for the committee's consideration. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Sections 110, 111, 112 and 113

Ms. Clark proposed combining these sections and include previously discussed paragraphs 105.5.3 and 105.5.5 into one section referencing related standards. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Section 114

Ms. Clark proposed moving relevant information from this section to 108 since this is really discussing requirements for this project delivery method and removing suggestions and recommendations. The new language would be included in the proposed language for 108 for the committee's consideration. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Section 115

Ms. Clark proposed combining this section with 109 since the topics were closely related and this would also likely need legal input. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Section 116 and 117

Ms. Clark proposed combining these two sections into one providing additional references for districts to consider. The new section would only contain the direction to the reference and would not repeat any of the information to avoid possible conflicts with outside materials at a later date. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

Division 5
Section 502

Ms. Clark proposed deleting this division as the information was covered in other areas of the Guide. Ms. Mattison proposed retaining the information in 502.5 and including it in Division 1 in the event the district elects to meet the requirements for a shelter. Ms. Mattison proposed retaining the information in 503.4 and including it in Division 1 for the districts reference. Ms. Clark proposed providing the new location in Division 1 for the committee's consideration. After discussion, the consensus of the group was to accept the proposal.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.