

RELOCATABLE GUIDE

MEETING MINUTES

November 30, 2011

Room 806
9 a.m. – 12:00 Noon

Voting Committee Members Present: Delisa Clark, Chair, John Stehmeyer, Dr. Frank Vail

Voting Committee Members Teleconferencing: David Blackwell, Eric Cook

Others Teleconferencing: Mark Dillon, Al McVey, Ed Roper

Others Present: Jaime Benton, Jeff Burkett, Bradley Cain, Scott Carlin,
Kevin Chipman, Todd Evatt, Jacqueline Myers

Recorder: Juliet Berry

OPENING

Mrs. Clark welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for participation.

Everyone introduced themselves including those participating over the phone.

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Mrs. Clark declared a quorum.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CHANGES DISCUSSED

Changes were reviewed from the minutes of the Relocatable Guide meeting on November 17, 2011.

Mrs. Clark noted that there are many instances of wording inconsistencies throughout the Guide such as the use of “relocatable classrooms” when the guide applies to all relocatable buildings and the committee if this type of change can be made for the next draft without discussing each instance. The committee agreed.

Discussion was held on the proposed new language for Section 3 (A) to encourage districts to look for best practices. The committee agreed with the language.

Discussion was held on the wording in the Codes and Standards section. The committee agreed that Mr. Blackwell and Mrs. Clark will propose language for this section in the next draft.

REVIEW OF NEW PROPOSED CHANGES

7. APPROVAL OF MANUFACTURER FOR SALE OR LEASE

7(C) Mrs. Clark proposed the language, “Each manufacturer may submit plans on any unit.” The committee agreed with the language.

7(H) Mrs. Clark proposed the language, “Each unit shall have permanently attached a certification label as required by 234380 (LLR reg) that requires the label with the following data.....”. The committee agreed with the language.

8. NEW RELOCATABLES

Mrs. Clark proposed language to read, 8(B) “Regardless of cost, fund source, used for procurement methods, plans and documents for relocatable units shall be prepared by South Carolina registered designed professionals.” The committee agreed with the language.

8(C) and 8(D) Mr. Dillon of ADC was asked to provide technical background on foundation and tie down requirements in the code. Mr. Dillon explained the difference between the requirements for force loading and the detailing requirements. Mr. Dillon offered the opinion that for piers less than 32” even in the higher seismic and wind areas, the additional requirements to comply with detailing did not add a measurable increase in safety to the building but significantly increased the cost. After discussion, the committee agreed to allow relocatables

with less than 32” between the top of grade and the top of the cmu to have foundations designed considering only force loading. The design for relocatables under other conditions need to be evaluated by the structural engineer and, if it can be demonstrated that an equivalent level of resistance can be achieved with a distance greater than 32” because of other site conditions, the engineer may request approval under alternate means and methods as allowed in the code.

Dr. Vail - Discussion was held concerning to keep a copy of up-to-date districtwide foundation plans or submit each time, moving or buying relocatable. Mrs. Clark advised either is fine

Mrs. Clark offered to provide language covering this in the next draft. The committee agreed.

8(F) Discussion was held on fire alarm wiring within a relocatable and the consensus of the group was that the requirement to run the wiring in metallic conduit should remain.

Also discussed was the communication plan the district would have in place to address not only fire alarm issues but also hazardous weather and security emergencies. It was proposed that a communication plan be added to 8(C) for information purposes. The committee agreed.

Section F was proposed to read, “Relocatables may have allowed stand alone fire alarm systems.” and that the second sentence be deleted. It was further proposed to delete F(3) and this is just a requirement of the code. A proposal was considered to reorder the remaining information and move the wording originally in the first paragraph to 1) and the requirement for the metallic conduit to 2). The committee agreed.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

Discussion was held on the distance between relocatables and other buildings. Previously, distances between relocatables and other relocatables or buildings were prescribed. After reviewing the code, it was determined that the prescribed distance were worst case scenarios and that, depending on the construction of the relocatable, separation distances may be reduced in accordance with the code. It was agreed by the committee to include separation guidelines in best practices.

8(G) Discussion was held concerning code required inspections during construction being provided by third party inspection providers (Chapter 1 and Chapter 17). It was proposed that the requirement for retention of inspection be removed to comply with previous changes. The committee agreed.

8(H) Discussion was held on an inspection of life safety systems prior to occupancy being

Ms. Clark proposed deleting Project Closeout I(1) and I(2) and allowing the districts to set requirements as needed. The committee agreed.

9. DISTRICT CONSTRUCTION

General discussion on requirements for districts to perform their own construction was held. As this is not a common occurrence, the only proposed change was to delete 9(E). The committee agreed.

10. RELOCATION OF EXISTING RELOCATABLE UNITS

Discussion was held on relocation of existing relocatable units. To create more clarity on the requirements for changes required to meet the current code, it was proposed that the second sentence be changed to read “Any modifications for reuse must be made in accordance with the current code.” The committee agreed.

10(D) Ms. Clark stated we will change some language so everything will agree on 10 (D). OSE will become Office of School Facilities (OSF). The words “Fire Marshal” will become “State Fire Marshal.”

DISCUSSION ON 2012 SOUTH CAROLINA ANNUAL INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE FOR RELOCATABLES

The committee reviewed the “2012 South Carolina Annual Inspection and Maintenance for Relocatables.” This will be the first of the best practice guides and is now open for general comments. There was discussion about including information on what can be done with relocatables that have lost their tag. A preliminary proposal is for a structural and life safety review, but the actual requirements will need to be finalized and there may be some additional requirement from LLR since the tag is actually their requirement.

Ms. Clark will email the *2012 South Carolina Annual Inspection and Maintenance for Relocatables* for any comments.

MEETING CONCLUSION

Dr. Vail made a motion to accept Relocatable Guide as revised and recommend adoption to the full Facilities Committee. Mr. Blackwell made an amended motion that the committee would accept all revisions except for 6 Codes and Standards. The amended motion was seconded by John Stehymeyer. The Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Clark stated we will schedule a meeting with the full committee on January 12, 2012, 10:00 a.m., Rutledge Conference Room (basement), Rutledge Building.

Ms. Clark noted that we will have one more meeting to accept the revisions to section 6 which will be the meeting currently scheduled for December 7. An email will be sent out and the committee will have a teleconference to accept the revised Guide.

Ms. Clark advised the committee of the upcoming subcommittee meetings beginning in February for the *South Carolina Planning and Construction Guide* and encouraged everyone to provide input.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.