# **Quality in Construction (QIC)**

# WebEx Meeting May 20, 2020

9:00 am - 12:00 pm

#### Attendees:

- Michelle Crowder, UT
- Brian Wilson, STREAM
- Paul Marshall, THEC
- Dick Tracy, TBR
- Jim Cobb, TTU
- Chris Byerly, OSA
- Eddie Harkleroad, ETSU
- Greg Campbell, AIA
- Clay Crownover, ABC
- Philip Cameron, SFM
- Mark Longfellow, UoM

- Austin Oakes, UT
- Marty Gibbs, AGC
- Patti Miller, THEC
- Kurt Boyd, ACEC
- Trey Wheeler, AIA
- Jim Prillaman, ACEC
- John Gromos, AGC
- Ted Hayden, STREAM
- Ashley Cates, AIA
- Chris Bainbridge, SFM
- Leslie Gower, AGC

- Bryan Hay, ABC
- Rich McNeil, AIA
- Alan Robertson, OSA
- Ann McGauran, OSA
- Chloe Shafer, OSA
- John Kenny, ACEC
- Allan Cox, ABC
- Jen Murphy, STREAM
- Jason Medeiros, AGC
- Kasey Anderson, ACEC

#### Discussion:

- I. All members were introduced.
- II. BIM Update Chris Byerly (OSA)
  - a. Chris Byerly said that OSA wants to be aware of any future BIM projects with the SPAs so Chris can provide appropriate support.
  - b. Chris Byerly noted that a recent BIM Task Force meeting occurred. OSA is reviewing the most recent comments and planning to follow up with proposed revisions and responses. A deadline will be established in order to finalize the BIM Standards.
  - c. Chris mentioned that OSA is working with the Task Force to develop a standard BIM release form, if needed. OSA is reviewing samples provided by the Task Force.
  - d. Chris said OSA will coordinate with the Task Force and the SPAs to develop a training session in the near future regarding the use of the BIM Standards.
- III. HPBr and Team Evaluations Update Chris Byerly (OSA) and Alan Robertson (OSA)
  - a. Chris noted that OSA is receiving about 65%-70% of the required HPBr deliverables for 2019 projects. OSA needs to ultimately be receiving 100%.
  - b. Alan and Chris emphasized that quarterly notices will be sent to the SPAs listing projects that are completed, or nearing completion, and requesting all HPBr and Team Evaluation deliverables, or updates on the progress.
- IV. State Fire Marshal Presentation Chris Bainbridge (SFM) and Philip Cameron (SFM)
  - a. Chris Bainbridge stated their offices are fully operational and have been set up for working remotely for a long time
  - b. Chris noted that both the Jackson and Knoxville SFM physical offices have been closed. Nashville will continue as the only home office.
  - c. Chris informed the group that WebEx is now the platform the SFM is using for meetings.
  - d. It was noted that Fred Garbler has now retired, and George Smith is his replacement.

- e. Chris said if any construction site employees test positive for COVID-19 than remote inspections will be required.
- f. Chris also added that inspections for Corrections projects are done remotely when possible.
  - 1. Alan Robertson asked Chris to define "remote inspections". Chris said this entails inspections and reviews through FaceTime and phone images as a way of communicating between a contractor and an inspector.
- g. Chris said that all code updates are listed on the SFM website. The residential code was updated this year. There is no schedule, at this time, to update the commercial code, but a stakeholder group may be convened in the Fall of this year.
- h. Chris said the current IBC code is the 2012 with future plans to adopt the 2018 version. Industry will be involved in providing input during this future adoption process.
- i. Chris noted that a quarterly newsletter is being published by the SFM. This will be a platform to inform industry regarding what codes will apply to projects and how inspections will be done. The SFM would like to get input from industry regarding any topics that should be addressed in future newsletters.
- j. Chris said the first newsletter went out to 20,000 people.
- k. Ann McGauran said that she has heard frustrations in the past when there are conflicts between project office reviews and field reviews.
  - 1. Chris Bainbridge said sometimes mistakes are made between an office review and a field inspector. They are working to coordinate these efforts better.
  - 2. Philip Cameron said he was aware of two past instances where there was a conflict. The first was a mistake, and the second instance involved an issue where the architect did not include information on the plans and the field inspector had to address the need in the field. The SFM worked with the contractor and the architect to help resolve the issue.
- I. Chris Bainbridge noted that past code adoption stakeholder groups consisted of architects, engineers, inspectors, contractors, and State personnel.
- m. Chris said a couple of the more notable code changes from the current 2012 edition to the 2018 edition will be required storm shelters for schools in high wind areas of the state, and stricter energy code requirements. There will be some smaller changes to the code due to mistakes realized in a previous edition that will have been addressed.
- n. Jim Prillaman asked what the difference is between code adoption and code enforcement for the energy code.
  - Chris Bainbridge said their office is not set up to do energy code inspections on projects.
    Submitted plans will be reviewed and approved based on if the plans comply with the energy code. The SFM is more geared toward life safety.

## V. COVID-19 Industry Update – Ann McGauran (OSA)

- a. Ann McGauran noted that some construction projects are slowing down. There have been a couple of construction projects that experienced shutdowns prompted by testing. Most construction sites have implemented proper PPE along with safety modifications to address COVID concerns.
- b. Ann mentioned that most design firms are having success maintaining their operations remotely from home.
- c. Ann had heard initial concerns about potential labor market impact but this appears to not have occurred.
- d. Ann said she heard of some delays in material supplies and specifically doors on project construction sites. The impact appears to mostly be related to material supply and manufacturing shut downs in the northeast and delays from international shipments.
- e. Ann said that it will be interesting to see what the impacts are in the industry 6 months from now. Most parties believe that there will be budgetary and financial impacts to come.

- f. The legislature will be reviewing the current state budget in June of this year with possible revisions and there is a State hiring freeze.
- g. It was noted that higher education will be refunding students for housing fees and this may have an impact on housing projects going forward.
- h. Dick Tracy said that TBR's projects are coming in either below or within budget. Dick noted that there have been some work force delays, and recalled a project where framers shut down for two weeks.
- i. John Kenny added it is now about doing things differently and they are interested in what fall and winter will look like.
- j. Jim Prillaman said he also is interested in what the landscape looks like in 6-8 months. They are finding more ways to leverage technology.
- k. John Gromos stated that contractors have been quickly identifying safety protocols and encouraging "call aheads" related to PPE needs. Some contractors are requiring temperature scanning. Some contractors have PPE for visitors. John said that most of the work force are showing up on sites and they are seeing favorable costs due to economic impact. There have been some product delays in Canada, China, and Mexico.
- I. Bryan Hay said his company has developed a phone app with 6 questions to be answered by an employee proceeded by a temperature check. This process does slow down the ability to get on the job. Bryan added that they are finding a delay in receiving light fixtures from China, along with other delays.
- m. Eddie Harkleroad said ETSU has maintained a few of their employees in the office, and may have all workforce in the office by June 15. Both Fine Arts and Cope Center projects have contractors on site working.
- n. John Gromos said he finds that most contractors have their own response plans in place and some are tracing persons who test positive. Construction sites with a positive occurrence will be cleaned with some level of fumigation. This cost can range from \$2,000 \$18,000 and is chargeable through general conditions. This is typically not an insurance reimbursable.
- Ann said she heard that some contractors are resistant to reporting a positive case.
- p. John Gromos said it is based on what constitutes a "reportable incident" and what is the impact on insurance rates.
- q. Ann posed the question whether there will be more stringent air filtering in buildings going forward?
- r. John Medeiros said the cost for electrostatic cleaning can cost around 10 cents per square foot.

### VI. Open Discussion

- a. Rich McNeil said he would like to see an update on industry impacts of COVID-19 at our next QIC meeting
- b. John Kenny said he would like to thank Chris Bainbridge and Philip Cameron for presenting from the SFM office and would like to see them come back and present annually.

Next Meeting: August 19, 2020