1 2 3 4 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON 5 FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON 6 KING CITY CIVIC ASSOCIATION, INC., an) Case No. 20CV07044 7 Oregon non-profit corporation, FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT 8 Plaintiff. 9 Negligence, Negligence Per Se, Breach of v. Contract, Breach of Warranty 10 KKLA CONTRACTORS LLC, an Oregon Not Subject to Mandatory Arbitration 11 limited liability company, and MFIA INC. DBA MFIA INC. CONSULTING 12 Jury Trial Requested ENGINEERS, an Oregon corporation, 13 Prayer in the amount of \$1,025,000 Defendants. 14 Fee Authority: ORS 21.160(1)(d) 15 KKLA CONTRACTORS LLC, an Oregon limited liability company, 16 Third-Party Plaintiff, 17 v. 18 DM STONE CONSTRUCTION, INC., an 19 Oregon corporation; DML CONSTRUCTION, 20 LLC, an Oregon limited liability company; G.W. PAULSON CO. DBA PAULSON'S 21 FLOOR COVERINGS, an Oregon corporation; JC & SONS CONSTRUCTION, 22 INC., an Oregon corporation; JET 23 INDUSTRIES, INC., an Oregon corporation; MFIA, INC. DBA MFIA INC. CONSULTING 24 ENGINEERS, an Oregon corporation; ML FRAMING, LLC, an Oregon limited liability 25 company; PERFEXION CONSTRUCTION 26 INC., an Oregon corporation, 27 Third-Party Defendants. 28

PAGE 1 – FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

VIAL • FOTHERINGHAM LLP 17355 SW Boones Ferry Road, Ste A Lake Oswego, OR 97035 503-684-4111/503-598-7758 fax www.vf-law.com

G.W. PAULSON CO. DBA PAULSON'S 1 FLOOR COVERINGS, an Oregon corporation,) 2 Fourth-Party Plaintiff, 3 v. 4 UNIVERSAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, 5 LLC, a Washington limited liability company, 6 Fourth-Party Defendant. 7 8 9 10 Plaintiff King City Civic Association, Inc. ("Plaintiff" or "Association") hereby alleges 11 as follows: **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS** 12 13 1. King City Community ("Community") is a planned community subject to the provisions 14 15 of the Oregon Planned Community Act, ORS 94.550 et. seq., located in Washington County, The Planned Community consists of sub-associations, homes, a golf course, and 16 17 common facilities. The Association is now and, at all material times herein, has been an Oregon non-profit corporation established and organized for the mutual benefit of the owners. 18 19 20 2. 21 The Planned Community and Association are governed by the Restated Declaration of 22 Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions of King City Civic Association, recorded December 14, 23 2001, as Document No. 2001-130532 in the records of Washington County, Oregon, and all amendments thereto ("Declaration"). The Association is also governed by the Restated Bylaws 24 of the King City Civic Association ("Bylaws"). 25 26 /// 27 28

4

56

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

1415

16 17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24

25

2627

28

3.

Under the Declaration, the Board has the duty to manage, improve, maintain, repair and replace all of the improvements located on Association Property or subject to the control of the Board, including personal property. The property is owned, managed and maintained by the Association for the use and benefit of the Members and their guests.

4.

In 2017, the Association hired KKLA Contractors LLC ("KKLA") to renovate the Crown Center Pool Enclosure (aka natatorium) and construct a new Lap Pool ("Project") on Association-owned property. The property and improvements are owned by the Association.

5.

In 2017, the Association hired MFIA Inc. DBA MFIA Inc. Consulting Engineers ("MFIA"), to provide design and mechanical engineering services associated with the Project.

6.

At all material times herein, KKLA was an Oregon limited liability company and an Oregon licensed contractor. KKLA performed the construction work on the Project and/or hired and supervised subcontractors to construct the Project.

7.

At all material times herein, MFIA was an Oregon corporation and an Oregon licensed engineering firm. MFIA performed the design and mechanical engineering work on the Project and/or hired and supervised engineers and consultants performing design and engineering services on the Project, including, without limitation, the following:

- 1. Designing the plumbing system, including, without limitation, the domestic water system; and sanitary waste and vent system;
- 2. Designing the mechanical system, including, without limitation, the natural gas piping system; heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; natatorium dehumidification system; and locker room exhaust system;
 - 3. Designing the electrical system, including, without limitation, the power systems;

- 4. Providing final reproducible drawings and technical specifications to be used in the construction work on the Project; and
- 5. Interacting with the contractors on questions, substitution requests, and plan review comments.

8.

The Project suffers from the following non-exhaustive list of items of faulty design, faulty engineering, workmanship, improper or defective materials, improper construction and/or noncompliance with industry, state and local building standards or manufacturer installation instructions:

- 1. Interior walls subject to water do not possess any waterproofing or other protection at the base-of-wall;
- 2. Mechanical equipment is not functioning properly, including, without limitation, the Senesco dehumidifier that is constantly inoperable, causing excessive humidity within the building and damaging many interior elements by allowing moisture in the air to accumulate on the windows and wall, condensing onto the surface and causing damage;
- 3. The exterior brick wainscoting was not constructed per the plans and lacks coderequired weep provision;
- 4. The ventilation exhaust system lacks an airtight seal between the pool area and the other areas of the pool building, which allows air from the pool area to migrate to the locker rooms and other areas of the pool building. By not designing a system that maintains negative pressurization in the pool area as compared to adjacent spaces, moisture and trichloramine are allowed to migrate throughout the rest of the building, damaging the structure and components of the building;
- 5. The roof does not possess adequate ventilation because the intake blocks are not equal to those specified in the plans;

25

26

27

- 6. Interior concrete lacks design plan-required reinforcement. Concrete cracks are numerous:
- 7. Concrete slab floors do not meet Oregon Health Authority requirements. Concrete slab floors do not drain properly. Several drains are installed too high, resulting in standing water and damage to interior wood doors;
- 8. Standing water from the single showers runs under the interior walls and into adjacent rooms;
- 9. Pool coping was not installed with enough slope, allowing water to pool on the coping;
- 10. Slot drains around the pool and spa were not installed correctly;
- 11. Tile work inside the two bathroom areas was not installed in a workmanlike manner. Cracked and damaged tile and grout has resulted;
- 12. The concrete floor slabs were not constructed per the plans, which has resulted in cracking and damage;
- 13. The Seresco dehumidifier included a recirculation pump (heat exchange pump) that has not been installed;
- 14. The building suffers from humidity problems;
- 15. Building was not constructed per the design drawings;
- 16. ADA shower bench was not adequately attached to blocking in the wall and has come loose;
- 17. Deep tooled joints adjacent to pool deck drains do not allow standing water to drain, creating a serviceability issue;
- 18. The wall moldings in the lobby were poorly applied and require correction. On one wall, the molding was applied over a bubble;
- 19. No floor moldings were applied in one of the closets in the pool area. There is no grout sealer or wall moldings, so when the decks are cleaned, water can potentially get up the interior wall;

- 20. One wall in the men's bathroom was constructed crooked;
- 21. The supply air registers do not perform correctly because their style and location cannot prevent condensation buildup on the windows, window sills, and walls of the natatorium, causing water to accumulate on the windows and walls and damage building envelope surfaces such as the windowsills;
- 22. None of the supply air registers serving the pool area deliver the volume of air necessary to meet industry standards;
- 23. The interior wall sheetrock in the pool area and other areas of the building (except the shower area) is not moisture resistant wallboard; and
- 24. The gas-fired instantaneous domestic water heaters are not vented per manufacturers recommendations, namely:
 - a. The common vented heaters lack the required Non-Return Valve p/n 100113130;
 - b. The horizontal vent heater does not appear to be sloped at 1/3 inch per foot;
 - c. There is no condensate drain in the exhaust vent run;
 - d. The common vent diameter should be 6 inches, but is undersized;
 - e. Reducing wyes were not used to connect heater vent to the trunk line; and
 - f. Venting error code is still occurring.

In this and subsequent paragraphs of this Complaint, the faulty design, faulty workmanship, improper or defective materials, improper construction, and/or noncompliance with local and state building code standards and industry standards are referred to separately and collectively as "construction defects."

9.

Despite being provided with notice and opportunity to cure, Defendant KKLA has failed to repair and correct, or cause to be repaired and corrected, the list of construction defects and

problems at the Project, as provided by Plaintiff, including, but not limited to, the construction defects listed in paragraph 8 above.

10.

The design and construction defects have caused and will cause loss of use and/or diminished value of the Association Property. Such loss of use of the Association Property has resulted or will result from a nuisance or defect or damage to the Association Property, or will result from requirements to facilitate repairs to the Association Property.

11.

Unless the problems and deficiencies set forth in paragraphs **8-10** and elsewhere herein are corrected, there is a real and substantial risk that the Association may be liable for (1) additional repairs and replacement of property damage; (2) repairs and replacement of property damage to the units and personal property within the Project; (3) personal and physical injuries to residents or guests; and (4) consequential damages to the Project.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Count One

(Negligence)

12.

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1-11 and incorporates them by reference herein.

13.

KKLA performed construction work on the Project; selected subcontractors; supervised the construction work at the Project; and inspected the construction progress and quality compliance with local and state building code standards and building product manufacturer specifications.

14.

As a result of its intimate association with, participation in, and oversight of the construction, construction supervision, selection of subcontractors, inspection of construction

progress, quality and compliance with the building codes, and manufacturers' specifications, KKLA, in the exercise of reasonable care, should have:

- a) identified that the construction defects described in paragraphs **8-10** above, and elsewhere herein, existed;
- b) realized that there was a substantial, unreasonable, and foreseeable risk that the
 Project had or, in the near future, would suffer consequential damages described in paragraphs 8 10 above, and elsewhere herein;
- c) realized that a failure to address and repair the construction defects and damages during the activities in which they were engaged would result in water damage, structural damage, and consequential damage, or posed an unreasonable risk of resulting therein;
- d) expected that the construction defects, damage, and risks would remain undetected by the Association and its owner-members for a substantial period of time, thereby increasing the damage and cost of repairing or remedying them, or that there was a substantial and unreasonable risk that such would occur; and
- e) expected that the Association would incur costs and expenses as a result of KKLA's failure to properly construct and/or address problems at the Project, including inspection, repair costs, and legal fees.

15.

Notwithstanding what it, in the exercise of reasonable care, should have done, KKLA failed to address and repair the water intrusion, water damage, construction defects, and risks described in paragraphs **8-10**, above, during their activities at the Project, and failed to disclose and/or concealed the water intrusion, water damage, construction defects, and/or risks thereof to Plaintiff.

16.

As a direct and proximate result of KKLA's negligence, Plaintiff has suffered damages as follows:

a) in an amount to be proved at trial, but not less than \$525,000.00, plus prejudgment interest, for the cost to repair the property damage to the Project;

b) in an amount to be proved at trial, but not less than \$525,000.00, plus prejudgment interest, for the loss of value to the Project, which amount will increase as time passes.

Count Two

(Negligence per se)

17.

The Oregon Building Code governs the construction, re-construction, alteration and repair of buildings in Oregon. In addition, manufacturers of various building components publish instructions governing the installation of the manufacturer's products, including integration of the product with surrounding building components. Lastly, various construction industry organizations publish installation guidelines for particular building components, and those publications constitute industry standards. The building code, manufacturers' instructions, and published industry standards establish uniform performance standards to protect the health, safety, welfare, comfort and security of Oregon residents.

18.

KKLA was required to follow the Oregon Building Code. This duty exists independently of other duties owed to Plaintiff. KKLA had additional unconditional duties to perform its work in accordance with all relevant manufacturers' installation instructions and published construction industry standards.

19.

KKLA was negligent *per se* because they violated the Oregon Building Code, and failed to follow manufacturer installation instructions and published construction industry standards by renovating the Project with the construction defects described in paragraphs **8-10**, above, and elsewhere herein.

20.

As a result of KKLA's negligence *per se*, Plaintiff has been damaged as set forth in paragraph **16**, above.

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

///

28

Count One

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Breach of Contract)

21.

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs **1-20** and incorporates them by reference herein.

22.

KKLA performed the work described in paragraphs 4 and 6 and elsewhere herein pursuant to its contract with the Association.

23.

The contract required that KKLA's work at the Project be completed in a good and workmanlike manner constituent with the construction standards and practices of other experienced contractors performing work on similar projects in the area where the project is located, and according to the drawings, specifications, and federal, state, local laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, codes, inspections and regulations, and industry standards.

24.

Defendant KKLA materially breached the terms of its contract with Plaintiff by failing to complete the work outlined in paragraphs 4 and 6 and elsewhere herein in a good and workmanlike manner, free from defects in materials and workmanship, free from violations of the Oregon Building Code, and according to the drawings and specifications. There were and are serious construction defects, building code violations, and resulting consequential damage as more particularly set forth in paragraphs 8-10, above.

25.

As a result of Defendant KKLA's breach of contract, Plaintiff has been damaged as set forth in paragraph **16**, above.

PAGE 10 – FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Count Two 1 (Breach of Warranty) 2 26. 3 Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs **1-25** and incorporates them by reference herein. 4 KKLA performed the work described in paragraphs 4 and 6 and elsewhere herein 5 pursuant to its contract with the Association. 6 28. 7 In the contract, KKLA warranted that the materials and equipment furnished under the 8 contract would be new, and that the Work would conform with the requirements of the contract 9 documents and would be free from defects. 10 29. 11 The Association has demanded that KKLA repair the construction defects as alleged in 12 paragraphs 8-10 and elsewhere herein under its warranty. Despite demand, KKLA has refused to 13 make repairs pursuant to its warranty. 14 30. 15 KKLA materially breached its warranty to Plaintiff by failing to correct the construction 16 defects in paragraphs 8-10 and elsewhere herein. There were and are serious construction 17 defects, building code violations, and resulting consequential damage as more particularly set 18 forth in paragraphs 8-10, above. 19 31. 20 As a result of Defendant KKLA's breach of warranty, Plaintiff has been damaged as set 21 forth in paragraph 16, above. 22 23 24 /// 25 26 27 28

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

2122

23

25

24

27

28

26

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Count One

(Negligence)

32.

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs **1-31**, and incorporates them by reference herein.

33.

MFIA performed design and mechanical engineering work on the Project; prepared drawings, plans, and material specifications; selected consultants; communicated and answered questions from contractors and subcontractors; supervised the construction work of their design and mechanical engineering work at the Project; and inspected the construction progress and quality compliance with local and state building code standards and building product manufacturer specifications.

34.

As a result of its intimate association with, participation in, and oversight of the design, engineering, selection of consultants, communication with contractors and subcontractors, supervision of the construction in relation to their design and mechanical engineering work, and inspection of construction progress, quality and compliance with the building codes, and manufacturers' specifications, MFIA, in the exercise of reasonable care, should have:

- a) identified that the design defects described in paragraphs **8-10** above, and elsewhere herein, existed;
- b) realized that there was a substantial, unreasonable, and foreseeable risk that the
 Project had or, in the near future, would suffer consequential damages described in paragraphs 8 10 above, and elsewhere herein;
- c) realized that a failure to address and repair the design defects and consequential damages during the activities in which they were engaged would result in water damage, structural damage, and consequential damage, or posed an unreasonable risk of resulting therein;
- d) expected that the construction defects, damage, and risks would remain undetected by the Association and its owner-members for a substantial period of time, thereby

increasing the damage and cost of repairing or remedying them, or that there was a substantial and unreasonable risk that such would occur; and

e) expected that the Association would incur costs and expenses as a result of Defendant MFIA's failure to properly design and/or engineer, and/or address problems at the Project, including inspection, repair costs, and legal fees.

35.

Notwithstanding what it, in the exercise of reasonable care, should have done, MFIA failed to address and repair the water intrusion, water damage, design and engineering defects, and risks described in paragraphs **8-10**, above, during their activities at the Project, and failed to disclose and/or concealed the water intrusion, water damage, design and engineering defects, and/or risks thereof to Plaintiff.

36.

As a direct and proximate result of MFIA's negligence, Plaintiff has suffered damages as follows:

- a) in an amount to be proven at trial, but not less than \$500,000.00, plus prejudgment interest, for the cost to repair the property damage to the Project;
- b) in an amount to be proved at trial, but not less than \$500,000.00, plus prejudgment interest, for the loss of value to the Project, which amount will increase as time passes.

Count Two

(Negligence per se)

37.

The Oregon Building Code and the specialty Oregon Mechanical Building Code governs the design, installation, alteration, and inspection of mechanical systems, as well as the construction, re-construction, alteration and repair of buildings in Oregon. In addition, manufacturers of various building components publish instructions governing the installation of the manufacturer's products, including integration of the product with surrounding building components. Lastly, various construction industry organizations publish installation guidelines

for particular building components and locations in buildings, and those publications constitute industry standards. The building code, manufacturers' instructions, and published industry standards establish uniform performance standards to protect the health, safety, welfare, comfort and security of Oregon residents.

38.

MFIA was required to follow the Oregon Building Code and the Oregon Mechanical Building Code. This duty exists independently of other duties owed to Plaintiff. MFIA had additional unconditional duties to perform its work in accordance with all relevant manufacturers' installation instructions and published construction industry standards.

39.

MFIA was negligent *per se* because it violated the Oregon Building Code and Oregon Mechanical Building Code, and failed to follow manufacturer installation instructions and published construction industry standards by designing and providing mechanical engineering services at the Project with the design and engineering defects described in paragraphs **8-10**, above, and elsewhere herein.

40.

As a result of MFIA's negligence *per se*, Plaintiff has been damaged as set forth in paragraph **36**, above.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Count One

(Breach of Contract)

41.

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs **1-11**, **33-36**, and **37-39**, and incorporates them by reference herein.

42.

MFIA performed the work described in paragraphs 5 and 7 and elsewhere herein pursuant to its contract with the Association.

PAGE 14 – FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

25

26

27

PAGE 15 – **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

The contract required that MFIA's work at the Project be completed in a good and workmanlike manner constituent with the engineering standards and practices of other experienced mechanical engineers performing work on similar projects in the area where the project is located, and according to the drawings, specifications, and federal, state, local laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, codes, inspections and regulations.

44.

MFIA materially breached the terms of its contract with Plaintiff by failing to complete the work outlined in paragraphs 5 and 7 and elsewhere herein in a good and workmanlike manner, free from defects in design and engineering workmanship, free from violations of the Oregon Building Code, Oregon Mechanical Building Code, the drawings and specifications, manufacturers guidelines and installation instructions, and industry standards. There were and are serious design and engineering defects, building code violations, manufacturer guideline and installation instruction violations, and violations of industry standards resulting in consequential damage as more particularly set forth in paragraphs 8-10, above.

45.

As a result of Defendant MFIA's breach of contract, Plaintiff has been damaged as set forth in paragraph 36, above.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. On Plaintiff's First Claim for Relief against Defendant KKLA, Count 1, damages as set forth in paragraph **16** above;
- 2. On Plaintiff's First Claim for Relief against Defendant KKLA, Count 2, damages as set forth in paragraph **16** above;
- 3. On Plaintiff's Second Claim for Relief against Defendant KKLA, Count 1, damages as set forth in paragraph **16** above, plus Plaintiff's reasonable attorney fees;

- 4. On Plaintiff's Second Claim for Relief against Defendant KKLA, Count 2, damages as set forth in paragraph **16** above, plus Plaintiff's reasonable attorney fees;
- 5. On Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief against Defendant MFIA, Count 1, damages as set forth in paragraph **36**, above;
- 6. On Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief against Defendant MFIA, Count 2, damages as set forth in paragraph **36**, above;
- 7. On Plaintiff's Fourth Claim for Relief against Defendant MFIA, damages as set forth in paragraph **36**, above;
 - 8. For Plaintiff's costs and disbursements incurred herein; and
 - 9. Such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

VIAL FOTHERINGHAM LLP

By: /s/ Christopher M. Tingey
Ryan D Harris, OSB #083569
rdh@vf-law.com
Christopher M. Tingey OSB #014326
cmt@vf-law.com
503-684-4111
Of Attorneys for Plaintiff

The Association's attorney certifies that he has consulted a design professional with similar credentials to MFIA, Inc. who is qualified, available and willing to testify to admissible facts and opinions sufficient to create a question of fact as to the liability of MFIA, Inc. The design professional with similar credentials who is qualified to testify as to the standard of professional skill and care applicable to the alleged facts, is available and willing to testify that:

(a) MFIA, Inc.'s conduct failed to meet the standard of professional skill and care ordinarily provided by other design professionals with similar credentials, experience and expertise and practicing under the same or similar circumstances; and