JIM GARZON
PENN STATE. AE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

APARTMENT COMPLEX ANYTOWN, USA


## PROJECT BACKGROUND



Type of building:
Mixed-use residential building
(Retail, and residential)
Size (total square feet):
423,469 SF
Number of stories above grade:
Five Floors above ground

## Dates of construction (start - finish):

August 21, 2006 - April 11, 2008

## Actual cost information:

Contract Amount: \$ 50,047,750
General Conditions: \$ 2,972,441
4.5\% Fee

Project delivery method:
Design-Bid-Built


SCHEDULE

| ID | 0 | Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | April 1 |  | September 2 March 11 |  |  |  | September 1 February 21 |  |  |  |  | Auqust 11 |  | February 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2／27 | 5／22 | 8／14 | 11／6 | 1／29 | 4／23 | 7／16 | 10／8 | 12／31 | 3／25 | 6／17 | 9／9 | $12 / 2$ | 2／24 | 5／18 |
| 1 | － | Design／Preconstruction | 166 days | Mon 6／6／05 | Mon 1／23／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 國 | Purchase Subs | 23 days | Mon 1／16／06 | Wed 2／15／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 國 | Permitting | 117 days | Wed 11／9／05 | Thu 4／20／06 |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 國 | NTP | 0 days | Mon 4／24／06 | Mon 4／24／06 |  |  |  |  |  | 4／24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | Sitework and Mobilization | 48 days | Mon 4／24／06 | Wed 6／28／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 國 | Excavation | 49 days | Fri 6／30／06 | Wed 9／6／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 且 | Foundations | 57 days | Thu 8／3／06 | Fri 10／20／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  | Superstructure | 140 days | Mon 10／23／06 | Fri 5／4／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 國 | Interior Framing | 71 days | Thu 2／8／07 | Thu 5／17／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 國 | Concrete | 136 days | Wed 8／2／06 | Wed 2／7／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 國 | Roof | 12 days | Tue 5／22／07 | Wed 6／6／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 戒 | Exterior Enclosure | 168 days | Thu 2／22／07 | Mon 10／15／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | － | Mechanical Rough in | 10 days | Fri 9／21／07 | Thu 10／4／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q |  |  |  |
| 14 | 國 | Electrical Rough in | 10 days | Fri 10／26／07 | Thu 11／8／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 15 | － | Plumbing Rough in | 5 days | Fri 10／26／07 | Thu 11／1／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16 | 國 | First Floor Complete | 0 days | Wed 11／28／07 | Wed 11／28／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11／28 |  |  |
| 17 | ［ | Second Floor Complete | 0 days | Fri 12／7／07 | Fri 12／7／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | © $12 / 7$ |  |  |
| 18 | 且 | Interior Finishes | 131 days | Fri 9／14／07 | Fri 3／14／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 且 | Third Floor Complete | 0 days | Thu 1／3／08 | Thu 1／3／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark 1$ |  |  |
| 20 | 國 | Fourth Floor Complete | 0 days | Wed 2／20／08 | Wed 2／20／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2 / 20$ |  |
| 21 | － | Fifth Floor Complete | 0 days | Fri 3／14／08 | Fri 3／14／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ 3／14 |  |
| 22 | － | Final Cleaning | 15 days | Mon 3／17／08 | Fri 4／4／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | － | Final Inspection | 5 days | Mon 4／7／08 | Fri 4／11／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | 國 | Substantial Completion | 0 days | Fri 4／11／08 | Fri 4／11／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\diamond 4$ |  |

BUILDING SYSTEM SUMMARY

- Structural System
- Mechanical System


## PROJECT COST EVALUATION

Actual Project Cost
Total Cost: \$42,584,209
Square Foot Cost: $\$ 100.56 /$ SF

Total Project Cost
Total Cost: \$50,047,750
Square Foot Cost: \$118.19/SF

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structural System | Total Cost of System | Square Foot Cost | \% of Total Project Cost |
| Mechanical System | $\$ 11,661,204$ | $\$ 27.54$ | $27.38 \%$ |
| Electrical System | $\$ 4,304,705$ | $\$ 10.17$ | $10.11 \%$ |
| Roofing System | $\$ 3,470,420$ | $\$ 8.20$ | $8.15 \%$ |
| Fire Protection | $\$ 1,709,289$ | $\$ 4.04$ | $4.01 \%$ |
| Masonry | $\$ 1,491,035$ | $\$ 3.52$ | $3.50 \%$ |

MY FOUR ANALYSES

- Prefabrication of the Exterior wall
- Reduction of the HVAC system
- Redesign of the interior structure
- Research: The language barrier problem


## ANALYSIS 1:

## PREFABRICATION OF THE EXTERIOR WALL



## Problem

Hand laid brick is the most common method when building the façade of a building. However, this method is slow and takes a lot of time of the schedule.

## Goal

The goal of this analysis is to see if replacing the bricks with precast brick panels could reduce the schedule duration and cost of the project.

RESEARCH METHOD STEPS
-Perform a Quantity Take-Off of the Existing Façade
-Select an Architectural Precast Brick Panel system to replace the current system.

Perform a Cost \& Schedule Comparison of both Systems


## CURRENT SYSTEM

| Category | CSI | Type | Quantity | Unit | Material | Labor | Tot. Unit Price | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Masonry | 5350 | EIFS | 14,000 | SF | 5.7 | 14.40 | 20.1 | \$281,400 |
|  | 1400 | Brick | 47,000 | SF | 15.05 | 18.35 | 33.40 | \$1,569,800 |
|  | 2750 | CMU | 3,000 | SF | 3.05 | 5.9 | 8.95 | \$26,850 |
| Doors | 5100 | Overhead door | 32 | EA | 1752 | 703 | \$2,455 | \$78,560 |
|  | 1980 | Storefronts | 32 | EA | 743 | 351 | \$1,694 | \$54,208 |
| Windows | 5850 | Type 1 | 250 | EA | 1400 | 294 | 1694 | \$423,500 |
|  | 5500 | Type 2 | 115 | EA | 975 | 243 | 1218 | \$140,070 |
|  | 5250 |  |  |  | 535 | 120 | 655 | \$49,125 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \$2,632,513 |



## PROPOSED SYSTEM



## PROPOSED SYSTEM



COST COMPARISON

| Item | SF | Cost/SF | Total Cost |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Slenderwall Panels | 64,000 | $\$ 36$ | $\$ 2,304,000$ |


| Item | Cost |
| :--- | :---: |
| Slenderwall Panels | $2,304,000$ |
| Crane Usage | 29,904 |
| General Condition savings | $-184,241$ |
| Cost of Previous system | $-1,878,050$ |
| Additional cost of new System | $\$ 271,613$ |

# SCHEDULE COMPARISON 

| Item | Quantity | Total Days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brick/EIFS/CMU | 64,000 SF | 166 days |
| SlenderWall Panels | 324 Panels | 21 days |

Optimal SLENDERWALL® Project Schedule

Prepare Contract Drawings



SCHEDULE

| ID | 0 | Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | April 1 |  | September 2 March 11 |  |  |  | September 1 February 21 |  |  |  |  | Auqust 11 |  | February 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2／27 | 5／22 | 8／14 | 11／6 | 1／29 | 4／23 | 7／16 | 10／8 | 12／31 | 3／25 | 6／17 | 9／9 | $12 / 2$ | 2／24 | 5／18 |
| 1 | － | Design／Preconstruction | 166 days | Mon 6／6／05 | Mon 1／23／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 國 | Purchase Subs | 23 days | Mon 1／16／06 | Wed 2／15／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 國 | Permitting | 117 days | Wed 11／9／05 | Thu 4／20／06 |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 國 | NTP | 0 days | Mon 4／24／06 | Mon 4／24／06 |  |  |  |  |  | 4／24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | Sitework and Mobilization | 48 days | Mon 4／24／06 | Wed 6／28／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 國 | Excavation | 49 days | Fri 6／30／06 | Wed 9／6／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 且 | Foundations | 57 days | Thu 8／3／06 | Fri 10／20／06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  | Superstructure | 140 days | Mon 10／23／06 | Fri 5／4／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 國 | Interior Framing | 71 days | Thu 2／8／07 | Thu 5／17／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 國 | Concrete | 136 days | Wed 8／2／06 | Wed 2／7／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 國 | Roof | 12 days | Tue 5／22／07 | Wed 6／6／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 戒 | Exterior Enclosure | 168 days | Thu 2／22／07 | Mon 10／15／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | － | Mechanical Rough in | 10 days | Fri 9／21／07 | Thu 10／4／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q |  |  |  |
| 14 | 國 | Electrical Rough in | 10 days | Fri 10／26／07 | Thu 11／8／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 15 | － | Plumbing Rough in | 5 days | Fri 10／26／07 | Thu 11／1／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16 | 國 | First Floor Complete | 0 days | Wed 11／28／07 | Wed 11／28／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11／28 |  |  |
| 17 | ［ | Second Floor Complete | 0 days | Fri 12／7／07 | Fri 12／7／07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | © $12 / 7$ |  |  |
| 18 | 且 | Interior Finishes | 131 days | Fri 9／14／07 | Fri 3／14／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 且 | Third Floor Complete | 0 days | Thu 1／3／08 | Thu 1／3／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark 1$ |  |  |
| 20 | 國 | Fourth Floor Complete | 0 days | Wed 2／20／08 | Wed 2／20／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2 / 20$ |  |
| 21 | － | Fifth Floor Complete | 0 days | Fri 3／14／08 | Fri 3／14／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ 3／14 |  |
| 22 | － | Final Cleaning | 15 days | Mon 3／17／08 | Fri 4／4／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | － | Final Inspection | 5 days | Mon 4／7／08 | Fri 4／11／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | 國 | Substantial Completion | 0 days | Fri 4／11／08 | Fri 4／11／08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\diamond 4$ |  |



## SITE PLANNING IMPLICATIONS



ADVANTAGES VS DISADVANTAGES OF PROPOSED SYSTEM

Disadvantages:
Increases Cost.
-Additional Planning and Coordination.

Advantages:
-Reduces Schedule Duration.
-Better Performance.

ANALYSIS 2: REDUCTION OF THE HVAC SYSTEM

PROPOSED IDEAS
-Centralized system
-Elimination of some units
-Downsizing the current units


TYPES
OF
WALLS

Air Space


Existing Design
Proposed Deslgn

# Ri AND U VALUE CALCULATIONS 

| Current System | Thickness | R-Value/inch | Total R-Value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Layer | (in) |  | (hr-SF-F/BTU) |
| Outside Air Film | $\infty$ | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| Brick | 4 | $.8 /$ thickness | 0.8 |
| Drywall | 2 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| Air Space | 0.5 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Fiberglass | 4 | 3.2 | 12.8 |
| SlenderWall System Thickness R-Value/inch Total R-Value <br> Layer (in)  (hr-SF-F/BTU) <br> Outside Air Film $\infty$ 0.17 0.17 <br> Precast Concrete face 2 0.8 1.6 <br> Air Space 0.5 1 0.5 <br> Fiberglass Batt insulation 6 3.14 18.84 |  |  |  |$>.$


| System | R-Value | U-Value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Unit | hr-SF-F/BTU | BTU/hr-SF-F |
| Current Brick system | 16.07 | .0622 |
| SlenderWall System | 21.1 | .0474 |



## MECHANICAL SYSTEM CALCULATIONS

|  | Area (SF) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Perimeter Wall | 65,000 |


| Winter Temperature In Washington DC |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| To | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Ti | $70^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Change in Temperature | $55^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |


| Summer Temperature In Washington DC |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| To | $95^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Ti | $70^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Change in Temperature | $25^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |



## MECHANICAL SYSTEM CALCULATIONS

| Heat Loss During Winter |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| System | U-Value <br> (BTU/hr-sf-F) | Area <br> (SF) | $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ <br> (F) | Heat Loss <br> (BTU/hr) |
| Current Brick Façade | .0622 | 65,000 | $55^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ | 222,365 |
| SlenderWall System | .0474 | 65,000 | $55^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ | 169,455 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Heat Gain During Summer |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| System | U-Value <br> (BTU/hr-sf-F) | Area <br> (SF) | $\Delta$ T <br> (F) | Heat Loss <br> (BTU/hr) |
| Current Brick Façade | .0622 | 65,000 | $25^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ | 101,075 |
| SlenderWall System | .0474 | 65,000 | $25^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ | 77,025 |
|  |  |  |  |  |



## HVAC SYSTEM INFORMATION WY13B33A



Cooling Capacity: 12,500/12,100 BTU/h
Heating Capacity: 10,400/10,000 BTU/h
EER: 9.0/9.0
Moisture Removal: 3.2 Pints/Hr.
Room Side Air Circulation: 280 CFM
Volts Rated: 230/208
Cooling Amps: 6.4/6.8
Cooling Watts: 1,389/1,352
Heating Amps: 5.4/5.7
Heating Watts: 1,182/1,136

MECHANICAL SYSTEM IMPACTS
-Centralized system
-Elimination of some units
-Downsizing the current units


## MECHANICAL SYSTEM IMPACTS

Each apartment would need 294 BTU／Hr less in the winter and 134 BTU／Hr less in the summer

| Madel | Cooling BTU | Hebling日Tй | Volts | Ampsi | EER | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Helith } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | W楼 in | Depth in． | Circuit Ereaker | Weight bis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WSor ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 6000 |  | 115 | 6.1 | 105 | 16．34 | 27 | 15－34 | 125－154 | 93 |
| WS10010A | 10000 |  | 115 | 8.7 | 10.5 | 16－34 | 27 | $16-3 / 4$ | 125V－154 | 163 |
| WS14日104 | 13500 |  | 115 | 120 | 0.5 | 16．34 | 27 | 16－3／4 | 120vis | 117 |
| WS10日304 | 10000 |  | 230206 | 4.6000 | 10.0 | 10－24 | 21 | 16－3／4 | $250 y-154$ | 401 |
| W5136300 | 12500 |  | 200200 | 6．367 | 0.9 | 16.34 | 27 | 16－3／4 | 250V154 | 164 |
| WSi6b304 | 1540 |  | $230 / 208$ | 780．5 | 0.0 | 16．34 | 27 | 16－3／4 | 260V／154 | 119 |
| We10日33a | 10000 | 11000 | 230208 | 106014．7 | 10.0 | 15.34 | 27 | 㥩． 34 | 20v－34 | $1{ }^{4}$ |
| We138338 | 12600 | 11000 | $2 \times 1209$ | 180．014．7 | 8.9 | 16．34 | 27 | 16－3／4 | 2501／204 | 111 |
| Weregut | 15800 | 11000 | 2.07008 | 16．014．7 | 8.0 | 16．34 | 27 | 10－34 | 2501204 | 121 |
| Wrioe33a | 10100 | $81100^{\circ}$ | 270008 | 3.90 .0 | 10.0 | 16－34 | 27 | 16.14 | 250v－204 | 107 |
| Wri3b334 | 12000 | $10400^{\circ}$ | 24020 | 5.488 .7 | 90 | 16－3／4 | 27 | $16-3 / 4$ | 2501－204 | 116 |

ADVANTAGES VS DISADVANTAGES
OF PROPOSED SYSTEM
Disadvantages:
-Increases Cost (increases cost of projects by only 0.6\%).

- Additional Planning and Coordination.

Advantages:
-Reduces Schedule Duration (Project can be completed 3 month earlier).
-Better Performance (the additional insulation saves energy and reduces electricity cost).

## ANALYSIS 3:

## REDESIGN OF THE INTERIOR STRUCTURE

REDESIGN OF THE INTERIOR STRUCTURE

COST ANALYSIS
-Total Cost of interior wood structure is $\$ 330,905$
-Total Cost of new proposed structure is $\$ 411,000$
-Increases the overall cost of the building by $0.2 \%$.
-Maintenance cost of wood is much greater.

REDESIGN OF THE INTERIOR STRUCTURE

SCHEDULE ANALYSIS
.The erection duration of new system is the same Schedule remains the same

REDESIGN OF THE INTERIOR STRUCTURE

CONCLUSION
.Increases cost (only by 0.2\%)
-Schedule remains the same .Increases the value of the building

## ANALYSIS 4:

## RESEARCH: THE LANGUAGE BARRIER PROBLEM



## THE LANGUAGE BARRIER PROBLEM





THE LANGUAGE BARRIER PROBLEM

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Would you take Spanish classes if the <br> company offered it? | 5 | 0 |
| Would you spend time studying <br> Spanish at home after work? | 1 | 4 |



## QUESTIONS?



## CONNECTION DETAILS



| Simple Mils to Gauge Conversion Chart |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Minimum <br> Thickness (mils) | Reference Gauge <br> Number |
| 33 | 20 |
| 43 | 18 |
| 54 | 16 |
| 68 | 14 |
| 97 | 12 |
| 118 | 10 |


| Load | Metal Stud |
| :---: | :---: |
| $4 k$ | 400 S162-54 |
| $8 k$ | $400 S 162-97$ |
| $12 k$ | (2) 400 S162-54 |
| $16 k$ | (2) 400 S162-68 |
| $20 k$ | (2) $400 \mathrm{~S} 162-97$ |
| $24 k$ | (2) $400 \mathrm{~S} 162-97$ |
| $30 k$ | (3) $400 \mathrm{~S} 162-54$ |

Unit 1+DAMPDU

$$
\mathrm{S}=4 \mathrm{ft}
$$

Live load $=40$ psf $\times(4 \mathrm{ft})=160$ plf
Dead load $=4 \mathrm{ft} \times[(1.6) \times(40 \mathrm{psf})+(1.2) \times(4 \mathrm{in} / 12) \times(150 \mathrm{psf})]$ = 496plf
Then use an Open Web steel joist k-series 12K5 (dead load = 555plf / live load = 198plf)
$\mathrm{P}=(496 \mathrm{plf}) \times(21 \mathrm{ft})=10.42 \mathrm{Kips} \quad$ Use 12.0 Kips
Then, based on the Joist Girder Design Guide use a 32G8N10.4K (32plf)

Steel is stronger, lighter and more dimensionally stable than wood.
Steel stud interior walls provide an uncommonly straight and stable wall.
This reduces call backs for sheet rock separation, nail pop-outs, molding separation and warping.
.Pre-punched service holes in studs for electrical wiring, plumbing or other utility lines save time and money.
Steel framed homes are safer in fires - they will not add fuel to a fire nor collapse as easily as wood.
Stronger: steel framed homes greatly exceed all wind and seismic codes without adding any additional cost.
Lightning protection: steel gives electricity a pathway to ground resulting in less secondary fires and explosions.
-No mold, mildew or rotting
Super Insulated - no air infiltration if insulated with foam.

- Avoid termite problems
-Less repairs and maintenance
-No wasted scrap - all extra material can be recycled.

