

Technical Report 2

Rev. James G. Gambet Center for Business and Healthcare



Brett Tallada Construction Management Advisor: Ray Sowers 10.12.2012

Executive Summary

The Reverend James G. Gambet Center for Business and Healthcare is the latest addition to the campus at DeSales University. The new \$27 million facility, which is the new home of the Business, Nursing, and Physician Assistant Programs, will be state of the art and include technologically advanced labs and classrooms. DeSales' continual growth and ever increasing quality in education has caused these programs to reach their maximum potential in the current facilities. Construction of the 77,000 square foot building is being managed by Alvin H. Butz, Inc., and is scheduled to complete in November 2012. The following technical assignment offers a more in depth look into the project schedule, structural steel and general condition estimates, Building Information Modeling (BIM) use evaluation, and constructability challenges.

The construction of the Gambet Center can be broken into three distinct phases; design and preconstruction, construction, and site work. On August 3, 2011, over a year after initial planning for the new facility began, Construction Manager Alvin H. Butz, Inc. received the notice to mobilize the site. Excavation began in late October 2011 after various site preparation and temporary storm water control systems were put in place. Production on site has been consistent throughout the construction process, however, excessive precipitation in the beginning and end of the project have pushed the schedule back slightly to bring a substantial completion date in early November 2012. With ample time between building completion and operation, there are no problems arising with the owner.

In addition to analysis of the detailed project schedule, RS Means Construction Cost Data was used to create both structural system and general conditions estimates and compared to the actual costs of the project. The structural estimate of a chosen bay, which includes both the steel structure and concrete foundation, comes in at \$7.24 per square foot less than that actual cost of \$44.41 per square foot, or an error of approximately 16 percent. The estimated general conditions were closer to the actual total, with an error of 8.9 percent. Analyses of the variation between estimated and actual costs are discussed in their respective sections.

Building Information Modeling is a relatively new practice in the construction industry, but with every passing year it is becoming increasingly popular. An evaluation into the use of BIM implementation is included with recommendations on how the owner and construction manager could have benefited from a greater effort to utilize BIM. One argument for 4D modeling is perfectly illustrated when considering the poor weather and existing site conditions generate constructability challenges that make it critical to prepare and execute plans effectively.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table of Contents	2
Detailed Project Schedule	3
Detailed Structural System Estimate	5
General Conditions Estimate	9
Building Information Modeling Use Evaluation	12
Constructability Challenges	15
Appendices	
A-1 Detailed Project Schedule	18
B-1 Structural System Quantity Takeoff	22
B-2 Detailed Structural System Estimate	27
C-1 General Conditions Estimate	
D-1 BIM Use Analysis Worksheet	32
D-2 BIM Level 1 Process Map	34

Detailed Project Schedule

*Please see Appendix A-1 for the Detailed Project Schedule

Schedule Overview

The schedule was a major driving force for the construction of the Gambet Center. DeSales' five year plan, which forecasts future enrollment, indicated the University would reach a maximum capacity of 1600 students by 2015. Scheduled completion is currently on track for November 2012, and the University plans to have the building completely operational by May 2013. This provided a padded window of construction that reduced risks associated with delays in the schedule. However, the potential for poor weather conditions and their negative impact on the schedule were the main areas of concern. For the Detailed Project Schedule, see Appendix A-1. The Detailed Project Schedule does not incorporate any delays, but details the initial projected construction timeline.

Project Sequence

The Detailed Project Schedule condenses the major areas of construction for the project into three phases. The first phase consists of design, preconstruction, and procurement activities associated with the Gambet Center. The second phase, which started when Phase 1 was mostly complete, is broken down by building system and demonstrates the sequence of construction performed by the trades. The large site allows for Phase 3 to be completed concurrently with Phase 2 without creating problems with site logistics.

DeSales University started programming for the Gambet Center in July 2010 after they realized extra space was needed to keep enrollment from reaching the maximum capacity. During this time, initial plans were made to select the site location on campus, decide which academic departments would relocate, and determine which facilities and equipment were needed. The Business Department was selected because it is the fastest growing degree program at DeSales. The Nursing and Physician Assistant programs are the top rated programs in the country, but students were choosing other schools because the existing labs were outdated. Early on it became clear the building would need sophisticated labs with a high level of technological integration.

DeSales hired Breslin Ridyard Fadero Architects in November 2010 to complete the design of the Gambet Center. The owner required the building to at least achieve LEED[®] Certification. During the first phase, Alvin H. Butz, Inc. was also brought into the project as the construction manager to perform preconstruction activities and help with

design decisions. After the design was finalized, Butz began to collect bid packages and award subcontracts.

During Phase 2 construction, work performed by many of the subcontractors fell on the critical path. Coordination among trades was crucial to keep one from affecting the schedule of work completed by others. This became apparent early in the project when excessive rain caused issues with the excavation due to the soft soil conditions on site. When there was dry weather, it was imperative to backfill excavations with compacted structural fill as soon as possible to prevent future concerns with excavation, differential settlement and to maintain the project schedule for foundations and underslab utilities.

Before excavation of the building foundation could start on October 24, 2011, many initial site work activities in Phase 3 had to be completed. This included temporary storm ponds, erosion and sedimentation controls, and the first 200' of Loop Road. Also part of Phase 3 activities were the relocation of utility lines, a permanent storm water diversion system, parking lots and sidewalks, site lighting, and landscaping.

The Detailed Project Schedule also contained critical milestones for the project. Approximately five months after excavation began, the rough building enclosure was completed in late March 2011. The Gambet Center was originally scheduled to reach substantial completion by October 2, 2012, however inclement weather has caused this date to slip to early November. Despite the delays, the Gambet Center should be completed with plenty of time for the owner to reach their first day of operation, and the relationship between DeSales University and Butz remains strong.

Detailed Structural System Estimate

*Please see Appendix B for Detailed Takeoff and Structural Estimate

The 77,000 square foot facility consists of the new construction of a two story structural steel frame with shallow slab on grade foundation. The typical bay was selected because it showed the most uniformity with other areas of the building, while remaining conservative. As shown in Figure 1, the chosen bay lies between column lines 3 and 6.



Figure 1: Typical Bay Chosen for Structural System Estimate

The structural system is a slab on grade foundation, consisting of reinforced concrete footings, piers, and foundation walls, and a two story structural steel frame with a composite floor system. All takeoff information was assembled from the structural drawings provided by Breslin Ridyard Fadero Architects, and organized in tables to display quantities. A unit cost estimate was produced using RS Means Construction Cost Data, adjusted for location in Lehigh Valley, PA, and a building cost index for January 2012. Other adjustments to quantity takeoffs were based on a 10 percent waste factor for concrete formwork, reinforcing, and metal decking, and 5 percent for concrete. Table 1 below shows the quantity takeoff summary for the structural system between column lines 3 and 6. For a more detailed breakdown of the takeoff, go to Appendix B-1.

Table 1: Structural Takeoff Summary								
Structural Steel	Structural Steel							
	Quantity	Units						
W 8X24	30	lf						
W 10X12	225.34	lf						
W 10X33	112	lf						
W 10X45	280	lf						
W 10X68	252	lf						
W 12X14	284.64	lf						
W 12X19	25.34	lf						
W 12X50	62.25	lf						
W 14X22	180.5	lf						
W 16X26	80	lf						
W 18X35	849.125	lf						
W 18X40	40	lf						
W 18X46	249	lf						
10K1	120	lf						
14K1	213.5	lf						
24K8	186.75	lf						
Concrete Slab Systems								
Normal Weight Concrete, 4000 psi	228.98	cu. yd.						
Lightweight Concrete, 4000 psi	448.09	cu. yd.						
WWF - W2.9xW2.9	7957	sq. ft.						
WWF - W4.0xW4.0	1935.00	sq. ft.						
20 gauge, 1-1/2" metal floor deck	4946	sq. ft.						
22 gauge, 1-1/2" metal roof deck	4946.00	sq. ft.						
Foundations								
Normal Weight Concrete, 4000 psi	101.95	cu. yd.						
Normal Weight Concrete, 3000 psi	229.28	cu. yd.						
#4-#7 Rebar, Footings	4596.04	lbs						
#3-#7 Rebar, Walls/Piers	6680.06	lbs						
#8-#18 Rebar, Walls/Piers	2950.35	lbs						
Formwork, Piers	878.80	sq. ft.						
Formwork, Walls	1466.32	sq. ft.						
Formwork, Footings	1380.40	sq. ft.						

These quantities were extrapolated to produce a detailed cost estimate for the bay. Appendix B-2 contains the Detailed Structural System Estimate. This estimated cost is compared below to the actual costs provided by Alvin H. Butz, Inc.

	Table 2: Structural System Estimated vs. Actual Cost Comparison										
	Estimated Cost	Actual Floor Area	Cost per Square Foot								
Concrete	\$172,011.27	9892	\$17.39	\$1,424,100.00	78000	\$18.26					
Steel	\$195,628.49	9892	\$19.78	\$2,039,602.00	78000	\$26.15					
Total	\$367,639.76	9892	\$37.17	\$3,463,702.00	78000	\$44.41					

The unit price estimate calculates a cost per square foot \$7.24 less than that of the actual cost. This corresponds to a 16.3 percent error in the estimated total. Examining further, about 88% of the error stems from the steel. For a detailed estimate this is usually unacceptable, however after continuing to examine the structural system, the chosen bay only conservatively estimates the cost of the structural system. A focus on column lines D3 to F6 on the roof framing plan shows members comprised mostly of steel roof joists, and transitioning to W18x46 structural steel beams at column line 4, where extra support is needed for the roof to adequately hold the large rooftop mechanical units. Only considering the chosen bay and consulting Appendix B-2, the W18x46 beams cost approximately \$16,000 more than the 24K8 joists. This also occurs in the East wing of the building. The estimate also does not include any hollow steel frames used for sunscreen and elevated roof construction or any steel used to construct stairs. With this taken into account, such a low estimate starts to make more sense.

Although the price of the concrete portion of the estimate is lower than the actual cost, it seems to be high when considering the amount of concrete work that does not involve the structural system. Contrasting the conservative estimate for the steel, the foundations supporting the selected bay are considerably deeper on the east side of the building. The cost of concrete per square foot decreases when coupling the deeper foundation on the west with the CMU masonry foundation that comprises most of the east wing of the building. This allows room to account for the exterior site concrete, stair treads, etc.

Although the structural unit price estimate differs greatly from the actual cost, it becomes more accurate when the variations in the system throughout the building are analyzed. The cost breakdown provided by Butz is helpful when trying to understand

how certain areas of the building impact the total cost of construction, but difficulty arises due to the generalization of grouping the work by subcontractor. This causes limitations when trying to determine the portion of the cost each subcontractor contributes to a particular building system. Regardless, knowing the scope of each contractor on a project enables the project team to understand discrepancies between estimated and actual costs.

General Conditions Estimate

*Please see Appendix C for the General Conditions Estimate

Every project requires money beyond the direct costs to complete construction. There are many indirect costs that are not reflected in the final product, but are inherent to the job. Most of these costs are general conditions and usually include staffing costs, temporary utilities and site preparation, contractor trailers and office equipment, insurance and bonding, and other miscellaneous costs that are not directly related to the actual construction. Table 3 details the breakdown of the major groups of the general conditions estimated for the Gambet Center. Appendix C-1 contains the detailed breakdown of the general conditions on the project, which is based off RS Means Construction Cost Data.

Table 3: General Conditions Cost Comparison									
Category Estimated Cost Actual C									
Personnel	\$734,850.00	\$823,080.00							
Temporary Utilities	\$97,323.85	\$115,077.26							
Site Office and Equipment	\$9,372.96	\$11,082.74							
Miscellaneous Costs	\$44,927.24	\$53,600.00							
Insurance, Bonds, and Permits	\$313,399.95	\$314,311.00							
Total	\$1,199,874.00	\$1,317,151.00							

The project team on the Gambet Center is comprised of a Senior Project Manager, Tom Daniels, who is not billed for the entire duration of the job. Tom is on the project from the start of preconstruction until closeout and is billed for 35 of the 84 weeks required to complete the project. Todd Rothermel, the Project Manager, is on the project the entire time from the beginning of preconstruction to closeout, and Dean Misera is on site for the 70 week construction period as the Superintendent. The MEP Project Manager, Larry McCabe, assists in both preconstruction and construction with 28 total weeks scheduled. A safety manager is assigned to the project for 25 percent of the construction time, or 18 weeks, which is more heavily weighted during times of more dangerous construction activities. About \$90,000 separates the estimated and actual cost of staffing for the project, and is due to clerical and administrative work completed in the home office, which is not included in the General Conditions Estimate.

Temporary utilities are made up by the cost of utilities to power, light, and heat the building and site during the construction period. Included in temporary utilities for this general conditions estimate are three portable toilets for the length of construction. Not included in this estimate are costs to have the power company connect necessary equipment to temporary underground power. Rental costs for site trailers, equipment, supplies, utilities, and storage containers are included in the Site and Office Equipment category. Construction fencing, temporary roads and parking, signage, cleanup, and commissioning make up Miscellaneous Costs. These estimates are reasonable and provide insight into the majority of the general conditions on the project; however limitations in RS Means Cost Data make it difficult to account for more obscure costs like cell phones, trash removal/recycling, etc., that give a clearer picture of the general costs required.

One category estimated very accurately by RS Means is Insurance, Bonding, and Permits. Based on a percentage of total construction cost, which was made available by Butz, the estimated costs for these general conditions was accurate within \$312. Below in Figures 2 and 3, graphs depict the differences and percentage breakdown between the actual and estimated prices, respectively.



Figure 2: Estimated vs. Actual General Conditions Costs





Estimated Cost Breakdown



Actual Cost Breakdown

BIM Use Evaluation

*Please See Appendix D for the BIM Use Analysis Worksheet and Level 1 Process Map

BIM Goals

Although Building Information Modeling was not a requirement for the Gambet Center, a 3D architectural model was created. The main objective for the model was to help BRF Architects to understand the massing of the building as the early design evolved. It also allowed analysis of the interior feature spaces, such as the Lobby and Labs. As the owner began to release more information to the public about the construction of the Gambet Center, the model also acted as a great marketing tool for both the owner and architect to show the building to the public. The mechanical contractor, H.T. Lyons, created a 3D mechanical and plumbing coordination model to assist with design, estimation, and coordination between trades. H.T. Lyons has been on the leading edge of investing in BIM, and is one of very few mechanical contractors in the Lehigh Valley Area to do so. While not a BIM goal for the project, it may have been beneficial to Butz to use the Gambet Center for an opportunity to expose their company to some facets of Building Information Modeling. Table 4 below prioritizes the BIM Goals and Objectives for the Gambet Center.

	Table 4: BIM Goals and Objectives									
Priority (High/Med/Low)	Goal Description	Potential BIM Uses								
High	Understand building massing during architectural design	Design Authoring, Design Reviews, 3D Coordination								
High	Analyze interior and feature spaces	Design Authoring, Design Reviews, 3D Coordination								
Med	Coordination between mechanical and plumbing trades	3D Coordination, Mechanical Analysis, LEED Evaluation, Cost Estimation, Construction System Design, Digital Fabrication								
Low	3D Record model for DeSales Department of Facilities Management	Record Modeling, Building Maintenance Scheduling								
High	Create renderings for marketing	Design Authoring								

BIM Use Analysis

*See Appendix D-1 for BIM Use Analysis Worksheet

Building Information Modeling was limited on the Gambet Center to a 3D architectural and mechanical system model, but there are many ways to utilize BIM to expand the usefulness of these models. The most likely to be used or the most potentially beneficial uses are described below. For the full list of considerations, the BIM Use Analysis Worksheet in Appendix C-1 contains an examination of different ways BIM could be implemented on this project.

Maintenance Scheduling

Adding mechanical and electrical equipment to the 3D model and loading them with information describing maintenance routines enables the owner to shift from reactionary maintenance and move toward preventative maintenance. Cost savings can be obtained by anticipating when equipment will need maintenance work, eliminating emergency calls, and reducing technician time on each call. DeSales University currently has no technological infrastructure linking their facilities electronically through the use of BIM. A large investment would be required to procure the advanced software needed, create 3D models of their buildings, and train their personnel. Despite these advantages proving to reduce costs substantially, this use of BIM was not be implemented on the Gambet Center project at DeSales.

Record Modeling

As with maintenance scheduling, DeSales does not currently demand record set models of their newly constructed buildings, and none were completed for the Gambet Center. This can have some negative effects on the owner in the future. They may not have any use for a 3D record model of their new construction, however as time goes on and BIM becomes more mainstream, DeSales could decide to establish new protocols for facility management using BIM. It would be much less expensive to have the record model completed now rather than to go back to create it in the future.

4D Modeling

One of the most beneficial uses for the contractor to see savings through BIM is to use 4D modeling to simulate phasing and constructability. Adding the dimension of time to the architectural model can also communicate to the owner how their project will come together, which can reduce their stress and give them more confidence in the contractor.

Specifically for the Gambet Center project, 4D modeling could have been implemented to examine site phasing, steel frame erection, and curtain wall construction.

3D Coordination

The use of BIM as a tool outside of 3D modeling for the Gambet Center was limited to the 3D mechanical model produced by H.T. Lyons. This model allowed the subcontractor to analyze the geometry of the systems and coordinate between the two out of the field. An important component of 3D coordination is running clash detection software, which can solve numerous issues that would have only been encountered in the field

BIM Uses

As stated above, Building Information Modeling was not a major aspect of this project, although there were some applications. Table 5 below lists the many ways to utilize BIM during each phase of construction, and highlights those used on the Gambet Center.

		Table 5:	BIN	A Uses			
PLAN		DESIGN		CONSTRUCT	OPERATE		
Programming	X	Design Authoring		Site Utilization Planning		Building Maintenance Scheduling	
Site Analysis	X	Design Reviews		Construction System Design		Building System Analysis	
	X	3D Coordination	X	3D Coordination		Asset Management	
		Structural Analysis		Digital Fabrication		Space Management/ Tracking	
		Lighting Analysis		3D Control and Planning		Disaster Planning	
		Energy Analysis		Record Modeling		Record Modeling	
		Mechanical					
	X	Analysis					
		Other Eng. Analysis					
		LEED Evaluation					
		Cade Validation					
Phase Planning (4D Modeling)		Phase Planning (4D Modeling)		Phase Planning (4D Modeling)		Phase Planning (4D Modeling)	
Cost Estimation	X	Cost Estimation		Cost Estimation		Cost Estimation	
Existing Conditions Modeling		Existing Conditions Modeling		Existing Conditions Modeling		Existing Conditions Modeling	

Constructability Challenges

Shallow Foundations, Soft Soils, and Structural Fill

The rainy weather mentioned in the Detailed Project Schedule section not only impacted the timeline at the beginning of the job, but also imposed several challenges to the construction of the foundation system. The soft ground conditions described in the Geotechnical Report required compacted structural fill to be placed over the soft soil, however the large amount of rain made the soil even softer. It was not practical to place the fill on top. To counteract both the delays to the schedule and the wet ground, productivity on dry days needed to be at a maximum. As soon as the excavations were complete, it was important to compact the virgin soil and then place and compact the structural fill.

An inadequately supported foundation would move and cause differential settling. This is especially a problem with slabs on grade, leading to cracks, leaks, and other performance issues. Only time will tell if the foundation will settle unevenly, even if the soil and fill were compacted correctly.

Steel Erection and Cold Weather Cast-In-Place Concrete

Another challenge to the project team was coordinating the construction sequence of the structural steel with placement of the slab on grade. Issues relating to cold weather and its effects on the setting of concrete had to be addressed, especially since the probability of an issue with settlement would increase with weak concrete. Fortunately, the winter of 2012 was very mild and the addition of non-chloride accelerating admixtures to the concrete design with thermal blankets mitigated any issues with curing.

In order to leave a lane for the crane to lift members, the slab had to be cast in different areas. Columns were erected on the east side of the building, and worked toward the west until reaching the interface where the atrium lobby began. The cranes went west and worked east until they got to the opposite wall of the atrium. While the west wing was erected, the slab on grade on the east side was cast.

The crane moved to the south side of the east wing and lifted the steel for the nursing and business offices, followed by the lecture hall on the north side of the east wing. Finally, the crane moved back to the middle of the building and completed the structural steel in the atrium, connecting the two wings. Figure 4 below highlights the phases of the steel and slab on grade construction on a plan of the building.



Figure 4: Steel and Slab on Grade Sequencing; Concrete follows steel, but both follow same sequence

Main Lobby Stair Construction

Construction of the main staircase in the atrium lobby was also difficult to put erect. The staircase originally had a straight forward design with a column support at the middle landing. The owner did not like the aesthetics of the column under the staircase, so it was redesigned during the beginning of construction. The solution to the issue was to remove the middle support, which left the remaining supports at the top and bottom of the stair. This would not be enough to withstand the loading. To address the "freestanding" design of the stairs, a column was added off to the side with a cantilever beam attached to the column to support the staircase at midspan. The weights of the steel stringers were also increased to reduce the deflection. In the end, the assembly of the staircase went together very smoothly, and the owner was very pleased.

| Appendix A-1 | DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE

`	Task Namo	Duration	Start	Einich	1 ct Outorter		1	ct Quartar		
)	lask Name	Duration	Start	Finish	1st Quarter	Anr	I Sen	<u>St Quarter</u> Feb	Iul	
1	Design, Preconstruction, and Procurement	344 days	Mon 7/26/10	Thu 11/17/11	1100	<u></u>	500	100	501	
2	Initial Programming/Township Approvals	133 days	Mon 7/26/10	Wed 1/26/11		C		📱 Initial Programm	ning/Township A	ppro
3	Design	145 days	Sat 11/20/10	Thu 6/9/11			C]	Design	
4	Preconstruction	70 days	Wed 4/20/11	Tue 7/26/11				C	Preconstru	ctior
5	Project Precon Meetings	5 days	Wed 7/27/11	Tue 8/2/11					👖 Project Pr	econ
6	Bid Site, Structural and Concrete Trades	22 days	Wed 6/22/11	Thu 7/21/11					📺 Bid Site, Str	uctu
7	Award Site, Structural, and Concrete Trades	s 16 days	Fri 7/22/11	Fri 8/12/11					📺 Award Si	te, S
8	Bid MEP and Masonry Contracts	31 days	Mon 8/8/11	Mon 9/19/11					Bid	MEP
9	Bid Remaining Architectural/Fit-Up Trades	10 days	Wed 8/31/11	Tue 9/13/11					📋 Bid R	ema
.0	Award MEP and Masonry Contracts	17 days	Mon 9/19/11	Tue 10/11/11					E A	war
1	Award Architectural/Fit-Up Contracts	26 days	Thu 10/13/11	Thu 11/17/11						- /
2	Construction	305 days	Wed 8/3/11	Tue 10/2/12					\bigtriangledown	
3	Mobilization	0 days	Wed 8/3/11	Wed 8/3/11					🔶 Mobilizat	ion
4	Site Preparation/Temporary Utilities	50 days	Thu 8/4/11	Wed 10/12/11					S	ite F
5	Excavation and Foundation	81 days	Mon 9/12/11	Mon 1/2/12						_
.6	Rebar Submittals	21 days	Wed 9/21/11	Wed 10/19/11						₹eb
7	Furnish, Fabricate, and Deliver Rebar	21 days	Mon 9/26/11	Mon 10/24/11						Fur
8	Strip Building Topsoil, Loop Road, and Se	rvice Areas 23 days	Mon 9/12/11	Wed 10/12/11					S	trip
9	Building Area Fills	16 days	Thu 9/29/11	Thu 10/20/11						3ui
)	Parking Rough Grading and Stone	18 days	Thu 9/29/11	Mon 10/24/11						Pa
1	Excavate for Footings	26 days	Mon 10/24/11	Mon 11/28/11						
2	Concrete Footings	23 days	Thu 10/27/11	Mon 11/28/11						
3	Foundation Walls and Piers	34 days	Wed 11/2/11	Mon 12/19/11						
4	Underslab Building Utilities	21 days	Mon 11/21/11	Mon 12/19/11						
5	Backfill Foundations	20 days	Tue 12/6/11	Mon 1/2/12						
6	Masonry Foundations	10 days	Tue 12/13/11	Mon 12/26/11						
7	Superstructure	167 days	Fri 8/5/11	Mon 3/26/12					_	
8	Structural Steel Shop Drawings	40 days	Fri 8/5/11	Thu 9/29/11					Str	uct
9	Furnish Fabricate, and Deliver Structural	Steel 55 days	Fri 9/30/11	Thu 12/15/11					C	
0	Start Casting Slab-On-Grade	6 days	Tue 12/20/11	Tue 12/27/11						
1	Erect Structural Steel	31 days	Wed 12/28/11	Wed 2/8/12						
2	Install Metal Deck	26 days	Wed 1/18/12	Wed 2/22/12						
3	Install Roof Joists	25 days	Wed 2/1/12	Tue 3/6/12						
4	Hollow Metal Frames	15 days	Tue 3/6/12	Mon 3/26/12						
5	Finish Slab on Grade	26 days	Wed 1/18/12	Wed 2/22/12						
86	Cast Second Floor Concrete Decking	24 days	Wed 2/15/12	Sun 3/18/12						
7	Enclosure	187 days	Mon 11/21/1	1 Tue 8/7/12						Ţ
8	Exterior Steel Studs and Sheathing	32 days	Wed 1/18/12	Thu 3/1/12						
39	Erect Interior Steel Pan Stairs	20 days	Wed 1/25/12	Tue 2/21/12						
	Task		Project Sumn	narv 🖵	- Ina	ctive Milestone	\$	Manual Su	mmary Rollun 🗕	_
			External Tack	s –		ctive Summary	·	Manual Su	mmary	
Jec te:	L. Rev. James G. Gambet Ce Spire Tue 10/9/12 Milestone	•	External Mile	stone	Ma Ma	nual Task	Č	Start-only	г	
	Summary	· ·	Inactive Task			ration-only		Finish-only	-	
	Summary	• •					41920			
						Dago 1				

1st Quarter			1st Quarter	
Dec	May	Oc [.]	t	Mar
gn, Preconstr	uction, and Procure	ment		
S				
eetings				
and Concrete	Trades			
ctural, and Co	ncrete Trades			
d Masonry Co	ntracts			
ng Architectur	al/Fit-Up Trades			
EP and Masor	nry Contracts			
d Architectur	al/Fit-Up Contracts			
		Constru	ction	
aration/Temp	orary Utilities			
Excavation a	and Foundation			
ıbmittals				
Fabricate, ar	d Deliver Rebar			
ding Topsoil,	Loop Road, and Serv	vice Areas		
Area Fills	,			
Rough Gradir	ng and Stone			
avate for Foot	tings			
crete Footing				
oundation W	,s alls and Diors			
Indorciah Buil	ding Utilitios			
	dations			
Steel Chen Dr	aperstructure			
Steel Shop Dr	awings		-1	
urnish Fabrica Chant Casting	ite, and Deliver Stru	ctural Ste	ei	
Start Casting				
Erect Str	uctural Steel			
Install	ivietal Deck			
[] Insta	II Root Joists			
📑 Ho	llow Metal Frames			
Finish	Slab on Grade			
E Cas	t Second Floor Conc	rete Deck	ing	
	Enclo	sure		
Exteri	ior Steel Studs and S	heathing		
Erect I	nterior Steel Pan Sta	irs		
_				
Dea	adline	*		
Pro	ogress			
	Br	ett Tallada	a Technical A	Assignment 2

						James G. Gambet Center - Detailed Project Schedule					
D	Task Name		Duration	Start	Finish	1st Quart	ter		1st Quarter		
40	Roof Blocking		15 days	Wed 2/1/12	Tue 2/21/12	Nov	Apr	Sep	Feb	j	ul 📃
41	Mechanical Curbs		5 days	Wed 2/8/12	Tue $2/14/12$						
42	Roofing Membrane		20 days	Wed 2/8/12	Tue 3/6/12						
43	Install Stair Tower and	Interior CMU Masonry	20 days	Wed 2/22/12	Tue 3/20/12						
44	Install Exterior Mason	rv Svstems	58 davs	Fri 2/24/12	Tue 5/15/12						
45	Enclose Mechanical/E	lectrical Room	10 davs	Wed 3/7/12	Tue 3/20/12						
46	Detail Roofing and Co	pings	15 days	Wed 3/7/12	Tue 3/27/12						
47	Rough-In Enclosure		0 days	Wed 3/28/12	Wed 3/28/12						
48	Exterior Spray Insulati	on	10 days	Wed 3/21/12	Tue 4/3/12						
49	Curtain Wall and Wind	dow Submittals	40 days	Mon 11/21/11	1 Fri 1/13/12						
50	Exterior Aluminum Pa	nel Shop Drawings	50 days	Mon 1/16/12	Fri 3/23/12						
51	Furnish, Fabricate, and	d Deliver Curtain Wall	45 days	Mon 1/16/12	Fri 3/16/12						
52	Install Curtain Wall		40 days	Mon 3/19/12	Fri 5/11/12						
53	Exterior Aluminum Pa	nel Fabrication	50 days	Mon 3/26/12	Fri 6/1/12						
54	Exterior Aluminum Pa	nel Erection	20 days	Mon 6/4/12	Fri 6/29/12						
55	Sunscreen Installation	I	16 days	Mon 7/2/12	Mon 7/23/12						
56	Final Exterior Caulking	7	10 days	Tue 7/10/12	Mon 7/23/12						
57	Install Doors and Hard	lware	20 days	Wed 7/11/12	Tue 8/7/12						
58	Permanent Building E	nclosure	0 days	Tue 8/7/12	Tue 8/7/12						
59	MEP Systems		202 days	Mon 11/21/1	1 Tue 8/28/12						-
60	Furnish, Fabricate, and	d Deliver Switchgear	30 days	Mon 11/21/11	1 Fri 12/30/11						C
61	Furnish, Fabricate, and	d Deliver Mechanical Equipment	30 days	Mon 11/21/11	1 Fri 12/30/11						
62	HVAC Rough-In		65 days	Wed 2/1/12	Tue 5/1/12						
63	Plumbing Rough-In		50 days	Tue 2/21/12	Mon 4/30/12						
64	Fire Protection Rough	-In	50 days	Tue 2/21/12	Mon 4/30/12						
65	Spray Fireproofing		5 days	Wed 3/14/12	Tue 3/20/12						
66	Electrical Rough-In		65 days	Tue 2/21/12	Mon 5/21/12						
67	Switchgear and Perma	anent Power	15 days	Wed 3/21/12	Tue 4/10/12						
68	Install MEPS Equipme	nt and Devices	26 days	Tue 7/3/12	Tue 8/7/12						
69	Start-Up Mechanical U	Units for Dehumidification	11 days	Tue 7/3/12	Tue 7/17/12						
70	Begin MEPS Systems I	nspections and QC	15 days	Wed 8/8/12	Tue 8/28/12						
71	Interiors and Finishes		156 days	Tue 2/14/12	Tue 9/18/12						
72	Interior Framing		35 days	Tue 2/14/12	Mon 4/2/12						
73	Drywall and Spackle		89 days	Thu 3/8/12	Tue 7/10/12						
74	Install Elevator		15 days	Tue 5/1/12	Mon 5/21/12						
75	Install Ceramic Tile		16 days	Tue 6/19/12	Tue 7/10/12						
76	Interior Painting		61 days	Tue 6/19/12	Tue 9/11/12						
77	Interior Finishes, Milly	work, and Trim	36 days	Tue 6/26/12	Tue 8/14/12						
78	Ceiling Grid		26 days	Tue 6/26/12	Tue 7/31/12						
		Tack)	Droject Sump			nactivo Milostono		Manua	L Summary Bo	
				Project Sumn				×	Ivianua	i Summary Kol	iup
Project	: Rev. James G. Gambet Ce	Split		External Task	S		nactive Summary			I Summary	
Date: T	ue 10/9/12	Milestone 🔶		External Mile	stone 🔶	I	Manual Task	Ľ.	□ Start-o	nly	E
		Summary 🗸 🗸		Inactive Task			Duration-only		Finish-o	only	ב
		I									



D	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	1st Quarter		1st	Quarter	
					Nov	Apr	Sep	Feb	Jul
79	Install Lobby Staircase	15 days	Wed 7/11/12	Tue 7/31/12					
80	Plumbing Fixtures	10 days	Wed 7/11/12	Tue 7/24/12					
81	Drop Acoustical Ceiling Tiles	20 days	Wed 8/1/12	Tue 8/28/12					
32	Install Terazzo	20 days	Wed 8/15/12	Tue 9/11/12					
33	Install Carpet	20 days	Wed 8/22/12	Tue 9/18/12					
34	Punchlist and Commissioning	10 days	Wed 9/19/12	Tue 10/2/12					
85	Pre-Purge HVAC System	10 days	Wed 9/19/12	Tue 10/2/12					
6	Building Substantial Completion	0 days	Tue 10/2/12	Tue 10/2/12					
37	Site Work	257 days	Wed 8/3/11	Fri 7/27/12					-
88	UGI Gas Line Relocation Study and Engineering	79 days	Wed 8/3/11	Mon 11/21/11					ן כין נ
89	Begin Erosion and Sedimentation Controls	7 days	Thu 9/1/11	Fri 9/9/11					Begin Eros
0	Temporary Storm Ponds and Diversion Work	11 days	Tue 9/6/11	Tue 9/20/11					🔲 Tempora
1	Begin Infiltration Basin and Install Soil Mix	47 days	Mon 9/19/11	Tue 11/22/11					
2	First 200' of Loop Road	7 days	Thu 9/29/11	Fri 10/7/11					First 2
3	Station Ave. Waterline Relocations	28 days	Mon 10/10/11	Wed 11/16/11					 S
4	Gas Line Pipe Delivery/UGI Delays	8 days	Tue 11/22/11	Thu 12/1/11					
5	Station Ave. Gas Relocation	15 days	Fri 12/2/11	Thu 12/22/11					l
6	Begin Stormwater Conveyance System	40 days	Fri 12/2/11	Thu 1/26/12					Í
7	PennDOT Station Ave. Improvements/Pipe Crossings	30 days	Fri 12/23/11	Thu 2/2/12					
8	Sanitary Sewerage System	15 days	Fri 1/27/12	Thu 2/16/12					
9	Internal Water Loop	20 days	Fri 1/27/12	Thu 2/23/12					
00	Complete Permanent Storm System	20 days	Wed 4/11/12	Tue 5/8/12					
)1	Remove Temporary Storm Diversion System	15 days	Wed 5/9/12	Tue 5/29/12					
)2	Parking Lot Curbs. Site Concrete. Etc.	, 25 davs	Wed 5/9/12	Tue 6/12/12					
)3	Station Ave. Widenings. Milling. Etc.	, 23 davs	Tue 6/12/12	Thu 7/12/12					
)4	Underground Site Electrical/Lighting Rough-In	, 15 davs	Thu 3/1/12	Wed 3/21/12					
)5	Curbs for Loop Road	20 days	Thu 3/22/12	Wed 4/18/12					
)6	Loop Road - Fine, Stone, and Binder Course	10 days	Thu 4/19/12	Wed 5/2/12					
)7	Exterior Slabs, Site Walks, and Site Concrete	30 days	Wed 5/16/12	Tue 6/26/12					
)8	Final Site Grading	15 days	Wed 5/30/12	Tue 6/19/12					
79 19	Permanent Seeding/Landscaning	10 days	Wed 5/30/12	Tue $6/12/12$					
10	Site Lighting/Electrical Eixtures	10 days	Wed 6/20/12	Tue 7/3/12					
 11	Wearing Course Line Strining and Signage	10 days	Fri 7/13/12	Thu 7/26/12					
 12	Site Substantial Completion	D dave	Fri 7/27/12	Fri 7/27/12					
12		18 days	Tue 10/2/12	Thu 10/25/12					
1/		20 days	$Fri \frac{10}{26} \frac{10}{12}$	Thu 11/22/12					
15	rust ruigt		Thu 11/1/12	Thu 11/22/12					
.15	rinal completion	U days	1 NU 11/1/12	mu 11/1/12					

Project: Rev. James G. Gambet Ce	Task		Project Summary	\bigtriangledown	Inactive Milestone	\diamond	Manual Summary Rollur	0 0
	Split		External Tasks		Inactive Summary	\bigtriangledown	Manual Summary	-
Date: Tue 10/9/12	Milestone	♦	External Milestone		Manual Task	۲ ۵	Start-only	C
	Summary		Inactive Task		Duration-only		Finish-only	ב
					Page 3			

1st Quarter				1st Qu	arter
Dec	May	066	Oct	10000	Mar
			Jacal	icase	
			ures uetiz	al Coilir	
		stall 1	lera7	20 CEIII	15 11103
		nstall	Carn	et	
		Punc	hlist	and Co	mmissioning
		Pre-	urge	HVAC	System
	4	Buil	ding	Substar	itial Completion
	Site W	ork			
Gas Line Relocat	tion Study and Er	ginee	ring		
and Sedimenta	tion Controls	[
Storm Ponds and	d Diversion Work				
n Infiltration Ba	sin and Install So	il Mix			
of Loop Road					
on Ave. Waterlin	ne Relocations				
s Line Pipe Deliv	ery/UGI Delays				
Station Ave. Gas	Relocation				
Begin Storm	water Conveyand	e Syst	em		
PennDOT S	tation Ave. Impro	veme	nts/	Pipe Cro	ossings
📺 Sanitary S	ewerage System				
Internal	Water Loop				
	Complete Perma	nent S	torn	n Systen	n
	Remove Temp	orary	Stor	m Diver	sion System
	Parking Lot (urbs,	Site	Concret	e, Etc.
		ve. W	Iden	ings, Mi	liling, EtC.
Unde	rground Site Elec	urical/	Light	ung Kou	igu-in
<u> </u>		Stone		Bindor	Course
	EUOP KOdu - Fille,		, and to W	alks an	d Site Concrete
	Final Site G	ading		uiks, all	
	Permanent 9	Seedin	g/La	ndscani	ng
	Site Lighti	ng/Ele	ctric	al Fixtu	res
	🔲 Wearin	g Cou	rse, I	ine Stri	ping, and Signage
	Site Su	bstan	tial C	Complet	ion
	•	o 🔁	wner	Occupa	ancy
			Pos	st Purge	-
			inal	Comple	etion
		1		-	
Dead	line	÷			
Drogr		•			_
→ Progr	535				_
	Br	ett Ta	llada	Techr	nical Assignment 2

| Appendix B-1 |

DETAILED STRUCTURAL SYSTEM QUANTITY TAKEOFF

	Second Floor Framing												
Type/Size	Length (ft)	Quantity	Total Length										
W 10X12	10	14	140										
W 12X14	17.79	12	213.48										
W 12X19	12.67	2	25.34										
W 14X22	5.125	2	10.25										
W 14X22	20	4	80										
W 18X35	10	3	30										
W 18X35	20	10	200										
W 18X35	31.125	16	498										

Detailed Structural System Quantity Takeoff

	Roof	Framing	
Type/Size	Length (ft)	Quantity	Total Length
W 16X26	20	4	80
W 14X22	5.125	2	10.25
W 14X22	20	4	80
W 18X35	10	3	30
W 18X35	20	3	60
W 18X35	31.125	1	31.125
W 18X40	20	2	40
W 18X46	31.125	8	249
W 10X12	12.67	2	25.34
W 10X12	10	6	60
W 12X14	17.79	4	71.16
W 12X50	31.125	2	62.25
W 8X24	5	6	30
10K1	10	12	120
14K1	17.79	12	213.48
24K8	31.125	6	186.75

	Column Framing												
Type/Size	Length (ft)	Quantity	Total Length										
W 10X45	28	10	280										
W 10X33	28	4	112										
W 10X68	28	9	252										

Detailed Structural System Quantity Takeoff

	Foundatio	on		
	Size	Туре	Quantity	Unit
Spread Footings				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	79.75	cu. yd.
Rebar	#5		1539.47	lbs
	#6		904.2	lbs
Formwork			226.86	sq. ft.
Column Footings				
Type F2 (x2)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	4.08	cu. yd.
Rebar	#5		65.71	lbs
Formwork			42.00	sq. ft.
Туре F3 (х6)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	16	cu. yd.
Rebar	#5		200.26	lbs
Formwork			432	sq. ft.
Туре F4 (х4)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	13.50	cu. yd.
Rebar	#5		187.74	lbs
Formwork			108.00	sq. ft.
Type F6 (x2)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	11.25	cu. yd.
Rebar	#5		160.62	lbs
Formwork			73.5	sq. ft.
Туре F9 (х4)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	36.36	cu. yd.
Rebar	#6		588.78	lbs
Formwork			187.04	sq. ft.

Detailed Structural System Quantity Takeoff

	Foundation - Co	ntinued		
	Size	Туре	Quantity	Unit
Туре F9 (х4)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	36.36	cu. yd.
Rebar	#6		588.78	lbs
Formwork			187.04	sq. ft.
Туре F10 (х1)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	11.45	cu. yd.
Rebar	#6		180.24	lbs
Formwork			55	sq. ft.
Туре F11 (х4)				
Concrete	3000 psi	Normal	56.89	cu. yd.
Rebar	#6		769.02	lbd
Formwork			256.00	sq. ft.
Pier Type V (x19)				
Concrete	4000 psi	Normal	48.71	cu. yd.
Rebar	#8		2950.35	lbs
	#3		121.82	lbs
Formwork			876.80	sq. ft.
Foundation Walls				
Concrete	4000 psi	Normal	63.11	cu. yd.
Rebar	#4		219.77	lbs
	#5		1727.21	lbs
	#7		4611.26	lbs
Formwork			1466.32	sq. ft.

Detailed Structural	Sys	tem (Quantity	' Takeoff

	Metal Deck/Co	ncrete Slabs		
	Size	Туре	Quantity	Unit
Slab On Grade				
Concrete	4000 psi	Normal Weight		
	4"		111.56	cu. yd.
	6"		107.56	cu. yd.
WWF				
4" slab on grade	6"x 6"	66-W2.9xW2.9	3011	sq. ft.
6" slab on grade	6"x 6"	44-W4.0xW4.0	1935	sq. ft.
Second Floor Slab				
Metal Deck	1-1/2", 20 ga		4,946	sq. ft.
Concrete	4000 psi	Lightweight		
	5"		228.98	cu. yd.
WWF	6"x 6"	66-W2.9xW2.9	4,946	sq. ft.
Roof Decking				
Metal Roof Deck	1-1/2", 22 ga		4,946	sq. ft.

| Appendix B-2 |

DETAILED STRUCTURAL SYSTEM ESTIMATE

er valley, FA															
Quantity	Line Number	Description	Crew	Daily Output	Labor Hours	Unit	Mat. O&P	Labor O&P	Equip. O&P	Total O&P	Ext. Mat. O&P	Ext. Labor O&P	Ext. Equip. O&P	Ext. Total O&P	Data Release
Concrete				Jouput	nours					11				\$17	2,011.27
Formwork															-
966.68	031113256600	C.I.P. concrete forms, column, square, plywood, 24" x 24", 3 use, includes erecting, bracing, stripping and cleaning	C1	230	0.14	SFCA	\$ 1.09	\$ 10.53	\$ -	\$ 11.62	\$ 1,053.68	\$ 10,179.14	\$ -	\$ 11,232.82	Year 2012 Quarter 2
1612.95	031113450100	C.I.P. concrete forms, footing, continuous wall, plywood, 3 use, includes erecting, bracing, stripping and cleaning	C1	470	0.07	SFCA	\$ 2.51	\$ 5.16	\$ -	\$ 7.67	\$ 4,048.50	\$ 8,322.82	\$ -	\$ 12,371.33	Year 2012 Quarter 2
101.2	031113451500	C.I.P. concrete forms, footing, keyway, tapered wood, 2" x 4", 4 use. includes erecting, bracing, stripping and cleaning	CARP	530	0.02	L.F.	\$ 0.18	\$ 1.20	¢ _	\$ 1.38	\$ 18.22	\$ 121.44	¢	\$ 139.66	Year 2012 Ouarter 2
1510 //	021112455100	C.I.P. concrete forms, footing, spread, plywood, 3 use, includes		401	0.00	SEC A	φ 0.10	φ <u>1.20</u>	Ψ 	¢ (07	<u>+ 1220.04</u>	φ <u>121.11</u>	φ 	φ <u>10,100</u>	Year 2012
1510.44 Deinforcomo	U31113433100	erecting, bracing, su ipping and cleaning		401	0.00	SPUA	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.00	\$ -	\$ 0.87	\$ 1,229.94	\$ 9,201.75	-	\$ 10,431.00	Quarter 2
Kenijorteme		1		Т	· · · · · ·		T	T		1		I	1 1	[
5055.64	032110600502	Reinforcing Steel, in place, footings, #4 to #7, A615, grade 60, incl labor for accessories, excl material for accessories	RODM	4200	0.01	Lb.	\$ 0.54	\$ 0.67	\$-	\$ 1.21	\$ 2,730.05	\$ 3,387.28	\$-	\$ 6,117.32	Year 2012 Quarter 2
2 67	022110600700	Reinforcing Steel, in place, walls, #3 to #7, A615, grade 60, incl	RUDW	2	10.67	Ton	¢ 007.33	¢ 932.70	ф	¢ 1.020.03	ф <u>2 660 20</u>	¢ 2423.01	¢	¢ 7.083.21	Year 2012 Quarter 2
3.07	032110000700	labor for accessories, excl material for accessories	NUDM	5	10.07	1011	\$ 777.33	\$ 734.70	ъ -	۵ <u>۱</u> ,۶۵۰.03	\$ 3,000.20	\$ 3,423.01	-	\$ 7,003.21	Quarter 2
1.63	032110600750	Reinforcing Steel, in place, walls, #8 to #18, A615, grade 60, incl labor for accessories, excl material for accessories	RODM	4	8	Ton	\$ 997.33	\$ 698.13	\$ -	\$ 1,695.46	\$ 1,625.65	\$ 1,137.95	\$-	\$ 2,763.60	Year 2012 Quarter 2
		Welded wire fabric, sheets, 6 x 6 - W2.9 x W2.9 (6 x 6) 42 lb. per C.S.F., A185, incl labor for accessories, excl material for													Year 2012
87.53	032205500300	accessories Welded wire fabric, sheets, 6 x 6 - W4 x W4 (4 x 4) 58 lb. per	RODM	29	0.55	C.S.F.	\$ 25.78	\$ 48.59	\$ -	\$ 74.37	\$ 2,256.52	\$ 4,253.08	\$-	\$ 6,509.61	Quarter 2 Vear 2012
21.29	032205500400	C.S.F., A185, Incluador for accessories, exclutate hallon accessories	RODM	27	0.59	C.S.F.	\$ 35.51	\$ 51.94	\$-	\$ 87.45	\$ 756.01	\$ 1,105.80	\$ -	\$ 1,861.81	Quarter 2
Concrete															
240.744	033105350150	Structural concrete, ready mix, normal weight, 3000 psi, includes local aggregate, sand, Portland cement and water, delivered. excludes all additives and treatments				C.Y.	\$ 94.86	\$ -	\$-	\$ 94.86	\$ 22,836.98	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,836.98	Year 2012 Quarter 2
347 4765	033105350300	Structural concrete, ready mix, normal weight, 4000 PSI, includes local aggregate, sand, Portland cement and water,				C.Y.	¢ 95.71	¢	¢	¢ 95.71	¢ 33.256.98	¢	¢	¢ 33,256,98	Year 2012 Quarter 2
F1 1 4 FF	00010000000	Structural concrete, placing, column, square or round, pumped, 24" thick, includes strike off & consolidation,	620		0.006	C V	Ψ 20011	ψ	Ψ 10.45	Ψ	φ <u>00,200,70</u>	Ψ	φ	φ <u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u></u>	Year 2012
51.1455	033105700000	excludes material	620	92	0.090	U.T.		\$ 41.40	\$ 10.45	\$ 51.85	\$ -	\$ 2,117.42	\$ 534.47	\$ 2,651.89	Quarter 2
240.45	033105701400	Structural concrete, placing, elevated slab, pumped, less than 6" thick, includes strike off & consolidation, excludes material	C20	140	0.457	C.Y.	\$ -	\$ 27.43	\$ 6.87	\$ 34.30	\$-	\$ 6,595.54	\$ 1,651.89	\$ 8,247.44	Year 2012 Quarter 2
83.7375	033105701900	Structural concrete, placing, continuous footing, shallow, direct chute, includes strike off & consolidation, excludes	C6	120	0.4	C.Y.	\$ -	\$ 23.29	\$ 0.57	\$ 23.86	\$ -	\$ 1.950.25	\$ 47.73	\$ 1,997.98	Year 2012 Quarter 2
-		Structural concrete, placing, spread footing, direct chute,	i	+		i	¥	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ŷ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	<u> </u>
35.259	033105702400	under 1 C.Y., includes strike off & consolidation, excludes material	C6	55	0.873	C.Y.	\$ -	\$ 50.72	\$ 1.25	\$ 51.97	\$ -	\$ 1,788.34	\$ 44.07	\$ 1,832.41	Year 2012 Quarter 2
109.935	033105702600	Structural concrete, placing, spread footing, direct chute, over 5 C.Y., includes strike off & consolidation, excludes material	C6	120	0.4	C.Y.	\$ -	\$ 23.29	\$ 0.57	\$ 23.86	\$ -	\$ 2,560.39	\$ 62.66	\$ 2,623.05	Year 2012 Quarter 2
230.0655	033105704350	Structural concrete, placing, slab on grade, pumped, up to 6" thick, includes strike off & consolidation, excludes material	C20	130	0.492	C.Y.	\$-	\$ 29.50	\$ 7.38	\$ 36.88	\$ -	\$ 6,786.93	\$ 1,697.88	\$ 8,484.82	Year 2012 Quarter 2
240 45	033116100820	Structural concrete, ready mix, lightweight, 110 #/C.F., 4000 PSI, includes lightweight aggregate, sand, portland cement and				C.Y.	¢ 131.29	¢	¢	¢ 131.29	¢ 31 568 68	¢	¢	¢ 31 568 68	Year 2012 Quarter 2
Structural Ste		Water, excludes an additives and it earnents				GITT	φ 101.67	φ	φ	φ 101.67	۹ 31,300.00	<u></u> , ф	<u></u>	\$ 51,500.00	5 628 49
Reams and C	olumns													ψτγ	3,020.77
Deams and S		Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building,		T	,		I	Ι				I	1		1
30	051223750360	W8x24, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted connections	E2	550	0.1	L.F.	\$ 33.22	\$ 10.28	\$ 3.43	\$ 46.93	\$ 996.60	\$ 308.40	\$ 102.90	\$ 1,407.90	Year 2012 Quarter 2
225.34	051223750600	Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building, W10x12, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted	E2	600	0.09	L.F.	\$ 16.52	\$ 9.42	\$ 3.14	\$ 29.08	\$ 3.722.62	\$ 2.122.70	\$ 707.57	\$ 6,552.89	Year 2012 Quarter 2
140	054000550540	Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building, W10x33, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted	50	550											Year 2012
112	051223750740	connections	EZ	550	0.1	L.F.	\$ 45.50	\$ 10.28	\$ 3.43	\$ 59.21	\$ 5,096.00 '	\$ 1,151.36	\$ 384.16	\$ 6,631.52	Quarter 2

Detailed Structural System Est

Column Lines 3-6

timate

Quantity	Line Number	Description	Crew	Daily Output	Labor Hours	Unit	Mat. O&P	Labor O&P	Equip. O&P	Total O&P	Ext. Mat. O&P	Ext. Labor O&P	Ext. Equip. O&P	Ext. Total O&P	Data Release
532	051223750900	Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building, W10x49, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted	F2	550	0.1	LF	¢ 67.24	¢ 10.28	¢ 242	¢ 91.05	¢ 25.924.99	¢ 5.468.06	¢ 1.824.76	\$ 42.118.60 (7ear 2012 Quarter 2
	031223730700	Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building,		550	0.1	1.1.	\$ 07.54	φ <u>10.20</u>	φ <u>3.43</u>	\$ 01.05	\$ 55,624.00	\$ 5,400.70	\$ 1,024.70	φ 43,110.00 Q	
310	051223751100	W12x16, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted connections	E2	880	0.06	L.F.	\$ 21.84	\$ 6.43	\$ 2.14	\$ 30.41	\$ 6,770.40	\$ 1,993.30	\$ 663.40	\$ 9,427.10 Q	Quarter 2
		Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building,												Y	
56	051223751560	connections	E2	750	0.07	L.F.	\$ 68.71	\$ 7.59	\$ 2.52	\$ 78.82	\$ 3,847.76	\$ 425.04	\$ 141.12	\$ 4,413.92 Q	Quarter 2
		Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building, W14x26, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted												Y	Year 2012
180.5	051223751900	connections	E2	990	0.06	L.F.	\$ 35.95	\$ 5.73	\$ 1.90	\$ 43.58	\$ 6,488.98	\$ 1,034.27	\$ 342.95	\$ 7,866.19	Quarter 2
		W16x26, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted		1000										Y	/ear 2012
80	051223752700	connections Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building.	E2	1000	0.06	L.F.	\$ 35.95	\$ 5.67	\$ 1.89	\$ 43.51	\$ 2,876.00	\$ 453.60	\$ 151.20	\$ 3,480.80 Q	Juarter 2
840 125	051222752200	W18x35, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted	FC	960	0.08	ΤĒ	¢ 40.22	¢ 0.02	¢ 0.10	¢ 50.00	¢ 40.052.20	¢ 7.227.05	¢ 100015	¢ 50.001.20 (lear 2012
049.125	031223733300	Connections Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building,	23	,00	0.00	L.I [*] .	\$ 40.23	\$ 0.03	<u>۵ 2.12</u>	\$ 50.90	\$ 40,955.30	\$ 7,327.93	\$ 1,000.15	\$ 50,001.39 G	
40	051223753500	W18x40, A992 steel, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, bolted	E5	960	0.08	L.F.	\$ 55.06	\$ 8.63	\$ 2.12	\$ 65.81	\$ 2,202.40	\$ 345.20	\$ 84.80	\$ 2,632.40 Q	l'ear 2012 Quarter 2
		Structural steel member, 100-ton project, 1 to 2 story building,									·			v	Vear 2012
249	051223753520	connections	E5	960	0.08	L.F.	\$ 63.25	\$ 8.63	\$ 2.12	\$ 74.00	\$ 15,749.25	\$ 2,148.87	\$ 527.88	\$ 18,426.00 Q	Quarter 2
Steel Roof Jo	ists			-	[[1	1	1				Г — Г	
100	050440400440	spans up to 30', shop fabricated, incl shop primer, horizontal	7.5	1000	0.07									Y	7ear 2012
120	052119100140	bridging Open web har joist K Series 40-top job lots 14K3 60 plf	E7	1200	0.07	L.F.	\$ 4.81	\$ 7.01	\$ 1.84	\$ 13.66	\$ 577.20	\$ 841.20	\$ 220.80	\$ 1,639.20 Q	Juarter 2
212 F	052110100100	spans up to 30', shop fabricated, incl shop primer, horizontal	67	1500	0.05	LE		* 5 (0)	¢ 4.004.00	ф <u>1105</u> со	¢ 040.05	Y	/ear 2012
213.5	052119100180	bridging Open web bar joist, K Series, 40-ton job lots, 24K6, 9.7 plf, 30'	E/	1500	0.05	L.F.	\$ 5.77	\$ 5.60	\$ 1.47	\$ 12.84	\$ 1,231.90	\$ 1,195.60	\$ 313.85	\$ 2,741.34 Q	Juarter 2
186 75	052119100580	to 50' spans, shop fabricated, incl shop primer, horizontal	F7	2200	0.04	ΙF	¢ 0.14	¢ 202	¢ 1.00	¢ 12.06	¢ 1.706.00	¢ 712.20	¢ 106.75	¢ 2607.02 (/ear 2012 Ouarter 2
Metal Deckin	na	bridging	L/	2200	0.04	L.I'.	۶ 9.14 ب	\$ 3.02	\$ 1.00	۶ 15.90 ا	\$ 1,700.90	\$ 715.59	۶ 100.75	¢ 2,007.05	
Metal Deckin		Metal floor decking, steel, non-cellular, composite, galvanized,												Y	Year 2012
5440.6	053113505140	1-1/2" D, 20 gauge	E4	3800	0.01	S.F.	\$ 2.39	\$ 0.93	\$ 0.05	\$ 3.37	\$ 13,003.03	\$ 5,059.76	\$ 272.03	\$ 18,334.82 Q	Quarter 2
5440.6	053123502100	Metal roof decking, steel, open type B wide rib, galvanized, under 50 sg., 1-1/2" D, 22 gauge	E4	4500	0.01	S.F.	\$ 2.18	\$ 0.78	\$ 0.03	\$ 2.99	\$ 11,860.51	\$ 4,243.67	\$ 163.22	\$ 16,267.39 Q	/ear 2012 Quarter 2
	•				•			•	·	•					
Total							\$ 2,898.80	\$ 2,060.32	\$ 59.72	\$ 5,018.84	\$ 257,949.14	\$ 97,764.41	\$ 11,926.24	\$ 367,639.76	

| Appendix C-1 |

GENERAL CONDITIONS ESTIMATE

Quantity	LineNumber	Description	Crew	Daily Output	Labor Hours	Unit	Mat. O&P	Labor O&P	Equip. O&P	Total O&P	Ext. Mat. O&P	Ext. Labor O&P	Ext. Equip. O&P	Ext. Total O&P	Data Release	Category Total
Personnel								-								\$ 734,850.00
28	013113200140	Field personnel, MEP Project Manager				Week	\$ -	\$ 2,275.00	\$ -	\$ 2,275.00	\$ -	\$ 63,700.00	\$ -	\$ 63,700.00	Year 2012	
18	013113200180	Field personnel, Safety Manager				Week	\$ -	\$ 2,850.00	\$ -	\$ 2,850.00	\$ -	\$ 51,300.00	\$ -	\$ 51,300.00	Year 2012	
84	013113200200	Field personnel, Project Manager				Week	\$ -	\$ 3,275.00	\$ -	\$ 3,275.00	\$ -	\$ 275,100.00	\$ -	\$ 275,100.00	Year 2012	
35	013113200220	Field personnel, Senior Project Manager				Week	\$ -	\$ 3,750.00	\$ -	\$ 3,750.00	\$ -	\$ 131,250.00	\$ -	\$ 131,250.00	Year 2012	
70	013113200260	Field personnel, Superintendent, average				Week	\$ -	\$ 3,050.00	\$	\$ 3,050.00	\$ -	\$ 213,500.00	\$ -	\$ 213,500.00	Year 2012	
Temporary Utilities		•		•	·											\$ 97,323.85
780	015113800100	Temporary Heat, per week, 12 hours per day, incl. fuel a	1 Skwk	100	0.08	CSF Flr	\$ 38.24	\$ 6.36	\$ -	\$ 44.60	\$ 29,827.20	\$ 4,960.80	\$	\$ 34,788.00	Year 2012	
		Temporary Power, lighting, incl. service lamps, wiring														
780	015113800350	and outlets, min	1 Elec	34	0.235	CSF Flr	\$ 2.94	\$ 20.60	\$ -	\$ 23.54	\$ 2,293.20	\$ 16,068.00	\$ -	\$ 18,361.20	Year 2012	
780	015113800430	Temporary Power, for temp lighting only, 11.8 KWH/mo	۹			CSF Flr	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$ 1.88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,466.40	Year 2012	
780	015113800600	Temporary Utilities, power for job duration, incl.				CSE Elr	¢	¢	¢	¢ 52.20	¢	¢	¢	¢ 41.574.00	Vear 2012	
13	0.152012	3 Portable Chemical Toilets				Fa	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 87.25	\$ 35.30 \$ 87.25	\$ -	\$	\$ 1134.25	\$ 1134.25	Year 2012	
Site Office and Equipment	0.192012			<u> </u>		Lu.	Ψ	Ψ	ψ 01.25	φ 0(1.25	Ψ	Ψ	ψ 1,131.25	φ 1,151.25	1 cui 2012	\$ 9 372 96
one onnee and Equipment																φ 5,5(2.50
1	015213200550	Office Trailer, furnished, rent per month, 50' x 12', excl.				Ea.	\$ 382.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 382.40	\$ 382.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 382.40	Year 2012	
13	015213201250	Storage Boxes, rent per month, 20' x 8'				Ea.	\$ 75.52	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75.52	\$ 981.76	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 981.76	Year 2012	
15	015213400100	Field Office Expense, office equipment rental, average				Month	\$ 210.32	\$	\$	\$ 210.32	\$ 3154.80	\$	\$	\$ 3154.80	Year 2012	
15	015012400100	Field Office Expense, office supplies, average				Manth	¢ <u>210.32</u>	¢	¢	¢ 210.52	¢ 1102.05	¢	¢	¢ <u>,191,05</u>	V2012	
	013213400120					Month	\$ (8.8)	۶ -	\$ -	\$ (8.8)	\$ 1,183.05	> -	\$ -	\$ 1,183.05	rear 2012	
15	015213400140	Field Office Expense, telephone bill; avg. bill/month, in	L			Month	\$ 85.08	\$ -	\$	\$ 85.08	\$ 1,276.20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,276.20	Year 2012	
15	015213400160	Field Office Expense, field office lights & HVAC				Month	\$ 159.65	\$	\$	\$ 159.65	\$ 2,394.75	\$ -	\$	\$ 2,394.75	Year 2012	
Miscellaneous Costs			-	-												\$ 44,927.24
1500	015626500250	Temporary Fencing, chain link, rented up to 12 months	2 Clab	300	0.053	L.F.	\$ 3.46	\$ 3.27	\$ -	\$ 6.73	\$ 5,190.00	\$ 4,905.00	\$ -	\$ 10,095.00	Year 2012	
2000	0.15501	Temporary Road				S Y	\$ 0.36	\$ 1.19	\$ 0.36	\$ 1.90	\$ 720.00	\$ 2,370.00	\$ 710.00	\$ 3,800.00	Year 2012	
200	015813500020	Project signs, sign, high intensity reflectorized, buy, exc	q			S.F.	\$ 35.85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35.85	\$ 7,170.00	\$	\$	\$ 7,170.00	Year 2012	
		Cleaning up, cleanup of floor area, continuous, per														
78	017413200050	day, during construction	A5	24	0.75	M.S.F.	\$ 1.85	\$ 45.97	\$ 2.75	\$ 50.57	\$ 144.30	\$ 3,585.66	\$ 214.50	\$ 3,944.46	Year 2012	
78	017413200100	Cleaning up, cleanup of floor area, final by GC at end of	A5	11.5	1.565	M.S.F.	\$ 2.93	\$ 95.34	\$ 5.74	\$ 104.01	\$ 228.54	\$ 7,436.52	\$ 447.72	\$ 8,112.78	Year 2012	
4722000	0.151138001	Commissioning/Inspection				%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,805.00	Year 2012	
Insurance and Permitting																\$ 313,399.95
20567000	015113800100	Permits rule of thumb, most cities, minimum				% Job	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$ -	\$ 102,835.00	Year 2012	
20567000	015113800100	Performance Bond, for buildings, minimum				% Job	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 109,786.65	Year 2012	
20567000	015113800100	All-risk Insurance, minimum				% Job	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$	\$ 51,417.50	Year 2012	
20567000	015113800100	Builders Risk Insurance, standard, minimum				% Job	\$ -	\$	\$	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49,360.80	Year 2012	
Total											\$ 54,946.20	\$ 774,175.98	\$ 2,506.47	\$ 1,199,874.00		

| Appendix D-1 |

BIM USE EVALUATION WORKSHEET

BIM Use	Value to Project	Responsible Party	Value to Resp Party	C	apabil Rating	ity g	Additional Resources / Competencies Required to Implement	Notes	Proceed with Use
				5	Scale 1	-3			
				Resources	Competency	Experience			
Maintenance Scheduling	Low	DeSales University, Owner	Low	1	1	1	Requires training and software		NO
							No existing infrastructure		
Building Systems Analysis	Med	H.T. Lyons, Mechanical	High	3	3	2	Requires training and software		YES
		Amthor Steel, Structural	Low	2	1	1			
		Diefenderfer, Electrical	Low	1	1	1			
Record Modeling	Low	BRF Architects	Low	2	2	2		As the campus grows owner may	NO
	Low	DeSales, Owner	Med	1	1	1		want to utilize record models for	
				-	-	-		facility management in the future	-
			•						
Cost Estimation	Med	H.T. Lyons, Mechanical	High	3	3	2			YES
3D Coordination	High	Butz, Construction Manager	High	1	2	1	Requires training and software	No specific BIM requirements on	YES
		H.T. Lyons, Mechanical	High	3	3	2		project	
T	TTC 1							I	
Engineering Analysis	Hıgh	BRF Architects	Med	2	2	2	May require additional training		YES
		H. I. Lyons, Mechanical	High	3	5	2			_
						ļ			
Design Reviews	High	BRF Architects	High	2	2	2			YES
3D Coordination (Design)	Med	BRF Architects	High	2	2	2			YES
			+						-
				1	1	1			
Design Authoring	Med	BRF Architects	High	2	2	2			YES
									_
		L							

| Appendix D-2 |

BUILDING INFORMATION MODELING

LEVEL 1 PROCESS MAP

