

Attending:

Dr. Michael Panza
Ryan Snodgrass
Janet Burkardt
Debbie Pozycki
Alan Caponi
Gregory O'Hare
Tom Risley
Keith Pancoast
John Hosmer
Kelly Magill
Kristine Retetagos
Betsy Kane
Stefanie Bako
Tom Gorski
Kieran Wilmes
Steve Parker
Greg Smith
Jeff Krill

Representing:

West Jefferson Hills School District (WJHSD)
West Jefferson Hills School District
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee (WJHCC)
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
Turner Construction Company (TCCo)
Turner Construction Company
Tower Engineering
Tower Engineering
Grimm+Parker Architects (G+P)
Grimm+Parker
WTW Architects
WTW Architects

Email:

mpanza@wjhsd.net
rsnodgrass@wjhsd.net
jburkardt@wbklegal.com
dpozycki@bc.pitt.edu
acaponi@aol.com
ohareg@hotmail.com
trisley001@gmail.com
kpancoast53@comcast.net
jhosmer218@comcast.net
ksmagill@verizon.net
kretetagos@tcco.com
bkane@tcco.com
sbako@estower.com
tgorski@estower.com
kwilmes@gparch.com
sparker@gparch.com
gsmith@wtwarch.com
jkrill@wtwarch.com

Meeting Location: Thomas Jefferson High School – Choir Room

Meeting Purpose: Thomas Jefferson High School Value Engineering Review.

Items of Discussion:

1. D. Pozycki opened the meeting, welcomed all those attending, and asked for any public comment on the agenda. There were no comments on the agenda.
2. G. Smith reviewed the PlanCon Part D information and presented potential scenarios to align the Aggregate Building Expenditure Standard (ABES) with the current estimate. These scenarios involved additional capacity, future adjustments to the PDE per-pupil cost, and internal adjustments to design and estimating contingency.
 - a. T. Risley asked Turner representatives to comment on an adjustment to the design and estimating contingency. K. Retetagos replied that a reduction to 4% would work with the caveat that the design team be in close contact to the estimating team where changes are made or items are unclear.
 - b. D. Pozycki asked if all current VE adjustments are reflected in the scenario spreadsheets. G. Smith noted that all adjustments including the deletion of the fire pump are included.
 - c. G. O'Hare asked if PDE would need to review these changes. J. Krill replied PDE would see these changes during their Part G (bid result) review. The ABES can change, but the Board-adopted figure plus 8% must be maintained.
 - d. G. O'Hare asked whether the estimate included the current \$4.6M in value engineering reductions, or a previous \$4.3M figure. K. Retetagos replied that \$4.6M was included.
3. D. Pozycki opened the discussion of the value engineering items for the building – site items would be addressed later in the meeting. The committee's review would only focus items with which members had questions and/or concerns.
 - a. G. O'Hare noted that making the rooftop screens an alternate(s) was a good idea.
 - b. D. Pozycki asked why the screen on the athletic wing was not removed. K. Wilmes replied that the visual exposure to this rooftop equipment was much more prominent during the approach to the building.
 - c. D. Pozycki asked what the entries would look like. K. Wilmes described the materials and finishes in the main, arts, and athletic lobbies: VCT floors, ground face block wainscot, painted CMU walls, acoustic tile

- ceiling – this ceiling may be eliminated. Alternates are proposed for polished concrete floors and terrazzo floors. B. Kane encouraged the committee to look at examples of polished concrete floors before committing to this option.
- d. D. Pozycki thought the painted CMU looked too institutional for the public areas and asked if the ground face block could be taken higher and drywall used above. The ground face block has very low maintenance. K. Retetagos will look at the costs of revised material based on recommendations from the design team. K. Wilmes noted the main lobby features a lot of glass, therefore changes to other materials would be minimal.
 - e. D. Pozycki asked why items A54 (lower tech ed roof) and A55a (lower choral roof to 16') were not accepted. B. Kane explained the tech ed roof helps to screen the rooftop equipment. K. Wilmes replied that lowering the interior clear space of the choral area below 16' greatly impacts the acoustical quality of the room.
 - f. T. Riskey questioned why the reduced floor to floor height (A38) was not accepted. K. Wilmes and T. Gorski replied that many ceilings will need to be lowered, especially at critical locations; also, there would be no tolerance for construction conflicts which result in change orders.
 - g. G. O'Hare asked about the parapet height, noting an EPDM roof shouldn't require more than a cant and a coping. K. Wilmes replied it is currently between 2'-4" and 2'-8" as needed for construction assembly incorporating flashings, overflow scuppers, etc. However, as the wall sections are developed the design team will look to minimize the parapet height where possible.
 - h. T. Riskey asked what Construction Committee input is needed to make a decision on the clerestory openings at the top of the central drum. M. Panza remarked this feature brings in lots of light and is attractive, but thought additional discussion was needed at the Committee level. When asked about creating an alternate for this space, K. Wilmes stated it would be difficult because of the complexity of the construction. A. Caponi pointed out this space was always considered to have a 'wow factor'; this would be lost if the clerestory was removed. All agreed to keep the clerestory feature and reject the VE item.
 - i. K. Magill asked about the impact on the HVAC system if the operable windows are eliminated. T. Gorski replied that removing the variable of window openings will be better for controlling the environment and result in energy savings. The outdoor air ventilation realized by opening windows is not factored into the HVAC calculations.
 - j. J. Hosmer asked about the conversion of the glass greenhouse to brick and mortar construction (A16) and whether any PDE reimbursement capacity will be lost. J. Krill replied this space's designation as a classroom will not be changed. R. Snodgrass noted it will be a general purpose biology teaching space; in the future, a free-standing greenhouse could be located elsewhere on the grounds as desired.
 - k. T. Riskey asked the administration to review the pool construction options with the swim coach. M. Panza noted that the VE item for a reduction to the pool deck was accepted. K. Wilmes noted there was still sufficient space to circulate at the end of the pool.
 - l. D. Pozycki initiated discussion about seat sizes in the gym and auditorium.
 - m. D. Pozycki asked for a description of the revised locker room changes on both main and lower levels (A61 & A62). K. Wilmes provided the description, noting the removal of a 5' slice and the projection near the wrestling room. M. Panza stated he had reviewed the changes to the locker room layouts with the Athletic Director and received approval.
 - n. D. Pozycki asked if the west stair (A7) was removed; B. Kane said it was not removed.
 - o. D. Pozycki requested an explanation of proposed corridor base change (A28). K. Wilmes described the base in the instructional corridors as ground face block below the lockers noting the low maintenance benefit over other materials. A. Caponi asked for the height of the ground face wainscot in the main lobbies. K. Wilmes replied 3'-4" to align with the exterior band of block.
 - p. G. O'Hare questioned where terrazzo floors were considered and whether they should be an alternate. M. Panza pointed out terrazzo would be in the 'H' portion of the central building. All decided an alternate was acceptable.
 - q. M. Panza stated that he had reviewed a revised corridor locker allocation with the Principal and received approval.

WTW Project No. 71-4012

- r. T. Risley asked for clarification of the purpose for the glass railing at the pool seating. K. Wilmes referred to the importance of the sightlines which outweighed the additional cost.
 - s. G. O'Hare asked if the fire chief reviewed the flow test reports and if the flow/pressure in the line is sufficient for fire-fighting purposes – specifically whether the water supply will be able to keep up with the equipment. J. Krill referenced a meeting with the fire chief where that issue was discussed. The fire chief was satisfied with the flow tests and did not have a need for a fire pump. The reports will be made available through ShareFile.
 - t. D. Pozycki asked if CO2 sensors are needed to meet building code requirements. T. Gorski responded the sensors are not required but provide energy savings.
 - u. G. O'Hare suggested if plastic roof drains are used (P11) then they need to be locked down.
 - v. D. Pozycki questioned the level of reduction realized in the LGI room if many items which she thought had been eliminated are still in the space; was \$303K in savings fully realized? K. Retetagos replied that not all the savings was realized due to things which were added and changed. K. Wilmes responded that the few items which remain maintain a small degree of flexibility. S. Bako noted there will be lighting panels and a minimal number of light fixtures and the District could purchase additional fixtures as needed. M. Panza pointed out that the grid and catwalk were eliminated and the operable partition was revised.
 - w. K. Pancoast asked for a description of the control booth levels and whether there was ADA access. K. Wilmes detailed how the booth is primarily accessed from the corridor and up a small flight of steps; additionally, a wheelchair lift at the southwest corner of the auditorium provides access to the booth from the rear of the auditorium.
 - x. T. Risley reminded all to factor operating costs when considering the LED lighting alternate(s). G. O'Hare suggested E4 (corridor LED) should be an alternate separate from E3 (classroom LED).
 - y. D. Pozycki confirmed the design team was comfortable with the revised number of electrical receptacles (E5) remaining in the project.
 - z. T. Risley noted the generator may be re-sized with the elimination of the fire pump. He also asked if the generator will be able to handle the requirements of a Disaster Relief Center. M. Panza will research the District's agreement with Allegheny County to determine the requirements.
 - aa. D. Pozycki suggested that E8 (cable tray) could be an alternate. S. Bako and R. Snodgrass described the data distribution system as a nodal type which will not require extended lengths of cable.
 - bb. G. O'Hare mentioned a potential deformation issue with aluminum buss bars (E12); he suggested this VE item be rejected. All agreed.
4. D. Pozycki opened discussion of the Site Value Engineering items.
 - a. D. Pozycki asked whether the Tennis court lighting (C4) could be made an alternate. K. Retetagos noted that the conduit to the tennis court area is in the project. All agreed to create an estimate for the court lighting system.
 - b. G. O'Hare also suggested making an alternate for the Athletic field lighting (C9r1) including extending conduit as needed. T. Risley noted the fields should be titled 'Athletic Fields' rather than fields for specific sports such as 'Soccer Field'. Post Meeting Note: L. Payne confirmed during previous Conditional Use presentations to the Borough of Jefferson Hills (BoJH), the District stated that only the tennis courts might receive lighting as part of the Project. WTW does not recommend adding additional Alternates that contradict previous statements made during BoJH presentations.
 - c. D. Pozycki asked whether a separate contingency fund can be used for site work. B. Kane responded that PDE treats site work and building work differently and do not count site work contingency towards reimbursable calculations.
 5. G. Smith displayed the working list of alternates.
 - a. K. Retetagos suggested Alternate 3 be split into 3A and 3B.
 - b. Referencing Alternate 6 (card readers at classroom doors), T. Risley suggested that a security consultant be utilized for this project. R. Snodgrass updated the Committee on discussions the administration has had with a security consultant, including exterior door monitoring devices and cameras. T. Risley asked

WTW Project No. 71-4012

- about how the system would be monitored; how does the security officer fit in; how does the building coordinate with a security plan. G. O'Hare suggested reviewing a security plan with the police department. T. Risley asked the administration to follow-through and report back.
- c. T. Risley noted that a few items on the VE matrix were listed as potential Add Alternates e.g. Softball field, they did not show up on the Alternate list; this needs to be reconciled.
6. M. Panza asked the committee for input on the decision to use electric hand dryers or paper towel dispensers. After discussion, it was decided to use paper towel dispensers for all toilet rooms.
 7. M. Panza described the proposed Site Stabilization bid package as a single contractor which will oversee all portions of the project including clearing and grubbing, road development, deep dynamic compaction, and mine grouting. All portions require use of heavy equipment.
 8. D. Pozycki expressed concern over scope creep. S. Parker stated the best method to avoid scope creep is to continually meet and discuss the project; which is what the design team intends to do.
 9. B. Kane reviewed the total project costs. G. O'Hare requested a matrix showing the budgets and estimates for three levels of the project: PDE Building cost; PDE Project cost; Overall Project cost.
 10. T. Risley initiated discussion about tablet seats in auditorium, recalling approx. 300 tablet seats were planned for the front of the auditorium at a previous meeting. K. Retetagos noted that tablet seating has not been factored into the estimate. M. Panza remarked that, during discussion with the principal, tablet seats were not deemed necessary for the intended uses of the space.

Action Items:

1. West Jefferson Hills School District:
 - a. Review agreement with Allegheny County for Disaster Relief Center specifications. Status: Ongoing
 - b. Confirm direction for Open Lunch Concept; if yes, some SF currently assigned to the Dining Room may be reallocated to student areas. Due: 11/13/14, Status: Assumed rejected, but not confirmed to date
 - c. Review and comment on Educational Specifications document. Due: 12/9/14, Status: No comments received to date.
 - d. WBK shall prepare pros/cons for OCIP and PLA and provide to WJHSD Administration for dissemination to WJHCC and Board. Due: TBD, Status: Ongoing
 - e. C. Sefcheck to develop plan for migration/ordering new furniture. Due: TBD, Status: Pending
 - f. Review VE Site Plan for approved strategies. Due: 6/18/15, Status: No comments received to date.
2. Design Team:
 - a. WTW:
 - 1) Develop and maintain list of Alternates. Status: Ongoing
 - 2) Generate list of reports and expected major submissions. Due: 3/17/15, Status: Schedule updates are ongoing
 - 3) Update the schedule of design meetings through Construction Documents. Due: TDB, Status: Ongoing.
 - b. G+P:
 - 1) Continue to refine DD exteriors. Status: Ongoing
3. Construction Management Team:
 - a. Turner:
 - 1) Revise list of Value Engineering items. Status: Anticipated Distribution is week of August 3rd.
 - 2) Generate Comparison of Act 34 Figures. Status: Attached.

Next Meeting:

1. Construction Committee Meeting – August 20, 2015, Time 5:30, Location: TJ High School – Choir Room
2. Required/Specialized Attendance:

WTW Project No. 71-4012

- a. WJHSD
 - b. Design Team: WTW, G+P & Design Team (as required)
3. Proposed Major Agenda Items:
- a. Update on approved VE strategies and building envelope / interior finishes review.

Any authorized persons who take exception to any statement in this report shall notify the Preparer, in writing, within three (3) days from the date of receipt of this report, stating in detail the correction or omission. Otherwise this report shall be considered correct and final.

Prepared by:

WTW ARCHITECTS
Jeff Krill, RA
Project Architect
July 16, 2015

Distribution:

Name:

Attendees

Ira Weiss
Tracy Harris
Keith Hartbauer
Chris Sefcheck
Bonnie Dyer
~~James McGraw~~

John Rambo
Aaron Donahue
Bob Goetz
Mike Miller
Jim Pospisil
Paul Whealdon
David Brooks
Megan Sweringen
Ken Kistler
Ted Wallover
Susan Wallover
Lisa Whitmeyer
Javaid Alvi
Pervaiz Alvi
Tom Stasny
Heather Krepisik
Greg Vizza
David Nash
Anthony Lucarelli
Laura Meador
Billy Arias
Rich DeYoung
Larry Payne

Representing:

West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee (WJHCC)
West Jefferson Hills School District
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills Construction Committee
West Jefferson Hills School District
~~West Jefferson Hills School District (Weiss, Burkhardt, Kramer, LLC)~~
Mertz Culinary Management (MCM)
Turner Construction Company (TCCo)
Trans Associates (TA)
Barber & Hoffman, Inc. (B&H)
Barber & Hoffman, Inc.
Fahringer, McCarty, Grey, Inc. (FMG)
Fahringer, McCarty, Grey, Inc.
Fahringer, McCarty, Grey, Inc.
McFarland Kistler & Associates (MKA)
Wallover Architects, Inc. (WAI)
Wallover Architects, Inc.
Wallover Architects, Inc.
Geo-Mechanics, Inc. (GMI)
Geo-Mechanics, Inc.
Langan Engineering & Environmental Services (LEE)
Langan Engineering & Environmental Services
VizzAcoustics (VA)
StoweNash Associates, LLC (SNA)
Grimm+Parker (G+P)
Grimm+Parker
Grimm+Parker
WTW Architects (WTW)
WTW Architects

Email:

iweiss@wbklegal.com
tharris@wjhsd.net
khartbauer@wjhsd.net
csefcheck@wjhsd.net
bdyer@wjhsd.net
jmcgraw@wbklegal.com

jrambo@wjhsd.net
adonahue@tcco.com
goetz@transassociates.com
mmiller@barberhoffman.com
jpospisil@barberhoffman.com
pwhealdon@fmginc.us
dbrooks@fmginc.us
msweringen@fmginc.us
kkistler-mka@comcast.net
ewallover@walloverarchitects.com
swallover@walloverarchitects.com
lwhitmeyer@walloverarchitects.com
jalvi@geo-mechanics.com
palvi@geo-mechanics.com
tstasny@langan.com
hkrepisik@langan.com
greggvizza@vizzacoustics.com
david@stowenash.com
alucarelli@gparch.com
lmeador@gparch.com
barias@gparch.com
rdeyoung@wtwarch.com
lpayne@wtwarch.com

Thomas Jefferson High School
West Jefferson Hills School District

WTW Project No. 71-4012

WJHSD CC CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS MEETING 02

July 14, 2015

Revised July 22, 2015

Page 6 of 6

Attachments:

1. ~~None~~ Comparison of Act 34 Figures.

f:\proj\4012 wjhhs\3_mtg\reports & presentations\2015-07-14 wjhcc dd ve review\4012_2015-07-14 wjhsd cc cd mtg 02 r1.doc

PROJECT ACCOUNTING BASED ON ESTIMATES (1 of 2)

District/CTC: West Jefferson Hills School District	Project Name: Thomas Jefferson High School	Project #: P1587
---	---	---------------------

ROUND FIGURES TO NEAREST DOLLAR

PROJECT COSTS	NEW		TOTAL
A. STRUCTURE COSTS (include site development)	BUILDING	SITE COSTS	
1. General (Report costs for sanitary sewage disposal on line E-1.)	38,789,409	11,780,215	50,569,624
2. Heating and Ventilating	10,182,828		10,182,828
3. Plumbing (Report costs for sanitary sewage disposal on line E-1.)	4,246,784	249,907	4,496,691
4. Electrical	8,678,881	1,590,449	10,269,331
A-1 to A-7 - Subtotal	61,897,901	13,620,572	75,518,473
8. Construction Insurance			
a. Owner Controlled Insurance Program on Structure COSTS (Exclude asbestos abatement, building purchase and other structure costs not covered by the program)	1,027,505	226,101	1,253,607
b. Builder's Risk Insurance (if not included in primes)	123,796		123,796
c. Construction Insurance - Total	1,151,301	226,101	1,377,402
9. TOTAL-Structure Costs (A-1 to A-7-Subtotal plus A-8-c)	63,049,202	13,846,673	76,895,876
B. ARCHITECT'S FEE			
1. Architect's/Engineer's Fee on Structure	3,549,730	777,735	4,327,465
D. STRUCTURE COSTS, ARCHITECT'S FEE, MOVABLE FIXTURES & EQUIPMENT - TOTAL (A-9 plus B-3 and C-3)	66,598,933	14,624,408	81,223,340
E. SITE COSTS			
1. Sanitary Sewage Disposal	275,459		275,459
2. Sanitary Sewage Disposal Tap-In Fee and/or Capacity Charges	25,157		25,157
3. Owner Controlled Insurance Program/Builder's Risk Insurance on Sanitary Sewage Disposal	4,617		4,617
4. Architect's/Engineer's Fee for Sanitary Sewage Disposal	15,880		15,880
5. Site Acquisition Costs		X X X X X X	
a. Gross Amount Due from Settlement Statement or Estimated Just Compensation	1,091,740	X X X X X X	1,091,740
c. Other Related Site Acquisition Costs	9,000	X X X X X X	9,000
d. Site Acquisition Costs - Total	1,100,740	X X X X X X	1,100,740
6. TOTAL - Site Costs	1,421,853		1,421,853
F. STRUCTURE COSTS, ARCHITECT'S FEE, MOVABLE FIXTURES & EQUIPMENT, AND SITE COSTS - TOTAL (D plus E-6)	68,020,786	14,624,408	82,645,193
G. ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION-RELATED COSTS			
2. Construction Manager Fee and Related Costs			1,875,000
2.a Geo-Tech Services, Phase 1			201,238
4. Architectural Printing and Reimbursable Expense			110,000
5. Test Borings			15,000
6. Site Survey			40,000
7. Other (attach schedule if needed)			
a. Environmental Testing, Steel/Concrete Testing & Commissioning			740,494
b. PlanCon-D-Add't Costs, Total			744,235
8. Contingency, 4%			3,031,757
8.a Architect's Fee on Contingency			173,113
9. TOTAL - Additional Construction-Related Costs			6,930,838
H. FINANCING COSTS			1,415,158
I. TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (F plus G-9 plus H-10)			90,991,189

		Current Estimate	Delta*
Act 34 Maximum Building Construction Cost adopted by Board	67,227,965	66,598,933	(629,032)
Total Project Revenue Sources per Act 34 Hearing (bonds plus cash)	91,346,293	90,991,189	(355,104)
FFE and Technology Budget		9,500,000	
Soft Cost Contingency		50,000	
Board approved Total Project Budget	101,712,307	100,541,189	(1,171,118)

*negative value = under target

- Notes:
- Form numbers are not sequential as cells with no value are hidden.
 - 2% Escalation is included in construction costs.
 - Design & Estimating Contingency is 4%.
 - Construction Contingency is 4%.
 - Agreed upon VE items and Fire Pump savings are included. Food Services increase of \$130,000 is included.
 - OCIP is based on Marsh 'expected loss estimate rate' of .0166. For Willis rate (.0214), add ~ \$ 361,000.
 - Increases for the 2015-2016 Building Expenditure Standard have not been issued and are not included.
 - Additional revenue for 'science student project rooms' was not added to Aggregate Building Expenditure Standard.