Agenda Items

Priestly Status:

- Targeting 3/1/2022 for Certificate of Occupancy (State and local inspections completed)
- Ceilings are in place
- Flooring is in place
- Security system wiring is in place
- IT wiring is in place
- Fire Alarm and Elevator call box monitoring is in place
- Scheduling smoke evacuation 3rd party system testing is being scheduled

Discussion Regarding Window Approvals by SHPO/NPS:

During the review of the window mockups the National Park Service indicated that they wanted a gap that is
part of the window construction to be caulked. This gap is visible in the window design drawings that NPS
accepted without comment. The window supplier & manufacturer indicated that any caulking applied to the
windows that is not part of the installation would void the warranty. The window installation subcontractor
recently priced the cost to caulk this gap at ~\$160,000.00. Subsequent priced proposals by others lowered this
cost to ~\$75,000.00. The task force recommends that the owner attempt to have NPS relax the caulking
requirement by submitting a revised part 3 amendment.

Changes:

Proposal Request	Title	Explanation	Cost
#			
	Cha	anges already executed by CEO for Board ratification	
58	Underground Footing removal on site	During site digging for drainage numerous old building foundations were encountered below ground that were previously unknown. Cost is for additional manhours, equipment and disposal of these foundations to allow for installation of site drainage.	\$54,426.00
59	Replacement of Front Door Frame	The A/E design called for a 6'8" door and frame at the front door. Contractor installed exactly per the door schedule assuming there was a fir down, brick in fill or window above. Door should have been 8'0. Contractor had partially installed the frame and had to remove the frame and procure a new door and frame and re-install it. Door panel won't be delivered for a couple of months due to supply issues. A temporary door will be used until the final leaf is delivered.	\$4,303.00
60	Curtain Wall Steel Framing	Structural steel design was not properly coordinated with curtain wall system. Additional steel was needed to support the curtain wall at the atrium.	\$12,072.00
61	Electrical Power for VAV Units	The A/E electrical and mechanical design did not properly coordinate the VAV electric re-heat elements in the new addition with the electrical power panel. The mistake was not picked up by the contractor or the A/E during the product data submittal process. The electric re-heat elements needed to be replaced with different units and additional 480v circuits were needed to power them. A/E believes this is a construction coordination issue, the task force believes this error began with the A/E who didn't	\$27,334.00

		properly coordinate the different disciplines and accepted the	
		product data submittal as meeting the design intent.	
62	Eye Wash / Shower	Owner requested an added chemical shower and eyewash in	\$2,471.00
02	Flooring Change	second laboratory classroom. Needed to change the flooring to	
		something waterproof.	
64	Low Voltage Conduit	Owner requested conduit for WAPs and plywood in IT closets.	\$3,483.00
	-	Proposal currently shows plywood as double counted.	
66	Tank Foundations per	The original construction documents did not include foundations	\$11,822.00
	ASI 007	for the Acid and Grease tanks. ASI 007 moved them to new	
		locations due to space constraints and added foundations needed	
		to hold them down. The relocation of the tanks was covered in	
		PR13. This PR is just for the added foundations.	
68	Credit for infiltration	Credit for steel supports and walk grates that span the infiltration	\$(40,000.00)
	trench grates	trench on the west side of the campus	
69	Infiltration wood deck	Wood and Trex decking to connect the sidewalks over the	\$12,186.00
		infiltration trench on the west side of the campus previously via	
		metal grates removed via PR 68.	
		Total	\$88,097.00
		Changes for FC / Board Approval	
71	GC Builders Risk	Typically the owner assumes insurance coverage at substantial	\$17,802.00
	Insurance Policy	completion. With the declaration of Substantial Completion in	
	Extension	December the school will assume insurance coverage on the	
		property on 3/1. The GC BR policy to expired 1/31/2022. This	
		change is to cover the premium for extension of GC builders risk	
		policy to 3/15/2022.	
		The LFNO general property insurance started on 1/31/2022 which	
		doesn't cover construction activities.	4
72	Gym HVAC	To avoid damage to trees adjacent to the gym the HVAC equipment	\$7,177.00
	Modifications	platform was modified to reduce the number of piles needed to	
		support it. This decreased the size of the platform putting the air	
		handlers closer together. This change happened after the units	
		were ordered. The air handlers needed to be modified in the field	
		to change the direction of the discharge air.	624 070 00
		Total New Changes	\$24,979.00
20	Dollo Window Cost	Request for Equitable Adjustment	600 812 00
39	Pella Window Cost Increase / Request for	Prior to the manufacturing of the replacement windows, the manufacturer, Pella, stated that the cost of materials had increased	\$90,812.00
	Increase / Request for	T Manufacturer. Pelia. Stated that the cost of materials had increased	
	Equitable Adjustment	to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time.	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time. Negotiations reduced the original PR value from ~\$130,000.00	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time.	
		to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time. Negotiations reduced the original PR value from ~\$130,000.00 which included extended general condition / time delay costs.	
		 to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time. Negotiations reduced the original PR value from ~\$130,000.00 which included extended general condition / time delay costs. The owner is not responsible for material price increases in a fixed 	
		 to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time. Negotiations reduced the original PR value from ~\$130,000.00 which included extended general condition / time delay costs. The owner is not responsible for material price increases in a fixed price contract but in this case the GC acted in good faith that a 	
		 to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time. Negotiations reduced the original PR value from ~\$130,000.00 which included extended general condition / time delay costs. The owner is not responsible for material price increases in a fixed price contract but in this case the GC acted in good faith that a settlement could be reached and did not file a claim pursuant to 	
		 to a point beyond their ability to mitigate. They refused to accept the order as originally quoted by the window subcontractor, Glass Man, and raised the price by ~\$90,000.00. The GC paid this cost increase directly thereby ensuring the windows would be manufactured in time. Negotiations reduced the original PR value from ~\$130,000.00 which included extended general condition / time delay costs. The owner is not responsible for material price increases in a fixed price contract but in this case the GC acted in good faith that a 	

Additionally, the GC went to extraordinary efforts to accelerate	
construction and achieved obtaining the Temporary Certificate of	
Occupancy (TCO) and Substantial Completion by 12/31/2021	
allowing LFNO to avoid the tax credit penalty.	
The task force does not agree with the narrative that the window	
order was delayed due to excessive duration of SHPO/NPS approval	
process. It is generally understood that SHPO/NPS historic	
renovation approvals are slow. In addition historic window	
replacement approvals require fully installed window mockups	
comprised of old and new windows. Side by side installations are	
needed to allow a direct comparison. The window mockup was not	
ready until the morning of the review with SHPO / NPS. In addition,	
the school took the extraordinary measure by directing the GC to	
place the window order prior to approval by SHPO / NPS thereby	
negating the impact of their lengthy approval process. The task	
force does not accept a correlation between the approval process	
time line and the window price increase.	
Approval of this change is tantamount to rewarding the GC for their	
efforts to assist with achieving the benefit of the full tax credit	
value without penalties and less to do with the risks associated	
with the window approval and ordering process.	