Estimate Summary - Schematic to March DD-1 7/12/2012



		Schematic Design			March 26, 2012 DD-1	
			Reconciled		Source of variation / cost drivers	
		DG Jones	DG Jones	Turner		
Α	Substructure	\$3,291,568	\$3,910,650	\$4,338,561	Substructure	
A10	Foundations	\$3,291,568	\$3,910,650	\$4,338,561	1 Building square footage increased.	
					2 Building classified as emergency shelter.	
					3 Increased unit prices.	
В	Shell	\$15,634,045	\$21,696,857	\$22,377,617	Shell	
B10	Super Structure	\$7,781,198	\$8,487,989	\$8,991,815	1 Building square footage increased.	
B20	Exterior Enclosure	\$5,313,864	\$9,490,475	\$9,743,219	2 Increased amount of transfer beams.	
B30	Roofing	\$2,538,983	\$3,718,393	\$3,642,583	3 Building classified as emergency shelter.	
					4 More complicated structure than schematic.	
					Structural framing at every floor opening (skylights, light wells,	
					tunnels, etc) proved out to be expensive.	
					6 increased amounts of exterior glass and sun shading.	
					7	
					Increased exterior detailing with too many different materials.	
					Increased amounts of skylights which resulted in rippling affects	
					8 with general roofing costs beyond the actual cost of the skylight units.	
					Increased exterior projections from schematic which resulted in	
					increased exterior surface area.	
					10 Less use of masonry veneer.	
					11 Third floor terraces were added.	
					12 Various schematic accepted VE items were not incorporated.	
					13 Cost of the penthouse shell proved to be costly.	
					14 Mechanical roof screening added.	
					15 Trellis added	
					16 Insulation shown on exterior walls, not required.	
					17 Various schematic accepted VE items didn't materialize.	
C	Interiors	\$11,443,210	\$13,379,344	\$13,390,503	Interiors	
C10	Interior Construction	\$5,023,794	\$6,496,852	\$6,492,255	1 Building square footage increased.	
C20	Stairs	\$439,010	\$511,758	\$402,160	2 Increased amounts of interior glass.	
C30	Interior Finishes	\$5,980,406	\$6,370,734	\$6,496,088	Partition wall type construction became complicated and costly	
		, , , , , , , ,	, -,,	, -,,	4 Stairs were not switchback as accepted in schematic VE.	
					General flooring finishes not followed per accepted schematic V	
					5	
					6 Increased amounts of fire rated glass at stairs.	
					7 Increased amount of wood door frames	
					8 SS toilet partitions added	
					Locker material changed to phenolic from metal	
					10 Various schematic accepted VE items didn't materialize.	

June 29, 2012	DD-2
Reconciled	
DG Jones	Turner
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
Şΰ	ŞÜ
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
·	
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
<del>, 5</del> 0	<b>3</b> 0
ćo	40
\$0	\$0

## **Concord-Carlisle High School**

Estimate Summary - Schematic to March DD-1 7/12/2012



		Schematic Design			March 26, 2012 DD-1	June 29, 2012 DD-2	
			Reconciled		Source of variation / cost drivers	Reconciled	
		DG Jones	DG Jones	Turner		DG Jones	Turner
D	Services	\$17,286,582	\$22,419,282	\$23,832,386	Services	\$0	\$0
D10	Conveying	\$321,676	\$407,450	\$383,602	1 Building square footage increase.	\$0	\$0
D20	Plumbing	\$2,358,714	\$2,813,746	\$2,720,709	Mechanical equipment specified was extremely expensive.	\$0	\$0
					Mechanical systems and controls had many overlaps. Multiple		
D30	HVAC	\$8,803,017	\$11,348,208	\$12,560,428	systems doing the same service, monitoring or control.	\$0	\$0
D40	Fire Protection	\$958,146	\$1,020,555	\$1,002,662	4 Aircuity system control proved out to be expensive.	\$0	\$0
D50	Electrical	\$4,845,029	\$6,829,323	\$7,164,985	Mechanical systems not grouped or combined proved out to be expensive.	\$0	\$0
					6 Non stacking of systems; elect, plumbing and mechanical.		
					7 Increased amounts of LED lighting specified.		
					Expensive lighting controls specified. Design team thought energy efficient lighting control system would be cost neutral.  Scope of security system increased.		
E	Equip + Furnishings	\$2,782,879	\$4,263,201	\$4,688,814	Equip + Furnishings	\$0	\$0
E10	Equipment	\$1,391,400	\$2,131,841	\$2,409,479	1 Additional fume hoods were added.	\$0	\$0
E20	Furnishings	\$1,391,478	\$2,131,360	\$2,279,335	2 Electric hand dryers added.	\$0	\$0
220		ψ2,331,173	ψ <b>2</b> )131)300	Ψ2,273,333	3 Kitchen equipment budget increased.	Ψū	ų v
					4 Stage equipment increased.		
					5 A/V equipment added.		
					6 Casework equipment or unit rates increased.		
					7 Fixed audience seating or unit rates increased.		
					8 Targeted VE savings didn't materialize.		
F	Special / Demo	\$0	\$3,048,113	\$3,004,795	Special / Demo	\$0	\$0
F10	Special Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	1 Neutral	\$0	\$0
F20	Selective Building Demo	\$0	\$0	\$3,004,795		\$0	\$0
F20	Existing Building Demolition	\$0	\$1,546,863	\$0		\$0	\$0
F20	Asbestos Removal	\$0	\$1,501,250	\$0		\$0	\$0
			¥ =/===/===	*-		7.5	
G	Sitework	\$5,816,316	\$9,532,935	\$9,899,604	Sitework	\$0	\$0
G10	Site Preparation	\$1,984,940	\$2,461,780	\$2,124,881	1 Increased amount of hardscaping sf and material type	\$0	\$0
G20	Site Improvements	\$1,838,084	\$4,069,501	\$4,342,612	2 Irrigation scope increased.	\$0	\$0
					Schematic site prep cost in the schematic may have been understated? At the schematic estimate the delta between KVA and DC Lyce (14x (text)) with CCOOk being in situated along.		
G30	Site Mechanical Utilities	\$1,330,734	\$2,428,566	\$2,764,460	DG J was \$1m (total), with \$500k being in sitework alone.	\$0	\$0
					Site utility scope increased. However, the project team and the		
					4 District did mitigate many costs by performing early infrastructure		
G40	Site Electrical Utilities	\$662,559	\$573,088	\$667,651	work under separate contracts.	\$0	\$0

Estimate Summary - Schematic to March DD-1 7/12/2012



	Schematic Design	
	DG Jones	
Other (Salvage & Re-Used Elements)	\$3,210,300	
Subtotal	\$59,464,900	
GR/GC + Insurance	\$5,410,428	
,		
Bond	\$595,818	
Design/Escalation	\$2,081,272	
Estimating contingency	\$4,728,670	
CM Contingency	\$1,445,622	
CM fee	\$1,264,919	
<b>Total Construction Cost</b>	\$74,991,629	

		March 26, 2012 DD-1		
Reconciled		Source of variation / cost drivers		
DG Jones	Turner			
		Increased parking count due to compliance with zoning requirements		
\$0	\$0			
\$78,250,382	\$81,532,280			
\$7,694,963	\$9,597,108			
\$582,750	\$0			
\$0	\$2,364,000			
\$2,163,202	\$0			
\$1,773,826	\$2,061,000			
\$1,312,500	\$1,312,500			
\$91,777,623	\$96,866,888	\$5.1m delta between TCC and DG Jones		
92	97			

June 29, 2012	DD-2
Reconciled	d
DG Jones	Turner
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
<b>30</b>	30
4.5	4
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
\$0	\$0
Ţ0	<u> </u>
\$0	\$0
TBD	TBD

\$94,322,256	Reconciled estimate based on splitting the difference
\$75,000,000	Construction budget (rounded)
\$19,322,256	VE
\$1,932,226	10% VE factor
\$21,254,481	VE to obtain post March DD-1 drawing set
-\$14,211,176	VE accepted as of 6-7-12 (based on TCC values)
-\$4,034,000	VE accepted post June 14th meeting with the MSBA.
\$77,364	Increase plug value for detached gym
\$3,086,669	Potential VE target value. Actual value TBD based on outcome of June DD-2 drawing set.

**75**