

CAMPBELL & COMPANY  
Notes on Pre-Bid Conference  
Health Sciences Unit B/C 0900  
Friday - 07 Nov 75

Kogl opened by noting the conference basically breaks into three parts 1) explanation of affirmative action programs 2) scheduling and 3) question and answer with HSAE.

Kogl introduced Bernie Baker, Equal Opportunity Coordinator at the University of Minnesota. He will be monitoring affirmative action programs of the contractors. Mr. Baker points out that the Regents, the state legislature, and Department of HEW of the Federal Government require affirmative action programs be submitted with the bid. This is covered in Article 17 of the General Conditions. The affirmative action goals should be realistic and a time-table should be included as part of the program. Mr. Baker points out that training programs need not be restricted to union apprenticeship programs only. Mr. Baker referenced Meda (Metropolitan Economic Development Association) which could furnish names of minority businesses and potential subcontractors. The EEO officer of the contractor should be in a position of responsibility and not a clerk. Mr. Baker's phone number is 373-7969. The University director of affirmative action, Lillian Williams, noted that compliance should not be "paper compliance" only. The University is aware of minority subcontractors who have performed. Any member of a minority who does have a job on the site must not regard it as a gift and must work the same as anyone else. Mr. Kogl points out that an affirmative action program can be effective without being expensive.

Mr. Kogl then went into part 2 of the conference, noting the CPM system was being used to manage the schedule. A full time consultant had been retained by the University. The University will provide the technical capability to produce CPM schedules. The input is by the contractors. A preliminary investigation has been undertaken and time-cost relationships analyzed. An outline schedule has been produced which will be crystallized with the successful contractors.

Mr. Campbell of Campbell & Company was introduced. Mr. Campbell noted that the pre-bid schedule is a schedule, one way to build the project and meet the parameters set by the University and user. The schedule has been developed with competent help on the part of the architect-engineers, University staff and competent contractors. Further, it is subject to criticism from all angles. There are some parts of the schedule that are "cast in bronze." The occupancy of 7th floor on 01 Jan 77, the occupancy of 11th and 12th on 01 Jul 77, the requirement that the animals be removed from Mayo Animal Quarters prior to demolition of Mayo. These are generally delineated in the specifications. The ECS contract is geared to the schedule as delineated in that the delivery is scheduled to coordinate with the erection sequence in this schedule. The schedule is developed with the parameter per Mr. Kogl that the 3rd floor will be finished last and will be a marshalling area. Mr. Kogl will manage the storage and removal of material on the 3rd level (grade level).

Mr. Campbell then outlined the stack sequence, the steel erection sequence, pre-cast will follow the structural steel and pouring of the decks for stability. Fireproofing

will follow two floors behind pre-cast. Mechanical and electrical will follow fire-proofing as quickly as possible followed by horizontal mechanical and as quickly as possible the finish work will start on 12th and work down. Thirteen and 14 are shell space. Ten and 15 are mechanical areas. The top-down sequence will start with ceilings which includes grid and branch circuit wiring followed by partitions and finish work. Finish will proceed 12 through 4, skip to the basement, then 1-2-3; 3 will be the last area completed. Mr. Campbell reiterated this is a basic plan which fits the University's parameters. The talent of the contractors will be utilized in honing the schedule and developing a good workable schedule. The contractors must work together. There will be "wrestling matches".

Copies of network diagrams and printouts were picked up by those desiring same. Those who desired copies and were not able to get them, will be mailed copies by 10 Nov 75.

The sequence and erection of steel on link "B" to Unit A was questioned. Mr. Campbell points out that this will be erected with Stacks 1 and 2 as the steel in that area goes up.

The sequence for the work on the plaza was questioned. The north half of the plaza will go as soon as possible, concurrently with the surfacing of Delaware in this area. The south half will have to follow demolition and reconstruction of the Mayo area. The opening of Delaware is a precedent to the closing of Union to maintain access to the Mayo court and the west of the building. Mr. Kogl points out that the bus from the parking ramp currently uses this area but this is not a critical consideration. The bid date of 25 Nov 75 and award date 09 Jan 76 were pointed out.

One of the mechanical contractors questioned the stage of construction at the time the chillers would arrive. These weigh 25 tons and have a five month lead time. It was pointed out that there would be access through the steel frame at that time.

The underpinning of Diehl and the balance of dirt from the ramp to the fill under-slab on grade in stacks 0 - 6 was pointed out. Mr. Campbell notes that it will be a "chore" to get the steel erection rigs out of the hole.

Mr. Moleski of Kraus-Anderson questioned what the statement that "the University will control the float" means. Mr. Campbell points out that it means exactly what it says; that Mr. Kogl will be the construction manager and expects to stay on the early side. Campbell acknowledges that this may be tough to administer but it was felt that it was a necessity so that one contractor could not use all of the float in a total float path. Mr. Kogl elaborated stating that the general contractor is the prime coordinator. There are separate primes. The general contractor does not have a direct relation to other primes. A team effort is necessary and that the construction management team hopes to establish that what is good for one is good for all, everybody gets out early and makes money. The control must be a joint effort.

The tunnel underpinning at the northwest corner of Diehl was questioned. Mr. Campbell notes that this is a problem but is currently planned to go with the work at Mayo and follow the underpinning of the north side on grid S47.

Mr. Walgenbach of Sheehy questioned the anticipated recourse regarding the control of the float. Mr. Kogl points out that this has not been determined as a hard and

fast rule and hopefully the necessity will not arise. Mr. Kogl went on to point out that orders may be checked by the University to determine if in fact they have been placed and are still not being negotiated after it has been claimed the material and/or equipment is on order.

At this point, Mr. Kogl introduced the personnel from HSAE that were present and moved into part 3 of the conference. Mr. Blanchard requested that questions be kept general and any technical questions be submitted in writing so that a written response could be formulated.

Mr. Jim O'Brien of Danny's Erection questioned electrical service for steel erection. This is covered in the specifications; 480 volt, 3 phase, 1200 amp will be furnished from a substation in Unit A by the electrical contractor. There is currently 200 amps of 120/240 volt. If more is needed prior to the electrical contractor completing the temporary service to the site, the contractor requiring same will have to provide it.

Natkin Mechanical Contractors questioned the allocation of storage on tracts 2 to 5 and of the office space. Mr. Kogl responded that tract 2 will be offices. This will be further defined as time goes on. There will be no long term storage on these tracts. There may be some long term storage on East River Road, the site formerly used for the K/E construction storage south of Powell. The allocation of storage space will probably be determined in a conference with all involved contractors. At the time the 3rd floor deck is available for storage, it will be short term, a few days at a time depending on the stage of construction and the congestion. Anything longer than a few days will be rehandled to 1st and 2nd floors for storage.

Hoffmann Electric questioned whether there will be guided tours at existing buildings. Mr. Dahlin responded that the public areas are open during normal hours and any other areas could be seen by setting up an appointment with Mr. Ollie Hughes, 376-5294. This is also covered in the specifications.

Haughton Elevator questioned the capacity of the temporary hoist facilities to be provided. Mr. Dahlin noted that this is up to the general contractor. Mr. Walgenbach of Sheehy noted that this was not very specific and questioned whether any hoist used by the general contractor including hoisting by the general contractor's subcontractors must be provided to mechanical and electrical contractors. Mr. Kogl states that the hoisting must be adequate for the job. Mr. Moleski of Kraus-Anderson notes that the hoisting of steel and precast is excluded. Questioned whether the general contractor could get by without providing any hoisting until the elevator was complete. There was a further discussion on use of hoist by general contractor's subcontractors for long material such as core wall, etc. It was pointed out that the general contract includes steel and precast erection and the tower crane is not a mobile crane.

Mr. Moleski of Kraus-Anderson questioned the specification regarding maintenance of the temporary elevator and why this should be by the general contractor when the general contractor will have to hire an elevator contractor to perform the maintenance work and at the time of bidding has no idea who the successful elevator contractor on the project will be; further pointing out that this is the most expensive way for the University. Mr. Blanchard requested comments by elevator contractors present. A representative from Westinghouse noted that it was his opinion the spec was written properly and that they would not know the timing involved in use of the elevator for hoisting and they would furnish the maintenance quotation to the general contractor.

The Westinghouse representative then questioned whether it was the intent to use permanent doors and frames. Mr. Dahlin points out that it was the intent to use permanent frames. The Westinghouse representative questioned whether construction pace would be such that the core board would be up and the doors could be protected. Mr. Dahlin promised that this would be taken under consideration. Mr. Moleski again questioned how the general contractor was to anticipate who the elevator contractor would be. Mr. Blanchard responded that it had been their consideration that either the general contractor or the elevator contractor "would be guessing" and they would prefer to have the general contractor guessing. Mr. Kogl stated that it was their feeling that the vertical transportation was an integral part of the scheduling which is the responsibility of the general contractor to coordinate. The Westinghouse representative pointed out further that temporary doors in addition to making the schedule easier to keep, would reduce the exposure to damage.

Mr. Klein of Kraus-Anderson noted that there are two bids due on 25 Nov 75, one on this project and one on the parking ramp at the downtown Minneapolis post office. Questioned whether a change would be considered. Mr. Blanchard stated that it would be if it was felt that it would be beneficial to all parties. The post office parking ramp bid period was postponed to 25 Nov 75. Mr. Walgenbach felt that there was sufficient time now to prepare the proposal. A representative from Nystrom Constructors noted that two bids on the same day with the number of alternates under consideration would work a hardship. Mr. Blanchard pointed out that any delay in the bid date would be a delay of a week due to the fact that 25 Nov is in Thanksgiving week and the bid would be delayed to 02 Dec. This would also tighten up the overall time frame to complete the project by the specified "immoveable" dates.

One of the mechanical contractors questioned whether the chiller specification was to be submitted with the bid. It was determined that this was not the case. This will be further clarified.

Mr. Weber of Reuben L. Anderson-Cherne questioned the control wiring in mechanical contract and the division of responsibility. The mechanical and electrical engineers stated that it was their determination that this is similar to temperature control and that it was their intent to assign single responsibility for this work. It was pointed out that the mechanical contractor could use an electrical subcontractor other than the project's electrical prime contractor. Mr. Weber questioned the lack of drawings and wiring diagrams. Mr. Wilcox explained that this was an outline spec by function and it was up to the mechanical contractor to design a functional system.

Mr. Klein of Kraus-Anderson referred to the earthwork specification and the mechanical and electrical excavation and backfill and the requirement for the general contractor to examine the work as it proceeds. Questioned how close this inspection should be. Mr. Dahlin notes that the University will have a testing laboratory to do the inspection and testing. The intent of this provision was that the general contractor did not "throw junk" into mechanical trenches.

Mr. Weber noted that the fuel oil tanks and the vents for the emergency generator are provided by the mechanical contractor and questioned why these were not under the electrical contractor for the same reasons as the temperature control wiring is in the mechanical contract. Mr. Wilcox points out that the electrical is responsible for the performance test.

The present elevation of the rock was questioned. Mr. Hughes states it is 791.10 and is fairly level. Mr. Dahlin points out that this is in the specifications. Bolander, who did the excavation under the ECX contract, states that it is quite flat at 791. It is detailed in the contract documents and under the ramp is 2½ to 3 feet of rock to come out to get down to the solid bearing rock.

One of the plastering contractors questioned the soffit and high ceiling scaffolding. This will be clarified by addendum. The plastering contractor referred to scaffold at the heat shield which is to be furnished by the mechanical. Questioned whether it would be good enough for the plasterers. Mr. Blanchard questioned whether there would be a significant difference. Mr. Dahlin states this will be clarified.

Mr. Blanchard requested that questions regarding electrical work be directed to Gary Hall, mechanical to Harry Wilcox, general construction and vertical transportation to Dick Carlson and specification interpretation to Jim Kellet. Mr. Blanchard further points out the necessity that the request be made in writing to allow a specific interpretation.

Mr. Shepard of Bolander points out a perennial complaint with all University jobs regarding his subcontract relationships; the fact that he is the first contractor on the job and the interest on his retained percentage while he awaits final payment to the general contractor causes a considerable hardship. Mr. Dahlin notes that they do recognize the problem and the specification allows approval of payments on a line item basis. Mr. Shepard notes that the spec, General Conditions 15, states payments will be made to subcontractors for all work less the 10%. Mr. Dahlin points out that section 01151, Page 2, the retention will be reduced by line item when the line item reaches 50% completion. Mr. Shepard points out that this is still 5%, which can be a rather large figure. Mr. Kogl points out that the University is not involved in any way in any contract between the prime contractor and subcontractor, nor in any negotiations of the agreement. It is impossible for the owner to do anything under these circumstances. Mr. Kogl points out the legal precedence lies with the subcontractor in cases like this and the solution should rest with the prime contractor associations and subcontractor associations. Mr. Shepard points out the problems in a suit of expense and in terms of future working relations with the prime contractor. Mr. Fritz of Knutson Construction Co. questioned whether there is a University or State policy on the retainage percentage. Mr. Kogl states that this is University policy. Mr. Fritz notes that in South Dakota there are provisions allowing for retention of 2½% on contract amounts over \$250,000. Mr. Dahlin requested a copy of this for their consideration. Mr. Kogl points out that the University does not have the money as it is held by the legislature. The legislature holds it and there is no reason the University would hold it other than to hopefully provide leverage to encourage the contractors to complete uncompleted or defective work. Mr. Shepard stated that it would be helpful if the University would identify why they are holding it and request the prime contractor to complete payments to uninvolved subcontractors.