



UO Housing Central Kitchen and Woodshop

Project User Group Meeting #2

24 March 2014

ATTENDEES

Walter Daffe, Brian Anderson
James Robertson, Scott Stolarczyk
Deon Richards
Martina Oxoby, Denise Stewart
David Opp-Beckman, Michael Griffel,
Tom Driscoll, Gus Lim
Laurie Woodward

Chambers Construction
Robertson|Sherwood|Architects
JLR Design Group
UO Campus Planning, Design, & Construction
UO University Housing

EMU

ATTACHMENTS

Proposal Budget Summary

MEETING NOTES

1. A proposal budget summary spreadsheet that included final estimates from the Wildish/gLAs team, the Chambers/RSA team, the LCL/Mahlum team, and an estimate by RLB (developed during the feasibility study) was reviewed. Key points and questions discussed:
 - a. Why were the RLB general conditions so much lower? They used a 5% mark-up of sub-trade costs. This is about the same for the three D/B teams, only their sub-trade costs were higher. There would not necessarily be a proportional decrease in general conditions for the current round since some of this cost is driven by the project schedule. Walter says they do not use a percentage of sub-trade costs to develop their general conditions; however looking back at projects they will range anywhere from 4% to 10%.
 - b. Why were the RLB equipment costs so much lower? The likely reason for this is that in the feasibility study all of the kitchen equipment was to be Owner Furnished. During the last D/B process and in this current stage, built-in freezers and coolers, along with their related refrigeration systems, is in the scope of the D/B budget.
 - c. Structure/Envelope: The Wildish proposal had an all wood structure building, and the Chambers proposal had a mix of wood and steel. However the total costs for structure and envelope was very similar. Regardless, the D/B team will be analyzing costs of multiple structural systems in this round as a first step.

2. The existing woodshop's dust collection system is too small for the new woodshop. The D/B team will look at the possibility of reusing the existing system and supplementing as needed. Another option suggested was to look at localized, mobile dust collection equipment. However, it should be carefully studied as too the long term maintenance and replacement costs of using a less expensive mobile system, and also how well they will be able to control dust. Denise noted that the Miller Theater uses mobile dust collection and it has performed well for the past eight years, but she needs to confirm what the use schedule is and whether it is comparable to this project.

3. Heating is required at the woodshop, and air conditioning is optional. If A/C is not provided natural cross-ventilation should be designed for.
4. Placing the woodshop in a separate building from the kitchen may mean a need for dual time clock systems, unless staff entry for both functions can be in a convenient shared location with good covered circulation to each area.
5. There have been no noise complaints from neighbors regarding the current woodshop. However, consideration of impacts to the neighbors is still important to consider
6. Some lockers should be provided inside the woodshop.
7. Gus has a list he can share of parties that have contacted him with interest in taking and/or moving the existing houses.
8. Chef's work stations may be in a shared space. Each chef needs their own computer, some room for paperwork, some upper shelving, and undercounter file drawers. A common 4-drawer lateral should also be provided. There is typically only one chef in the space at a time, so overall the space can be small. Once a location and general size is developed the UO can have a discussion with their furnishing vendor to see if it is best to use systems furniture, built-in surfaces, or a mix. *The current Housing standard is Hermann Miller Action Office System.*
9. Guest parking (no more than two) should be near the office area, which acts as the public entrance.
10. The office area needs access to the kitchen, though it should be designed so the offices are not used as a shortcut for kitchen staff to get to the kitchen.
11. There are currently 24 full-time staff for kitchen operations. The number of student workers will vary, with at times the number getting up to about 50 students. The program calls for 60 half size lockers and 40 3-tier lockers. Full-time staff will be assigned half-size lockers. Students would use the remaining half-size lockers and the 3-tier lockers, but they would not be assigned. Staff changing will occur in restrooms.
12. Catering staff are given uniforms. Clean uniforms would be stored in the Catering Linen area.
13. An eye wash station should be conveniently provided for the woodshop and for the kitchen. The *emergency shower* could take the form of an overhead emergency shower located in a restroom. There is an example of this already on campus.
14. There should a soda vending machine in or near the break
15. The UO Sustainability Office has expressed interest in funding a bio-diesel fueling station that would use cooking oils from the kitchen. There are apparently some self contained systems that can do the required filtering and refinement. The UO will look into getting more information on this.
16. Any sort of bio-fuel station or electric charging station should not displace the required number of parking spaces for kitchen and woodshop operations.



17. Some spaces need to be segregated in the kitchen; cook chill, cold preparation, and the bakery. Other areas would benefit by combining the catering and central kitchen functions together.
18. Storage between the catering and central kitchen can occur together in a room but should be segregated by wire partitions.
19. Deon asked if a gluten-free workstation should be provided. This type of separation, or separation for peanuts, kosher, etc., is not currently required by law. If it is convenient to lay out the kitchen to provide it the D/B team will look into it.
20. The cold receiving room has been deleted from the project.
21. Forklift access is not required into the freezers, coolers, or storage areas.
22. The UO will use high-density storage in the freezers and coolers, if the furnishings budget can afford to buy them. Otherwise the UO will reuse existing shelving.
23. The thaw cooler is to stay in the project. It can be part of the main freezer but should be segregated somehow.
24. Tom has developed a spreadsheet of current freezer, cooler, and dry storage capacity, along with an anticipated increase for future needs. He will provide this to the entire team.
25. Cook/Chill operations require a “warm freezer”, set at 28 degrees.
26. Alcoholic beverage storage can occur in the main cooler, but should be segregated and lockable.
27. The flight-type washer should have adequate height to accommodate mixing bowls and other large equipment.
28. It is preferable to have separation between incoming and outgoing deliveries, and also between food deliveries and dirty cart drop-off. There could at times be up to 2-3 semi’s at one time.
29. Incoming deliveries typically occur in the early morning, but can run anytime between 7:00 and noon. Central kitchen outgoing deliveries start around 7:00 and go out about every two hours. Catering outgoing deliveries vary from day to day.
30. A pre-development question for the City will be whether the City will allocate a number of on-street parking spaces for exclusive use by the project. This has sometime been the case in the past for the neighborhood.
31. It would be ideal to have access to the coolers through more than one point, perhaps with reach-in side doors.
32. Transparency and views into the kitchen is nice but not a priority. Daylighting is highly desired.
33. Housing food service operations are now licensed through the County. Cook/chill operations are probably going to be licensed through the State. Tom will get contact information from both departments and pass this along to the D/B team so they can research permitting requirements and timelines.

END OF NOTES

Proposal Budget Summary

CSI Div #	Description	WILDISH		CHAMBERS		LCL		RLB	
		Subtotal		Subtotal		Subtotal		Subtotal	
DIVISION 01 - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS		\$ 356,569.53		\$ 432,359.00		\$ 410,000.00		\$ 248,430.00	
DIVISION 02 - EXISTING CONDITIONS		\$ 89,880.45		\$ 34,500.00		\$ 108,408.00		\$ 96,700.00	
DIVISION 03 - CONCRETE		\$ 196,429.00		\$ 276,063.00		\$ 175,242.00		\$ 368,134.00	
DIVISION 04 - MASONRY		\$ -		\$ 14,616.00		\$ -		\$ -	
DIVISION 05 - METALS		\$ 51,021.37	\$ 1,000,374	\$ 391,700.00	\$ 1,058,378	\$ 700,337.00	\$ 1,682,315	\$ 717,093.00	\$ 1,243,583
DIVISION 06 - WOOD, PLASTICS, AND COMPOSITIES		\$ 557,127.64		\$ 103,500.00		\$ 596,762.00		\$ 106,363.00	
DIVISION 07 - THERMALL AND MOISTURE PROTECTION		\$ 392,225.40		\$ 563,178.00		\$ 385,216.00		\$ 420,127.00	
DIVISION 08 - OPENINGS		\$ 136,840.90		\$ 202,950.00		\$		\$ 262,441.00	
DIVISION 09 - FINISHES		\$ 454,252.78		\$ 602,472.00		\$ 744,875.00		\$ 632,139.00	
DIVISION 10 - SPECIALTIES		\$ 57,392.14		\$ 69,440.00		\$		\$ 13,650.00	
DIVISION 11 - EQUIPMENT		\$ 1,043,415.87		\$ 1,491,576.00		\$ 990,443.00		\$ 29,485.00	
DIVISION 12 - FURNISHINGS		\$ 35,936.91		\$ 20,290.00		\$		\$ 70,755.00	
DIVISION 21 - FIRE SUPPRESSION		\$ 86,400.00		\$ 117,100.00		\$ 87,016.00		\$ 23,856.00	
DIVISION 22 - PLUMBING		\$ 1,282,588.00	\$ 2,538,028	\$ 660,811.00	\$ 1,882,133	\$ 339,032.00	\$ 1,345,560	\$ 340,266.00	\$ 1,023,056
DIVISION 23 - HEATING, VENTILATING AND AIR CONDITIONING		\$ 1,255,440.00		\$ 1,221,322.00		\$ 1,006,528.00		\$ 682,790.00	
DIVISION 26 - ELECTRICAL		\$ 953,045.00	\$ 1,274,045	\$ 1,116,276.00	\$ 1,116,276	\$ 942,592.00	\$ 942,592	\$ 515,656.00	\$ 581,201
DIVISION 27 - COMMUNICATIONS		\$ 321,000.00		\$ -		\$ -		\$ 65,545.00	
DIVISION 31 - EARTHWORK		\$ 143,276.18	\$ 748,761	\$ 85,700.00	\$ 538,403	\$ 131,986.00	\$ 557,108	\$ 14,316.00	\$ 782,528
DIVISION 32 - EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS		\$ 404,901.45		\$ 287,146.00		\$ 262,122.00		\$ 213,900.00	
DIVISION 33 - UTILITIES		\$ 200,583.58		\$ 165,557.00		\$ 163,000.00		\$ 554,312.00	

Subtotal	\$ 8,018,326.20	\$ 7,856,556.00	\$ 7,043,559.00	\$ 5,375,958.00
PL/PD Insurance	\$ 97,480.28	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 69,478.00	\$ 130,426.00
Builder's Risk	\$ 16,350.91	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 35,202.00	Inci below
Performance Bond	\$ 52,767.28	\$ 61,000.00	\$ 92,637.00	\$ 130,426.00
Contractor's Contingency	\$ 204,623.10	\$ 225,000.00	\$ 147,025.00	\$ -
Fee	\$ 384,727.32	\$ 413,683.00	\$ 268,998.00	\$ 160,424.00
Subtotal	\$ 755,948.89	\$ 782,683.00	\$ 613,340.00	\$ 421,276.00
LEED Registration Fee		\$ 4,000.00	\$ -	\$ -
EWEB Utilitiies		\$ 100,000.00	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00
Professional Fees	\$ 729,488.24	\$ 525,000.00	\$ 694,780.00	\$ 350,000.00
Design & Estimating Contingency	\$ 18,237.20	\$ 311,594.00	\$ 632,913.00	\$ 275,394.00
Escalation	\$ 96,181.83	\$ 96,181.83	\$ 168,777.00	\$ 43,375.00
TOTAL	\$ 9,618,182.36	\$ 9,676,014.83	\$ 9,153,369.00	\$ 6,566,003.00