

Fire Safe Construction Cost Comparison Study



Executive Summary Report

Fire Safe Construction Cost Comparison Study

Executive Summary Report

Commission Number 05119

Prepared By:

Haas Architects Engineers
1301 North Atherton Street
State College, Pennsylvania

Sponsored By:

New England/New York Fire Safety Construction Advisory Council
Pennsylvania Fire Safe Construction Advisory Council
Mid-Atlantic Fire Safety Construction Advisory Council
Northeast Cement Shippers Association

© Copyright 2006

This study is owned by the Pennsylvania Fire Safe Construction Advisory Council, New England/New York Fire Safety Construction Advisory Council, Mid Atlantic Fire Safety Construction Advisory Council and the Northeast Cement Shippers Association. This study is protected by U.S. Copyright Law and use for any purpose other than its intended use by its owners is strictly prohibited. This study may not be reproduced, in any form, or by any means, without the prior written permission of the owner. Reproduction of the study for resale by anyone other than its owners is also prohibited and in direct violation of copyright laws. All rights are reserved to its owner.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Methodology	3
Results and Discussion	4-9
Building Cost Comparison Study Drawing Examples	10-12
Conclusion	13
Containment Example	13





Introduction

With the phasing out of the three predominate model codes, BOCA National Building Code, SBCCI Standard Building Code, and ICBO Uniform Building Code, and implementation of the new International Building Code and associated family of codes, there has been a shift in the approach to fire safety in the built environment. This shift has been characterized as a shift away from the use of passive construction techniques, such as compartmentalization and the use of fireproof construction materials, in favor of an increased reliance on active fire control techniques such as sprinkler systems, allowing for construction to occur using materials that are more susceptible to fire damage.



In conjunction with this shift there are also reservations with the current ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials) methodology for testing fire assemblies ASTM E119, Standard Test Methods for Fire Tests of Building Construction and Materials. This test allows for the removal and replacement of the fire tested specimen prior to the initiation of the hose stream test. This test combination is intended to model the effects of the application of a fire suppression stream immediately after the intense heat from a compartment fire. The effect of this provision is that the specimen is a virgin test specimen when the fire suppression stream is applied, theoretically allowing certain materials to artificially perform at a higher level than would be expected in the field.

In addition, it has long been the opinion of legislators, code-officials, and design professionals that non-combustible concrete construction solutions are more costly than other alternatives such as gypsum fire walls with sprinklers.

Due to the perception of elevated cost, and the aforementioned code and testing issues, the acceptance of a balanced design approach incorporating both passive and active protection systems has met with resistance. Passive design incorporates the compartmentalization of the fire, limiting fire spread and protecting both the building occupants and the responding firefighters. This system is in place at all times and is not subject to failure due to the loss of utility service. An example of this is the incorporation of non-consumable materials in the construction of floors and walls used for fire control. The active portion of the design uses a combination of detection systems to warn occupants, and sprinklers to control fire spread until the fire department arrives.

Currently, there is no reliable published documentation available to refute the perception regarding the increased building cost associated with this approach. Based on this lack of information, the design of a comparative study was undertaken to accurately document the perceived increased cost associated with the use of balanced design in a common multi-family residential building. It is our pleasure to present the outcomes of this study.



Objectives

The objective of this study was to develop a construction cost model to accurately evaluate the relative construction cost of a multi-family building constructed using five different construction materials. The concept of multi-family would include traditional apartment type buildings, condominium style buildings, student housing, elderly housing, and others.



Methodology

Introduction

To accurately evaluate the relative construction cost between each of the five building systems, it was determined that a multi-family residential structure should be schematically designed meeting all of the requirements of the International Building Code 2003 edition. Once designed, the building would be reviewed for code compliance, and cost estimates would be prepared for the building using each of the different building systems.

The design team assembled included:

ARCHITECT & ENGINEER: *Haas Architects Engineers*

CODE OFFICIAL: *Tim E. Knisely*

COST ESTIMATION: *Poole Anderson Construction*

Haas Architects Engineers is a multi-disciplinary architectural and engineering firm located in State College, Pennsylvania with a thirty year history of client centered service including commercial, single and multi-family residential, retail, and sports based projects. Some projects include the Bryce Jordan Center and 2001 Beaver Stadium Expansion, both at The Pennsylvania State University.

Tim E. Knisely is a senior fire and commercial housing inspector for the Centre Region Code Administration, in State College, Pennsylvania. Mr. Knisely currently holds a certification as a registered Building Code Official in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and holds more than eight certifications from the International Code Council. In addition, Mr. Knisely has been involved in the fire service for more than 20 years.

Poole Anderson Construction is one of the largest building contractors in Central Pennsylvania with a 75 year history and an annual construction volume exceeding 60,000,000 dollars.

Building Model

The building model chosen for the project was a 4 story multi-family residential structure encompassing approximately 25,000 gross square feet of building area per floor. Based on the proposed target building types, it was decided that to better evaluate the relative construction costs, two different floor layouts would be used. The first model is a building comprised exclusively of single bedroom dwelling units. The second model is assembled using a typical mix of one and two bedroom dwelling units.

The combination of the two different layout considerations would more realistically address the variety of construction configurations commonly found in the multi-family dwelling marketplace. Schematic floor plans, elevations and detailed wall sections for a typical building model are provided.





Construction Types

The following construction types and alternates were evaluated:

- Conventional wood framing with wood floor system (Type VB Construction)
Alternate: Conventional wood framing with fire-rated wood floor system (Type VA Construction)
- Light Gauge Steel Framing with cast-in-place concrete floor system on metal form deck
- Load bearing concrete masonry construction with precast concrete plank floor system
Alternate: Cast-in-place concrete floor system
- Precast concrete walls and precast concrete floor system
- Insulated Concrete Form (ICF) walls and precast concrete plank floor system
Alternate: Cast-in-place concrete floor system
Alternate: Interior bearing walls constructed of concrete masonry units (CMU)

With respect to the conventional wood framing system presented, the primary system is an un-protected construction Type VB with an alternate of protected construction Type VA. The additional construction type was presented since the Type VB construction is not permitted to be used for a non-sprinklered building of this type that is four stories tall. For the proposed use and construction height using conventional wood frame Type VA would need to be used. Both systems are presented since the remaining systems are presented as un-protected framing systems.

For all systems other than the conventional wood frame systems, it was assumed that the partition walls within the dwelling unit would be constructed using metal stud finished with gypsum board.

Code Review

Once design was completed on each of the buildings, Mr. Knisely performed a detailed code review following the requirements of the International Building Code 2003 edition. This review was conducted following the plan review forms provided by the International Code Council. This review was in addition to the review performed internally by the professionals at Haas Architects Engineers.

The reader is alerted to the fact that there are a number of items that are common to all of the buildings that were not addressed in this study and that are missing from the code review forms. These items are typically dealing with site issues, soils information, etc. All of these items are common to each of the buildings and would add identical cost to each project. This was verified with the cost estimation personnel at Poole Anderson Construction.

Cost Estimation

To increase the direct applicability of the cost study a decision was made to complete the study in three different locations. The locations were chosen by each of the contributing groups, feeling that they represented the construction climate in their respective area. The locations chosen are as follows:

- Framingham, Massachusetts
- Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
- Towson, Maryland

In addition to the original three cities listed above, alternate metropolitan areas were investigated. Only the results relevant to the Mid-Atlantic region (listed below) are reported herein:

- Frederick, Maryland
- Richmond, VA
- Towson, Maryland
- Washington, D.C.

To allow for a fair and uniform comparison of the construction costs between trades it was determined that the cost study would use accepted prevailing wage rates published for each of the locations. These labor rates would be typical for a publicly funded project and will allow for a fair labor comparison, eliminating potential undercutting by any of the trades.

The cost estimate for each building model included the complete fit out of each building with the exception of movable appliances and furniture.

Results and Discussion


The results of the construction cost study for each geographic location are presented in the following tables. The relative cost presented is a percentage of the minimum cost system presented.

Frederick, MARYLAND


Building System	Cost	Relative Cost %
Conventional Wood Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$9,355,083.00	100
Type Vb 3 Story Only	\$7,381,981.00	
Conventional Wood Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$9,739,598.00	100
Type Vb 3 Story Only	\$7,623,007.00	
Light Gage Steel Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$9,896,461.00	106
Light Gage Steel Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$10,281,982.00	106
Masonry & Precast Single Bedroom Scheme	\$9,868,383.00	106
Masonry & Precast Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$9,997,300.00	103
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$10,656,617.00	114
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$10,836,880.00	111
Precast Construction Single Bedroom Scheme	\$11,271,524.00	121
Precast Construction Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,444,273.00	118
ICF Walls & Precast Plank Single Bedroom Scheme	\$10,053,271.00	108
ICF Walls & Precast Plank Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$10,193,877.00	105
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$10,977,200.00	117
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$11,182,769.00	115
Interior CMU Walls Alternate (Single)	\$9,955,751.00	106
Interior CMU Walls Alternate (Mixed)	\$10,053,053.00	103

The least expensive system for both building models is the conventional wood framing system. Several of the non-combustible wall systems compare very favorably with both the conventional wood framing system and the light gage steel framing system: (1) the load bearing masonry wall system with precast concrete plank floor system, (2) insulated concrete form (ICF) wall system with precast concrete plank floor system, (3) and both interior CMU alternates. The relative cost of these non-combustible systems ranged from 3 to 6 percent higher than the conventional wood framing system.

Frederick, Maryland Single Bedroom



Frederick, Maryland Mixed Bedroom




Conventional Wood Frame	Masonry/Precast Plank	Precast	ICF/Cast-in-place
Light Gauge Steel	Masonry/Cast-in-place	ICF/Precast	ICF/Masonry

Towson, MARYLAND


Building System	Cost	Relative Cost %
Conventional Wood Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$10,779,264.00	100
Type Vb 3 Stories Only	\$ 8,496,437.00	
Conventional Wood Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,540,327.00	100
Type Vb 3 Stories Only	\$ 8,931,852.00	
Light Gauge Steel Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$11,183,801.00	104
Light Gauge Steel Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,573,002.00	100
Masonry & Precast Single Bedroom Scheme	\$11,145,966.00	103
Masonry & Precast Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,249,743.00	98
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$12,453,743.00	116
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$12,599,629.00	109
Precast Construction Single Bedroom Scheme	\$12,680,336.00	118
Precast Construction Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$12,850,342.00	111
ICF Walls & Precast Plank Single Bedroom Scheme	\$11,475,947.00	107
ICF Walls & Precast Plank Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,565,232.00	100
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$12,957,185.00	120
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$12,129,126.00	105
Interior CMU Walls Alternate (Single)	\$11,273,890.00	105
Interior CMU Walls Alternate (Mixed)	\$11,326,383.00	98

Two non-combustible wall systems were found to be the least expensive systems of all that were investigated: (1) load bearing masonry wall system with precast concrete plank floor system, and (2) insulated concrete form (ICF) wall system with precast concrete plank floor system combined with the interior CMU wall alternate. All of the non-combustible construction methods compare favorably to the cost of wood framing. In addition, all of the non-combustible concrete construction systems provide excellent energy efficiency, durability, and other benefits in addition to fire safety.

Towson, Maryland Single Bedroom



Towson, Maryland Mixed Bedroom




Richmond, VIRGINIA


Building System	Cost	Relative Cost %
Conventional Wood Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$9,788,862.00	100
Type Vb 3 Story Only	\$7,516,128.00	
Conventional Wood Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$10,505,254.00	100
Type Vb 3 Story Only	\$8,053,172.00	
Light Gage Steel Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$10,535,092.00	108
Light Gage Steel Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$10,707,414.00	102
Masonry & Precast Single Bedroom Scheme	\$10,693,855.00	109
Masonry & Precast Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$10,827,256.00	103
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$11,308,119.00	116
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$11,463,200.00	109
Precast Construction Single Bedroom Scheme	\$12,415,627.00	127
Precast Construction Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$12,500,179.00	119
Icf Walls & Precast Plank Single Bedroom Scheme	\$10,955,147.00	112
Icf Walls & Precast Plank Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,123,062.00	106
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$11,609,047.00	119
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$11,770,113.00	112
Interior Cmu Walls Alternate (Single)	\$10,903,105.00	111
Interior Cmu Walls Alternate (Mixed)	\$11,074,793.00	105

The least expensive system for both building models is the conventional wood framing system. Three of the non-combustible wall systems compare very favorably with both the conventional wood framing system and the light gage steel framing system: (1) the load bearing masonry wall system with precast concrete plank floor system, (2) insulated concrete form (ICF) wall system with precast concrete plank floor system, (3) and the mixed bedroom interior CMU alternate. The relative cost of these non-combustible systems ranged from 3 to 6 percent higher than the conventional wood framing system, while the light gauge steel framing system resulted in a 2 percent increase above the conventional wood framing system.

Richmond, Virginia Single Bedroom



Richmond, Virginia Mixed Bedroom




Conventional Wood Frame	Masonry/Precast Plank	Precast	ICF/Cast-in-place
Light Gauge Steel	Masonry/Cast-in-place	ICF/Precast	ICF/Masonry

Washington D.C.


Building System	Cost	Relative Cost %
Conventional Wood Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$11,148,764.00	100
Type Vb 3 Story Only	\$8,887,356.00	
Conventional Wood Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,630,953.00	100
Type Vb 3 Story Only	\$9,153,773.00	
Light Gage Steel Framing Single Bedroom Scheme	\$11,552,715.00	104
Light Gage Steel Framing Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,943,109.00	103
Masonry & Precast Single Bedroom Scheme	\$11,842,165.00	106
Masonry & Precast Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$11,848,285.00	102
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$12,982,444.00	116
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$13,188,759.00	113
Precast Construction Single Bedroom Scheme	\$13,254,580.00	119
Precast Construction Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$13,485,270.00	116
ICF Walls & Precsat Plank Single Bedroom Scheme	\$12,026,767.00	108
ICF Walls & Precsat Plank Mixed Bedroom Scheme	\$12,140,136.00	104
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Single)	\$13,548,349.00	122
Form In Place Concrete Floor Alternate (Mixed)	\$13,754,718.00	118
Interior CMU Walls Alternate (Single)	\$11,811,966.00	106
Interior CMU Walls Alternate (Mixed)	\$11,889,725.00	102

The least expensive system for both building models is the conventional wood framing system. Several of the non-combustible wall systems compare very favorably with both the conventional wood framing system and the light gage steel framing system: (1) the load bearing masonry wall system with precast concrete plank floor system, (2) insulated concrete form (ICF) wall system with precast concrete plank floor system, (3) and both of the interior CMU alternates. The relative cost of these non-combustible systems ranged from 2 to 6 percent higher than the conventional wood framing system, while the light gauge steel framing system resulted in a 2 percent increase above the conventional wood framing system.


Washington, DC Single Bedroom




Washington, DC Mixed Bedroom




Conventional Wood Frame	Masonry/Precast Plank	Precast	ICF/Cast-in-place
Light Gauge Steel	Masonry/Cast-in-place	ICF/Precast	ICF/Masonry




1 ENLARGED WOOD CONSTRUCTION PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




2 ENLARGED METAL STUD CONSTRUCTION PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




3 ENLARGED MASONRY / PRECAST CONSTRUCTION PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




4 ENLARGED WOOD CONSTRUCTION PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



5 ENLARGED METAL STUD CONSTRUCTION PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




6 ENLARGED MASONRY / PRECAST CONSTRUCTION PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

BUILDING COST COMPARISON STUDY

A10.1



A7.1	BUILDING COST COMPARISON STUDY	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="width: 40px; height: 40px; background-color: black; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <div> HAAS ARCHITECTS ENGINEERS <small>100 N. 10TH STREET, SUITE 200 • STATE COLLEGE, PA 16801 • 814-335-1551 FAX: 814-335-8888 www.haaspe.com haas@haaspe.com </small> </div> </div>
-------------	---	--

Conclusion

Based on the construction estimates, the cost associated with a compartmentalized construction method utilizing a concrete based material was generally less than 3 percent of the overall construction cost. Comparatively speaking this amount is less than the contingency budget typically recommended for the owner to carry for unanticipated expenditures during the project.



The minimal increase in construction cost can be paid for over the life of the structure. Materials like concrete masonry, precast concrete, and cast-in-place concrete have many other advantages beyond their inherent fire performance including resistance to mold growth, resistance to damage from vandalism, and minimal damage caused by water and fire in the event of a fire in the building. In many cases, with this type of construction the damage outside of the fire compartment is minimal. This provides for reduced cleanup costs and quicker reoccupation of the structure.



Containment Example: Dormitory Fire Contained

On October 11, 2001, fire engulfed the **Rees Hall Dormitory at Hobart and William Smith Colleges** in Geneva, New York. Temperatures soared as high 1800°F resulting in melted plastic picture frames, light fixtures, smoke detectors, metal hinges and the steel door of the room where the fire began. Within 20 minutes, the raging fire had caused approximately \$100,000 in damages. This small repair bill was attributed to the fact that concrete construction contained the fire and saved the building from being completely destroyed.

Originally constructed in 1969 with concrete masonry and hollow-core floor planks, the building is **“durable and fire resistant,”** says Christopher J. Button, Senior Project Manager, HWS, **“and has much lower maintenance and insurance costs.”** Replacing the entire structure would have cost as much as \$5 million.

Button says he’d always believed any building with a smoke detector and non-combustible materials would withstand similar catastrophes, but after seeing how concrete stood up to the intense fire, he’s “a believer in concrete construction.”





Mid Atlantic Fire Safety Construction Advisory Council
2212 Youngs Drive • Haymarket, VA 20169
www.firesafeconstruction.org • 866-SAFE-NC3