STATE PROPERTIES REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of Meeting Held On September 26, 2019
450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, Connecticut

The State Properties Review Board held a Regular Meeting on September 26, 2019 in Suite 2035, 450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, Connecticut.

Members Present:
Edwin S. Greenberg, Chairman
Bruce Josephy, Vice Chairman
John P. Valengavich, Secretary
Jeffrey Berger
William Clancl

Members Absent:
Jack Halpert

Staff Present:
Dimple Desai
Thomas Jerram

Guests Present
Kevin Kopetz, Esquire DAS/DCS (10:06AM-10:35AM)
Joel Baranowski, PM, DAS/DCS (10:06AM-10:35AM)

Chairman Greenberg called the meeting to order.

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Berger seconded a motion to enter into Open Session. The motion passed unanimously.

OPEN SESSION

1. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Berger seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the September 23, 2019 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

2. COMMUNICATIONS

Director Desai provided a copy of the Board’s Annual Report to the Governor for their final review prior to Chairman Greenberg signing the report and delivery to the Governor.

Director Desai shared the contents of a communication with DoAG Commissioner Hurlburt regarding improving the process of the Board’s review of DoAG proposals to acquire development rights to specific farms.

3. REAL ESTATE- UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. REAL ESTATE – NEW BUSINESS

5. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - NEW BUSINESS
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PRB # 19-175
Origin/Client: DCS/DOC
Transaction/Contract Type: AE / Amendment #2
Project Number: BI-IA-465
Contract: BI-IA-465-ARC
Consultant: WSP, USA, Inc.
Property: East Lyme, W. Main St (201) – York CI
Project purpose: Central Plant and Piping Distribution System
Item Purpose: Amendment #2 to compensate the consultant for architect services.

Note: Mr. Kopetz and Mr. Baranowski joined the meeting at 10:06 AM and both left the meeting at 10:35 AM.

CONSULTANT FEE: $147,450

Background – DCS on behalf of DOC is replacing the central plant and all 32,000-LF of 10-inch hot water and chilled water supply and return underground piping that services the heating/cooling system at York Correctional Institution.

Under PRB #17-197, the Board approved the Consultant’s Contract totaling $2,967,170, of which $211,600 was for special services. The contract included all design services as well as construction administration services, including 100 site visits during the estimated 24-month construction period.

Under PRB #13-136, the Board approved Amendment #1, for additional design services to integrate specialized equipment to facilitate the central plant in communication with the 18 building utilizing steam and chilled water, as well as specialized services to utilize ground penetrating radar (GPR) to investigate with great confidence the horizontal subsurface location and depth of the existing buried utilities on the campus. The increase in the Consultant’s fee was $141,350.

Contact Amendment #2

Under this proposal, DCS seeks to amend the Consultant’s contract to compensate the consultant an additional $147,450, for the following services:

1. To provide enhanced Special Inspection Services by the Structural Engineer and Geotechnical Engineer, including additional site visits and inspections on a regular basis – additional fee = $38,250.
2. To provide enhanced Construction Administration support services by the Mechanical Engineer and Geotechnical Engineer, to perform regular additional site inspection of the installation of the chilled and hot water piping, including additional site visits – additional fee = $109,200.

This Amendment #2 brings the Total Fee to $3,256,220.

DCS has confirmed for SPRB that funding is available for this contract. As part of this contract amendment DCS states, the overall construction and total project budget remain unchanged at: $45,800,000 and $60,000,000 respectively.

FEE – The costs of basic and special services are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSP Fee for Basic Services (PRB #17-197)</th>
<th>COST ($) (BASIC)</th>
<th>COST ($) (SPECIAL)</th>
<th>C. Budget ($)</th>
<th>(%) Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design Phase</td>
<td>$440,891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Phase</td>
<td>$551,114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Document Phase</td>
<td>$826,671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding and Review Phase</td>
<td>$110,223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Administration Phase</td>
<td>$826,671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#17-197)(A)</td>
<td>$2,755,570</td>
<td>$45,800,000</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment #1 (#18-136) - additional controls work for system integration (A1)</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment #2 (#19-175) - Enhanced Special Inspection Services (A2)</td>
<td>$109,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW BASIC SERVICE FEE (A) + (A1) + (A2)</td>
<td>$2,952,270</td>
<td>$45,800,000</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey (Martinez Couch)</td>
<td>$131,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotech &amp; Environmental Engineering (GeoDesign)</td>
<td>$55,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS Design Contingency</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B)</td>
<td>$211,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Special Services - Ground Penetrating Radar (B1)</td>
<td>$53,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment #2 (#19-175) - Enhanced Special Inspection Services (B2)</td>
<td>$38,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B) + (B1) + (B2)</td>
<td>$265,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW PROJECT TOTAL FEE (A) + (A1) + (A2) + (B) + (B1)</td>
<td>$3,256,220</td>
<td>$45,800,000</td>
<td>7.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff requested clarification on the following issues with this proposal:

1. How old are the buildings?
2. When was the original project completed that failed prematurely?
3. Was the previous design done adequately? – supports, pipe, insulation, jacket, etc.
4. Who oversaw that project? Who was the Engineer, CA and the Contractor?

**DCS Response**
York Correctional was constructed in 1994 under project BI-JA-217. Almost all of the buildings are of that vintage, ~25 years old. There are a few older buildings that we are also connecting hot and chilled water to under this project. The facility was sited on the same property of the JB Gates correctional facility which has since been shuttered. The women’s prison was originally known as the women’s fam before the new facility was built in 1994. You may want to call it up on Google which will give you a sense of the scale of the facility.
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It appears that the pipe used for the original distribution system was properly specified. The soil is a sandy silty material which is perhaps the best material to lay the pipe in. Typically you do not need any special pipe supports in this type of soil and I do not believe that any were specified or used for that original work. The failures experienced are not due to wholesale pipe corrosion which can occur if the pipe is placed in soil with a chemical composition that reacts with steel. From what I have been told the leaks have occurred at bad welds. The poor workmanship for those existing piping is the cause of the hot and chilled water leaks. Right now DOC is operating the system as best it can at a pressure and temperature that minimize the amount of leakage.

I do not know who the original design team was but I know that Tishman Construction was hired as the construction manager to oversee the work at York. I was with DPW at the time the project was built. A few different colleagues who are no longer with the State worked on the project. Not long ago, a different repair project was undertaken to replace the block and repair waterproofing at all buildings. I do not know the cost of that repair project but it was significant. There was litigation to recover money. Other folks here at DAS may know these answers. Don Ouillette is one person that may know most of the information, unfortunately he is currently on leave.

1. What is the project status? Did construction begin on July 1, 2019 as anticipated?
   - DCS Response:
     - The Bond Commission Approved funding for construction on 6/26/2019.
     - No, however construction has begun. We issued a Notice to Proceed to construction to PDS on July 31, 2019.

2. What is the status of CMR? What will be the responsibility of CMR? Will CMR also cover the inspections and services that are being requested under this amendment?
   - DCS Response:
     - PDS, the CMR, has begun work on the project.
     - The CMR is responsible for constructing the work in accordance with the requirements of the documents. They have a responsibility for quality assurance.
     - There are several entities that are involved with making sure that work is done correctly, including the CMR, the CA, the Engineer (WSP) the testing lab and OSBI. Please keep in mind that this project includes not only new boilers and chillers but also installation of new heating and cooling distribution pipes. The piping under the original project failed prematurely in part because the work was not installed correctly. The intent of this Amendment is to provide a level of service on the part of the Engineer over and above that which is called for by the standard contract agreement so that we do not repeat the very expensive mistakes of the past.

3. Provide Statement of Special Inspections per original contract, Exhibit A, Section E
   - DCS Response:
     - At the time of contract, the Statement of Special Inspections had not been filled out by the Engineer. The services were unknown and had yet to be defined. In this Amendment, I seek to have the Engineer of Record out to the prison on a frequent basis to review the work. The work at York Correctional Institution is difficult because of the custody environment. Because every movement is controlled and requires Department of Correctional officer escorts it is more costly to work in this environment. I seek to have the Engineer of Record involved in the project to a greater extent to ensure that the work is held to the highest quality standard and does not fail prematurely like the original work did.
     - The Statement of Special Inspections that was prepared and issued at the end of the design phase is attached to this response.

4. What basic special inspection services were anticipated under the original contract
   - DCS Response:
     - Under the original contract the scope of work was not defined and the Statement of Special Inspections form for the York project did not exist at the point in time when the contract was signed. The Engineer anticipated an 18 month project duration (the project has a 24 month duration) and
the routing of the piping was unknown. The design that will be constructed runs a portion of the piping through buildings 8&9 on supports that will be constructed to hang the 10” pipe because the existing building structure was not capable of supporting the added load imposed by the new distribution piping. The pipe in Buildings 8&9 is run along the only practical routing which are the main corridors of the Administration Building where inmates move through the space 24 hours a day and which also acts as the main queueing space for kitchen stores and prepared meals. The women’s prison makes all the meals for all the inmates throughout the State. This is an important area which cannot afford to experience any leaks or problems in the future. The full scope of work could not have been realized by the Engineer at the time they offered their proposal for the original contract.

5. Please provide a revised R1105 that reflects the changes approved by DOC.
   ○ DCS Response:
   ○ The form is attached. DOC has not requested any formal changes since I was assigned to the project in January 2018.

Structural/Geotech field visits ($38,250):

6. Why are these considered enhanced services? Is the concept of hanging the piping mains new? How was the original scope designed to hang the pipes in the existing buildings?
   ○ DCS Response:
   ○ Under this amendment the Engineer will make more visits to the facility to inspect the work and shall be available to make site visits in order to respond to issues that are encountered in the field. The project is classified as a renovation project and renovation projects often encounter unforeseen conditions. In the case of York and its essential role as the only facility to house female offenders and in feeding the inmate population throughout the State, it is important that we

7. Based on WSP’s scope of work (dt. 4/17/17), page 11, they had retained a structural engineering services that was responsible to “review the building structures for support of piping and equipment as needed”. What was the recommendation from this Structural engineer to hang the pipes?
   ○ DCS Response:
   ○ The Engineer determined that the existing structure was not capable of support the loads of the new distribution piping. Additional structural elements (supports) are part of the project.

8. Why can’t these services be provided within existing scope? Per WSP’s original scope, there is an allowance of 100 meetings and field visits over a 24 month construction duration.
   ○ DCS Response:
   ○ The existing scope involves construction administration support of attending meetings on-site and inspecting the work by the Engineer’s project manager or member of their CA staff. WSP’s project manager (Chris Tso) and their construction administration staff person (Adam Prosser) have general knowledge of the project. They were not the lead mechanical engineer, structural engineer or geotechnical person. Construction phase services called for by the contract do not necessarily include regular site visits by the geotechnical engineer or the structural engineer. The scope of work under the amendment calls for the experts to visit the site frequently to ensure that all work performed is appropriate (particularly in the case of soils which can vary from the borings) and compliant with the construction contract documents.

9. Please provide a staffing and fee matrix to support the Special Inspection Services by the Structural Engineer and Geotechnical Engineer at $38,250 for 15 site visits.
   ○ DCS Response:
   ○ I have reached out to WSP and asked for the information that you seek.

Mechanical/Geotech field visits ($109,200):

10. Why are these considered enhanced services?
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- DCS Response:
  - The purpose of the amendment is to provide for more time in the field for the engineers that designed the project to ensure that the work is constructed to their expectations. The driving force for this additional level of oversight is to catch any problems with the work which may not surface for many years after the new piping system is placed into service. The piping that we are installing under the construction contract replaces pipes that failed well before they should have resulting in severe operational problems for the complex.

11. Why are enhanced CA services required when CA Consultant is providing similar services including an allowance for testing firm that will perform pipe weld testing and verify the integrity of the pipe, insulation and jacket as per the requirement of the Consultant's Construction Documents.

- DCS Response:
  - Simply stated, DAS seeks to engage the design engineers so we do not repeat the mistakes made in the past. Our intent is to avoid spending tens of millions of dollars unnecessarily by employing multiple layers of inspections before the work is buried.

12. Clarify why are enhanced Engineering services required when WSP is providing 100 site visits and meetings during the construction phase.

- DCS Response:
  - The scope of work of the amendment requires the design experts to visit the site, review the work and let us know if they have any concerns with the installation. The project consists of approximately six (6) miles of buried pipe. A trench will be cut for the piping which will be placed, welded and tested. It will then be buried. It is not feasible to leave the pipe exposed for very long, especially since a significant part of the pipe is within the prison fence. Once the pipes are buried they are concealed until they are dug up for repair. With the increased inspection we hope that they will not have to be dug up in the future for repair as was the case with the pipes that were installed when the prison was built in 1994. We plan to do it right this time.

13. Please provide a staffing and fee matrix to the enhanced Construction Administration support services by the Mechanical Engineer and Geotechnical Engineer support the $109,200 for 24 additional site visits.

- DCS Response: I have reached out to WSP and asked for the information that you seek.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends to REJECT this contract Amendment #2. These services are being provided by various professionals such as CMR, the CA, the Engineer (WSP), the testing lab and OSBI.

- These services are being provided by various professionals such as CMR, the CA, the Engineer (WSP), the testing lab and OSBI. There are already multiple layers of reviews and inspections that should provide the comfort level DCS is looking for.
- WSP's original scope includes Construction Administration during construction totaling about $827,000, which includes periodic field visits during construction to monitor construction progress.
- Construction Administration contract approved under PRB #18-090 in the amount of $2,251,257 for basic services plus $594,153 for special services (special services include $435,960 for construction phase pipe testing to be conducted by a Testing Firm).
- CMR is also responsible for constructing the work in accordance with the requirements of the construction documents. They have a responsibility for quality assurance as well.
- The design documents must require stringent weld specifications and testing requirements which will alleviate DCS's concern.

FROM PRB #18-136
Amendment #1

Amendment #1 to Contract BI-JA-465-ARC is requesting approval for funding for additional Basic Services and additional Special Services.

Additional Basic Services ($87,500): The original contract called for the replacement of the boilers within the Central Plant and all subsurface piping to connect to all 18 buildings on the Campus. As the project evolved, it became clear to the Engineer that the installation of equipment within the Central Plant cannot be fully integrated into the operating systems of the 18 satellite buildings on the Campus. Further complicating issues is that the operating systems for the 18 buildings are 25+ years old and replacement parts are increasingly difficult to locate.

DCS is requesting additional Basic Fees to investigate the existing condition of the controls in the 18 buildings on the Campus and expand their design to document the location of equipment on the drawings and call for the complete replacement of all controls equipment with a single fully integrated building controls management system that is fully warranted and capable of remote operation of all buildings from the Central Plant. The fee for this additional Basic Service is $87,500.

Additional Special Services ($53,850): The design team has recommended retaining the services of a subconsultant to conduct ground penetrating radar (GPR) to investigate locations on the Campus. The purpose is to identify with great confidence the horizontal subsurface location and depth of the existing buried utilities. The original contract included special services for geotechnical/environmental engineering (test borings and pits only) that required the identification of utilities through various methods, none of which included GPR. Aside from the field data collected from the surface and information on existing drawings for underground utilities, the surveyor was not able to confirm the exact location, size, or depth of the subsurface utilities.

DCS is requesting additional Special Service Fees to retain a subconsultant to identify the actual size, location and depth of the existing underground utilities. The subconsultant will employ the following three methods to identify the subsurface utilities: #1. Use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) to detect metal objects in non-conductive soil; #2. Electro-Magnetic (EM) technology to detect metallic-based piping and cables; and #3. Soft Digs (in 28 locations), to identify and confirm type, depth and size of existing underground utilities and structures. Results of the three methods will be marked on the surface locations with paint and incorporated into the site surveys. The fee for this additional Special Service is $53,850.

Amendment #1 requests an increase in $141,350 funding to compensate the Engineer for the additional Basic and Special Services. DCS has confirmed for SPRB that funding is available for this contract.

This Amendment #1 is seeking an increase in the Engineer's fee by $87,500 bringing the Total Fee to $3,108,520 and the Basic Fee to $2,843,070.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that SPRB APPROVE this contract Amendment #1 for WSP USA, Inc. to provide additional design related services for the integrated controls and special services for subsurface utility investigation. The revised overall basic service fee of $2,843,070 amounts to 6.21% of the construction budget and is well within the recommended guideline rate of 10.5% for this Group B Renovation Project with Group A Site Improvements.

FROM PRB # 17-197
PROJECT BRIEF— In general this project involves the complete renovation and equipment replacement of the existing 9,700-GSF Central Plant. The project will include the design of a new boiler system with a dual fuel system (natural gas and #2 fuel oil back-up), new chillers, variable drive pumps, and cooling tower cells. The project scope will also include the complete renovation of the existing plant, a new centralized building management control system, updated fire alarm system and planned expansion space. Due to the ongoing system failures, the project scope will also include the complete replacement of all 32,000-LF of 10-inch hot water and chilled water supply and return underground piping that services the system. This work will include all the required valve replacements and vault connections to connect all eighteen buildings located on the campus. As part of the initial project scope, the overall construction and total project budget have been established at $45,800,000 and $60,000,000 respectively.

This contract with the Engineer (WSP) was signed on 7/31/2017 for the completion of the York Correctional Central Plant and Distribution Project from the schematic design phase through the construction document phase, bidding and the subsequent completion of construction. The overall compensation rate for this basic service was $2,755,570 with an additional $211,600 for special services. As such the total project fee is $2,967,170. The special services detailed in the project scope include geotechnical/environmental engineering (test borings and pits only), land surveying and a design contingency.

FEE – The costs of basic and special services are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSP Fee for Basic Services (PRB #17-197)</th>
<th>COST ($) (BASIC)</th>
<th>COST ($) (SPECIAL)</th>
<th>C. Budget ($)</th>
<th>(%) Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design Phase</td>
<td>$440,891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Phase</td>
<td>$551,114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Document Phase</td>
<td>$836,671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding and Review Phase</td>
<td>$110,223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Administration Phase</td>
<td>$836,671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#17-197) (A)</td>
<td>$2,755,570</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,800,000</td>
<td>6.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIAL SERVICES:

| Survey (Martinson Couch)                | $131,000        |                    |              |           |
| Geotech & Environmental Engineering (GeoDesign) | $55,600 | | |
| BCS Design Contingency                  | $25,000         |                    |              |           |
| TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B)                | $211,600        |                    |              |           |
| Amendment #1 (#18-135) - additional controls work for system integration (A1) | $87,500 | | |
| Additional Special Services - Ground Penetrating Radar (B1) | $53,850 | | |
| NEW BASIC SERVICE FEE (A) + (A1)        | $2,843,070      |                    | $45,800,000  | 6.215     |
| NEW PROJECT TOTAL FEE (A) + (A1) + (B) + (B1) | $3,108,520 | $45,800,000 | 6.795 |

- The RFQ posted in October 2016 elicited 7 candidates. The Selection Panel interviewed five firms and ultimately recommended the appointment of WSP USA, Inc. (formerly Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.) ("WSP"). The selection was approved by Commissioner Currey on 2/8/2017.
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- WSP is located in New York City. Parsons Engineering was established in 1985. WSP acquired Parson Brinckerhoff, Inc. in 2014 and rebranded the firm as WSP USA, Inc. in 2016. WSP will be operating under its engineering corporation license PEX.0001890. The license is valid until 07/31/2017.

- JLT Specialty Insurance Inc. reported that over the past 5 years WSP has been exposed to fourteen general liability or professional liability claims. None of these claims were on state funded projects administered by DCS.

- The submittal is accompanied by a Consulting Agreement Affidavit notarized on 5/17/2017.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that **APPROVE** this new contract for WSP USA, Inc. (formerly Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.) to provide design related services at the **York Correctional Central Plant and Distribution Project.** The overall blended basic service rate of 6.01% is well within the established guideline rate of 10.50% for this Group B Renovation Project with Group A Site Improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRB #</th>
<th>19-175</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin/Client:</td>
<td>DCS/DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction/Contract Type</td>
<td>AE / Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>BI-JA-465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract:</td>
<td>BI- JA-465-ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant:</td>
<td>WSP, USA, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>East Lyme, W. Main St (201) – York CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Purpose:</td>
<td>Central Plant and Piping Distribution System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Purpose:</td>
<td>Amendment #2 to compensate the consultant for architect services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED AMOUNT:** $145,551

**PROJECT BRIEF:** Southern Connecticut State University ("SCSU") has requested construction administration services during the construction phase of the project. The scope of project is as follows:

Scope of Project:
- Replacement of brick shelf angles at four dormitory buildings – Chase Hall, Wilkinson Hall, Neff Hall and Hickerson Hall
- Removal and replacement of a few courses of bricks and the shelf angle at each level of these 4 buildings
- Repairs to the slate panels at Neff Hall
- Installation of a solar film at the windows at locations identified on the project drawings

Under this proposed Task Letter #2 DAS/DCS is seeking SPRB approval as the total project fee exceeds the threshold cost of $100,000.

As detailed in the proposed Task Letter #2 with Jacobs Project Management Co ("JPM"), the fee is intended to compensate the Consultant for the following construction phase services:

- Scheduling
- Supervision and Inspection;
- Project Meetings;
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- Documentation, Records, and Reporting;
- Change Orders;
- Construction Budget;
- Project Closeout;
- Payments to the Contractor; and
- Claims and Disputes.

The work will be done in two phases with the project duration estimated at 548 days plus 90 days for closeout.

An executed Form 1105 has been submitted. CSCU confirmed funding is in place for CA services totaling $149,914 via CHEFA Bond Funding.

In June 2017, SPRB approved Jacobs Property Management Co. ("JPM") (PRB #17-148) as one of seven firms under the latest On-Call Construction Administration Series of consultant contracts. These contracts have a common expiration date of January 31, 2020 as approved by the Board under PRB #15-158 and have a maximum cumulative fee of $1,000,000.

JPM has been approved for the following task(s) under this series:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Letter #1</th>
<th>Carl Robinson CI - Bathroom Renovations</th>
<th>$187,920 (#18-226)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total Fee to Date: $187,920

DCS also presented CF-RC-402-CA in the amount of $592,370, for Jacobs Project Management Co. to provide CA Services for the Manafort Drive Parking Garage Project at CCSU approved by the Board under PRB #18-403.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Letter #2 – JPM Basic Services Fee (#19-191)</th>
<th>CA Base Fees ($)</th>
<th>Special Services</th>
<th>Total Fee</th>
<th>Construction Budget ($)</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#19-191) (A)</td>
<td>$145,551</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,400,000</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff have requested clarification of the following issues:

1. Why, in this proposal, DCS is utilizing a $6,400,000 budget (SPRB Memo and B1105) when on August 5, 2019, DCS awarded a $2,119,633 contract to Armani Restoration for this work? Why does the contract (page 6) reference construction budget as $4,500,000? DCS Response: At the time the budget and the Task Letter was prepared, the GC contract was not awarded. $4.5M was the cost estimate provided by the architect for the project. OK

2. Based on the actual $2,119,633 construction cost, and the DCS CA Services guideline for maximum consultant compensation rate of 5.0%, indicate a maximum consultant fee of $105,982, or $39,569 less than the proposed contract. Please clarify why DCS is seeking approval to exceed their guideline based on the actual construction cost? DCS Response: The increased cost is due to the coverage (actual manhours) required by the CA during construction. The state is only receiving half time on-site presence with the proposed fees. I do not believe the 5% rule will provide enough coverage by the CA during the construction of this project. Also proposed fee is 3.2% of the CD cost estimate. OK
3. Please provide the final construction cost estimates prepared by the Architect during the CD Phase of their contract. 

**DCS Response:** Please find the attached cost estimate from the Architect during the CD phase. OK

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that the Board APPROVE this TL#2 in the amount of $145,551. The fee is 6.8% which is over 5% guidelines. It seems reasonable for the type of work being undertaken.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

8. VOTES ON PRB FILE:

**PRB FILE #19-175** – Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Berger seconded a motion to approve PRB FILE #19-175. The motion failed with all Members voting against.

**PRB FILE #19-191** – Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Berger seconded a motion to approve PRB FILE #19-191. The motion passed unanimously.

9. NEXT MEETING – Special Meeting, Wednesday, October 2, 2019

The meeting adjourned.

**APPROVED:**

John Valengavich, Secretary

Date: 10/2/19