

STATE PROPERTIES REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of Meeting Held On December 3, 2020 – remotely via telephone conference –

Pursuant to Governor Lamont's Executive Order No. 7B regarding suspension of In-Person Open Meeting requirements, the State Properties Review Board conducted its Regular Meeting at 9:30AM on December 3, 2020 remotely via telephone conference at (866)-692-4541, passcode 85607781.

Members Present:

Edwin S. Greenberg, Chairman
Bruce Josephy, Vice Chairman
John P. Valengavich, Secretary
Jack Halpert
Jeffrey Berger
William Cianci

Members Absent:

Staff Present:

Dimple Desai
Thomas Jerram

Guests Present

Stephen Burke, DCS
Shane Mallory, Administrator DAS Leasing & Property Transfer

At Chairman Greenberg's request, Vice Chairman Josephy led the meeting.

Vice Chairman Josephy called the meeting to order.

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Halpert 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 November 30, 2020 Meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

2. COMMUNICATIONS

Staff presented the Board with a monthly voucher statement pursuant to CGS 13a-73(h) identifying DOT real estate acquisitions for less than \$5,000.

3. REAL ESTATE- UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. REAL ESTATE – NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Halpert seconded a motion to go out of Open Session and into Executive Session at 10:04. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Shane Mallory was invited into the executive session to participate in the Board's review of this proposal. Mr. Mallory left the meeting at 10:37.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

PRB #: 20-224
Transaction/Contract Type: RE/ Lease

Origin/Client: DAS/ JUD

Statutory Disclosure Exemptions: 4b-23(e), 1-200(6)(D) & 1-210(b)(24)

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Berger seconded a motion to go out of Executive Session and into Open Session at 10:40. The motion passed unanimously.

OPEN SESSION

5. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - NEW BUSINESS

PRB #	20-216
Origin/Client:	DCS/DAS
Transaction/Contract Type	AE / Amendment
Project Number	BI-2B-381
Contract	BI-2B-381-ARC
Consultant:	Amenta/Emma Architects, P.C.
Property	Hartford, Capitol Ave (165)
Project purpose:	State Office Building Renovation
Item Purpose	Amendment #4

Mr. Stephen Burke joined the meeting at 9:33 to participate in the review of this Proposal. Mr. Burke left the meeting at 10:00.

CONSULTANT FEE: \$300,525

On August 10, 2020, under PRB File #20-141, the Board approved Amendment #3 to the ARC Contract to provide expanded design services totaling \$130,700, for the following scope of services:

- Build-out design services for Trinity Street employee relocation (\$101,500);
- Comptroller-requested workstation redesign (\$7,100);
- Screening at Breakrooms (\$20,150); and
- Lobby Desk Retrofit (\$1,950).

Under this Proposal (PRB #20-216), DCS is now seeking approval of AMENDMENT #4 to the ARC Contract to compensate the ARC Consultant an additional \$300,525 for additional ARC Design Services and ARC CA Services in conjunction with an early start of the renovation of the State Office Building (SOB) and Work Authorization Orders (WAOs):

- Expanded “phase two” Schematic Design Phase Services and Furniture Services as originally laid out in Amendment 3: Eight Thousand Dollars (\$8,000).
 - i. Schematic Design Phase (\$7,000)
Amenta/Emma’s original proposal for the “phase two” work dated 3-17-2020, included the preparation of a Schematic Floor Plan, review with each agency, and a maximum of two revisions. Due to DAS and OPM’s continued negotiations with both the Office of Ethics and the Freedom of Information Commission. The Consultant was asked to participate in additional calls, as well as produce several iterations of each agency’s suite. Fee covers the additional time spent by Amenta/Emma to receive approval by all agencies.
 - ii. Furniture Services (\$1,000)
Per the approved Schematic Design Floor Plan, Room G032J (previously a Training Room) was added to the scope of the project. All furniture services as outlined in the Consultant’s original proposal for the “phase two” work dated 3-17-2020 will be provided in order to convert the

room into the FOI Commissioners' Library and Supply Room. Changes are limited to furniture only.

- Expanded Construction Administration Services
 1. This compensation is due the Consultant due to the early start (WAOs and multiple GMP Amendments, but figuring CA services started at GMP amendment 2 on 11/8/2017) and the staggered move in which increased the project duration, causing the Consultant to expend more than 792 days of CA services. The period of time they are due compensation is calculated as follows:
 - Construction start at Gilbane Building Company's GMP Amendment 2 - 11/8/2017 (1/31/2018).
 - Plus AE original contract of 720 days gets to 10/19/2019 (1/21/2020)
 - Plus the 10% owed or 72 days gets to 1/9/2020. (4/2/2020)
 - 1/9/2020 to project final substantial completion on 6/15/2020 is the time Amenta/Emma is owed compensation in this amendment.

DCS states there will be no additional Construction Administration fee granted after this Amendment.

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

AEA Fee for Basic Services (PRB 14-133)	COST (\$) (BASIC)	COST (\$) (SPECIAL)	TOTAL FEE	C. Budget (\$)	(%) Budget
PRE-DESIGN STUDY TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#14-133) (A)	\$750,170			\$146,000,000	0.51%
SPECIAL SERVICES:					
Structural Engineering & Invasive Testing (Simpson Gumpertz and Heger)		\$75,000			
Geotechnical & Borings (Wolti Assoc.)		\$38,000			
Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessments (Fuss & O'Neill Inc.)		\$119,000	-		
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B)		\$232,000			
TOTAL FEE (PRB #14-133) (A) + (B)			\$982,170	\$146,000,000	0.67%
SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (A1)	\$2,000,000				
Geotechnical & Borings (Wolti Assoc.) (B1)		\$57,570	-		
BASIC SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (A) + (A1)	\$2,750,170			\$146,000,000	1.88%
SPECIAL SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (B) + (B1)		\$289,570			
TOTAL FEE (PRB #15-240) (A)+(A1) + (B)+(B1)			\$3,039,740	\$146,000,000	2.08%
PRB #16-240 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #1 – COMPLETION OF PROJECT DESIGN SERVICES AND ADDITIONAL TESTING	\$12,361,000	\$846,750	-		
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#16-240) (A) + (A1) + (A2)	\$15,111,170			\$139,736,664	10.81%
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES FEE (#16-240) (B) + (B1) + (B2)		\$1,136,320			
TOTAL FEE (PRB #16-240) (A)+(A1)+(A2)+(B)+(B1)+(B2)			\$16,247,490	\$139,736,664	11.63%
PRB #18-029 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #2 – COMPLETION OF PROJECT DESIGN SERVICES AND ADDITIONAL TESTING	\$241,284				
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#18-029) (A) + (A1) + (A2) + (A3)	\$15,352,454			\$139,736,664	10.99%
PRB #20-141 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #3 – Relocation of Trinity St Staff & Other Design Services (A4)	\$130,700				
PRB #20-216 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #4 – Expanded CA Services & Design Services (A5)	\$300,525				
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#20-141) (A) + (A1) + (A2) + (A3)+(A4)+(A5)	\$15,783,679			\$164,296,713	9.61%
TOTAL PROJECT FEE			\$16,919,999	\$164,296,713	10.30%

Staff have the following questions based on the review of the proposal.

- GMP, Amendment #2, dated 11-8-17, was approved by the AG on 11-14-17. This GMP #2 was specific to the demolition/reconstruction of the parking garage and select work within the SOB. Within GMP #2, the following WAOs were referenced:

WAO	Activity	WAO Cost	WAO Start	End
#1	Parking Garage Demo & Abatement	\$2,677,314	3/27/2017	1/31/2018
#2	Parking Garage Structural Precast Design, Fabrication & Sitework.	\$16,694,442	6/16/2017	1/31/2018
#3	State Office Building Demo & Abatement	\$12,217,515	8/23/2017	1/31/2018
#4	State Office Building Glass & Glazing Procurement	\$4,188,167	9/14/2017	1/31/2018

GMP #3, dated 1/31/18, was approved by the AG on 1-31-18. This GMP #3 was specific to the addition of the renovation of the SOB to the GMP and commenced the 720 construction period upon approval of the GMP. Within GMP #3, substantial completion was estimated at 1-23-2020 and final acceptance on 4-22-2020. Based on GMP #3 approval date, the 720 plus 10% would be beginning of April 2020.

NAME	Amenta Emma CA Hours from 1/9/20 to 6/15/20						Total Hours	Rate/Hr	Total
	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUNE			
Anthony Amenta - Principal-in-Charge	6	11	8	8	9	3	45	\$225	\$10,125
Robert Swain - Principal/165 PM	6	16	14	14	8	6	64	\$225	\$14,400
Peter Bowman - Construction Admin.	92	102	104	84	50	24	456	\$140	\$63,840
Kyle Cruz - Project Architect	66	158	154	121	125	58	682	\$135	\$92,070
Rob Adams - Assoc. Princ./ Senior Int. Des.	3	4	8	10	5	2	32	\$165	\$5,280
Dennis Faga - Interior PM / 165 Project Architect	20	18	12	10	8	4	72	\$165	\$11,880
Michelle Lanney - Project Architect			3				3	\$135	\$405
TOTAL	193	309	303	247	205	97	1354		\$198,000

- Clarify when the ARC's CA services started – NTP date. Provide a copy of NTP letter/authorization.

DCS Response: Amenta Emma's Construction Phase Services began 11/8/2017 with the approval of Gilbane's GMP Amendment 2, which was the start of construction for the Garage. We are working to dig up the NTP letter.

Staff Response: Will wait for NTP letter. Per GMP #2 contract, the construction phase duration will commence when the State Office Building work will be added. This work was added to the 3rd amendment to the GMP which was signed on 1/31/2018. Therefore, the construction start date should be 1/31/2018.

- Why is the ARC seeking compensation from 1/2020 to 6/2020 and not the early start period?

DCS Response: Because their contract duration of 792 days began 11/8/2017, it ended 1/9/2020. So they are seeking compensation for when their contract ran out. This is the same way that Skanska's request was portrayed and approved in their Amendment 1 from 3/9/2020.

Staff Response: The construction phase duration commenced on approval of the GMP #3 – 1/31/2018. Also, why is CA time for closeout not excluded from this extension? See your response to item #12 about Certificate of Acceptance.

- Why didn't DCS seek the Board approval when additional time was spent outside of the approved ARC's contract timeframe during the early start period?

DCS Response: The ARC's construction phase services started just when it should have, at the start of construction, Gilbane Amendment 2, 11/8/2017. The ARC's contract does not have a timeframe of dates to operate within, just a duration. This is why they are seeking compensation for the end period (1/2020 to 6/2020)

Staff Response: The construction phase duration commended on approval of the GMP #3.

4. Provide staffing matrix from when the ARC's CA staff spent time during the early start (11/8/17-1/31/18)

DCS Response: We will work on getting this from Amenta Emma.

Staff Response: OK, will wait for the info.

5. Did DCS approve additional time of early start?

DCS Response: Not sure what this question is asking.

Staff Response: Was ARC/CA contract amended to include the early start?

6. Why is DCS considering GMP #2 for CA's start of services vs GMP #3?

DCS Response: Amendment 2 was the start of construction for the garage, hence the start of the ARC's Construction Phase Services.

Staff Response: Per the GMP #2, the start of 720 days would be when the State Office Building work was added and approved as part of GMP #3, dated 1/31/2018

7. What services did ARC/CA provide after the approval of the GMP#2?

DCS Response: Construction Phase Services as outlined in their contract.

Staff Response: provide specific tasks they worked on.

8. When did construction begin per GMP #3?

DCS Response: GMP 3 was when the Office Building construction began, 2/1/2018.

Staff Response: OK

9. Why is Anthony Amenta and Robert Swain both charging Principal hourly rates?

DCS Response: They are both Principals at Amenta Emma Architects and were both involved.

Staff Response: It shows Robert Swain as 165 PM. Is it customary to have two principals working on the same project? Pl provide the staffing structure chart when ARC contract was approved.

10. Who is responsible for material delays and material inconsistencies and associated ARC's time?

DCS Response: The marble supplier in Turkey. It was very difficult coordinating with a stone company overseas. We pushed as hard as we could and used what little leverage we had on a company residing in a foreign country.

Staff Response: Per 10/5/2020 proposal from Amenta Emma, the design team spent additional time for material delays and material inconsistencies. Pl clarify what these delays and inconsistencies are and responsible entity.

11. Per GMP#3, the substantial completion date was 1/23/2020. Why was the substantial completion date delayed till 6/15/20? Has this extension been formalized/approved in writing by DCS and approved by the AG's office? What are the reasons for the delays?

DCS Response: For the record, the project team met every move in date that was required by DAS FM. This was a very challenging project. The time extension was signed off via change order #260 signed by the Deputy Commissioner (attached). Our change orders do not have to go to the AG. Also attached is the signed certificate of substantial completion dated 6/15/2020. Significant items that contributed to the delay in final substantial completion were:

1. Department of Public Health's reversal of position regarding <1% asbestos in the plaster.
2. Discovery of an unknown mudslab under the basement floor slab.
3. Delay in marble coordination and shipments from the shop in Turkey.

Staff Response: As mentioned in item #11 above, Amenta Emma's proposal references time spent to address material delays and material inconsistencies. Pl clarify what those are and who is responsible for those.

12. Per GMP#3, the acceptance date was 4/22/20. Has the project been accepted and if yes, what is the date?

DCS Response: Yes final acceptance was 6/22/2020, see attached signed Certificate of Acceptance.

Please keep in mind, this request is the exact same amendment that was granted for Skanska, the CA for the project, on 3/9/2020.

Staff Response: The Board will decide if this amendment is exactly same or not.

13. Why BVH's services are considered extended services?
14. Pl provide what services were provided by Fuss and O'Neill during this time?

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation to the Amendment #4 to compensate consultant for additional design & CA services for the continuing renovation to the State Office Building will depend on DCS responses. The overall basic service fee of \$300,525 is equivalent to approximately 9.61% of the \$164,296,713 construction budget and is within the 11.5% maximum guideline rate for this Group B Project.

DCS provided responses to Board inquiries prior to the meeting. Given the lack of time to thoroughly review the responses, it was recommended to suspend this file to permit review of the DCS responses.

FROM PRB #20-141

CONSULTANT FEE: \$130,700

On March 1, 2018, under PRB File #18-029, the Board approved Amendment #2 to the contract to provide expanded design services totaling \$241,284, for the following scope.

- Parking Structure Wall & Program Revisions
- East Lot Design Revisions
- Elevator Replacement
- Special Inspection Services

Under this proposed AMENDMENT 3 with Amenta/Emma Architects, P.C., the fee is intended to compensate the Consultant an additional \$130,700 for additional ARC Services in conjunction with the following scope of services:

- Build-out design services for Trinity Street employee relocation (\$101,500):
There are approximately 9,875 square feet of vacant space on the Ground Floor (G033, G050, G104, G105, and G126) and 1,765 square feet of vacant space on the First Floor (Suite 1157) that may be used to house some combination of the agencies identified. Intent is to relocate the Office of the Child Advocate to First Floor Suite 1157, which was fully constructed as part of the initial build out but will require new furniture.
- Comptroller-requested workstation redesign (\$7,100):
The Comptroller has requested (7) existing Type 3 workstations on the south side of the 3rd Floor North Wing be converted into (30) Type 1 workstations. Based on preliminary study, (18) Type 1 workstations can be provided in place of the existing (7) Type 3 stations. Additional power and data will be required.

In the northwest corner of the 3rd Floor North wing, the Comptroller has requested (4) existing Type 3 workstations be converted into (1) Type 3 workstation and (2) Type 2 stations. Based on preliminary study, (2) Type 3 stations and (2) Type 2 stations may be provided in place of the existing bank of (4) Type 3 stations. Existing power and data will support this change.
- Screening at Breakrooms (\$20,150):
Screening elements have been requested by the Attorney General, Comptroller and Treasurer offices for open workstations on the east and west sides of the building that are open to the restrooms and breakrooms. Intent is to reduce visual and noise complaints. On the second, third, and fifth floors, glass panels with applied film in top and bottom channels will be constructed in

front of workstations. A furniture option is to be reviewed and estimated as an alternate.

On the third floor, an additional option will be documented for as an alternate to the screen walls. Four new hard-wall offices have been requested on the west side of the floor in the open workstation area inboard from the window wall in place of four existing Type 3 workstations.

- **Lobby Desk Retrofit (\$1,950):**

Retrofit the existing lobby desk to add a transparent glass screen for the purpose of creating a barrier against the transmission of airborne particles from one side of the screen to the other. The screen should accommodate for clear communications between the sides of the screen and the ability to transfer documents below the screen but above the desk surface.

The following is a breakdown of the Consultant's Proposal:

<u>Fit out of existing spaces for relocated Trinity Street occupants</u>								
	Programmin g	SD	DD	CD	CA	Furnitur e	Sub Total	Total
Architectural	\$8,500	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$10,500	\$72,000	
MEP / FP	\$0	\$5,900	\$5,900	\$11,800	\$5,900	\$0	\$29,500	\$101,500
<u>Comptroller Workstation Changes</u>								
	Prog. + SD	SD	DD	CD	CA	Furnitur e	Sub Total	Total
Architectural	\$2,000	\$0		\$400	\$400	\$2,500	\$5,300	
MEP / FP	\$400	\$0	\$400	\$800	\$200	\$0	\$1,800	\$7,100
<u>Screening at Break Rooms/Office Option</u>								
		SD	DD	CD	CA	Furnitur e	Sub Total	Total
Architectural	\$0	\$750	\$1,500	\$9,500	\$6,000	\$1,500	\$19,250	
MEP / FP	\$0	\$200	\$200	\$400	\$100	NA	\$900	\$20,150
<u>Lobby Desk Retrofit</u>								
		SD	DD	CD	CA	Furnitur e	Sub Total	Total
Architectural	\$0	\$0	\$600	\$750	\$600	NA	\$1,950	\$1,950

DCS has confirmed for SPRB that funding is available for this contract.

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

AEA Fee for Basic Services (PRB 14-133)	<u>COST (\$)</u> <u>(BASIC)</u>	<u>COST (\$)</u> <u>(SPECIAL)</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>FEE</u>	<u>C. Budget (\$)</u>	<u>(%) Budget</u>
PRE-DESIGN STUDY TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#14-133) (A)	\$750,170			\$146,000,000	0.51%
<u>SPECIAL SERVICES:</u>					
Structural Engineering & Invasive Testing (Simpson Gumpertz and Heger)		\$75,000			
Geotechnical & Borings (Welti Assoc.)		\$38,000			
Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessments (Fuss & O'Neill Inc.)		<u>\$119,000</u>	-		
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B)		\$232,000			
TOTAL FEE (PRB #14-133) (A) + (B)			\$982,170	\$146,000,000	0.67%
SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (A1)	<u>\$2,000,000</u>				
Geotechnical & Borings (Welti Assoc.) (B1)		<u>\$57,570</u>	-		
BASIC SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (A) + (A1)	\$2,750,170			\$146,000,000	1.88%
SPECIAL SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (B) + (B1)		\$289,570			
TOTAL FEE (PRB #15-240) (A)+(A1) + (B)+(B1)			\$3,039,740	\$146,000,000	2.08%
PRB #16-240 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #1 – COMPLETION OF PROJECT DESIGN SERVICES AND ADDITIONAL TESTING	<u>\$12,361,000</u>	<u>\$846,750</u>	-		
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#16-240) (A) + (A1) + (A2)	\$15,111,170			\$139,736,664	10.81%
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES FEE (#16-240) (B) + (B1) + (B2)		\$1,136,320			
TOTAL FEE (PRB #16-240) (A)+(A1)+(A2)+(B)+(B1)+(B2)			\$16,247,490	\$139,736,664	11.63%

PRB #18-029 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #2 – COMPLETION OF PROJECT DESIGN SERVICES AND ADDITIONAL TESTING	<u>\$241,284</u>				
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#18-029) (A) + (A1) + (A2) + (A3)	\$15,352,454			\$139,736,664	10.99%
PRB #20-141 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #3 – Relocation of Trinity St Staff & Other Design Services (A4)	<u>\$130,700</u>				
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#20-141) (A) + (A1) + (A2) + (A3)+(A4)	\$15,483,154			\$164,296,713	9.42%
TOTAL PROJECT FEE			\$16,619,474	\$164,296,713	10.11%

Staff have requested clarification of the following issues:

Staff asked DCS to clarify the following:

1.Reason/s why this has to be done this way and not the normal way of securing consultant through regular process?

DCS Response: This was the direction from Noel. It will be faster to use Amenta Emma and the current team to do this as a change that it would to start a new project and go through the selection process.

DCS Legal: I would not characterize as abnormal the utilization of an existing design professional for additional work involving the same building as the base design. There is, moreover, ample justification for doing so here. There has been an expressed desire to move forward with the design and construction in the most expeditious and cost effective manner as possible so that the State of Connecticut can vacate the Trinity Street properties. Maintaining the same team that is in the process of completing the State Office Building renovations is the best means of accomplishing these goals. They are mobilized and knowledgeable of the building. Much of the work under the amendment includes a re-design or re-work of space that had been included in the base design. The architect can rely on the CMR for cost estimating throughout the design process.

Viewing the role of the architect in this process, as you know from reviewing past contracts and task letters, a design professional new to a project needs to engage in certain initial tasks. These include review of existing drawings, specifications, surveys, reports and other available documents; perform field inspections and measurements of existing conditions and problem areas; verify the configuration of existing space; verify the type and condition of applicable systems; and, prepare a report certifying the performance of such investigations and indicating the buildings capabilities, limitations and deficiencies. As you can see from the draft of the Amendment, utilization of the existing architectural firm eliminates the need for these initial tasks, and the firm can begin with programming for the space. In the present situation, the additional work also includes the architect's subconsultant for MEP work. Utilization of the same subconsultant who designed these systems is critical for maintaining the schedule and cost effectiveness of the additional work.

Keeping the same project team avoids the possibility, further, of coordination of work among prime contractors, the potential for impacting existing warranties, and confusion as to project labor agreement work versus non-project labor agreement work. OK

2.The hourly rates identified are 2020 rates. How do they compare with the rates from earlier amendments?

DCS Response: The rates are higher. Keep in mind the original contract was signed 5 years ago in 2015.

DCS Legal: The design professional's rates are slightly higher than the on-call architect contract series rates from 2019. For example, the principal's rate under the on-call series ranges from \$170 to \$240 per hour, the project manager from \$125 to \$160 and the senior architect/designer from \$110 to \$165. OK

3.Estimate total project cost (for the additional services) and % of the architect's fee

DCS Response: This part of the project is estimated at \$1,751,862.00 (Amount allocated at OPM but not transferred to DCS as of yet). AE fee is 7% of that at \$128,750.00 OK

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that SPRB **APPROVE** Amendment #3 to compensate consultant for additional design & CA services for the continuing renovation to the State Office Building. The overall basic service fee of \$130,100 is equivalent to approximately 7.5% of the \$1,751,862 construction budget and is within the 11.5% maximum guideline rate for this Group B Project.

Re: PRB # 18-029, Standard Fixed-Fee—A/E Services Contract – Amendment #2
State Office Building Renovation & New Parking Garage Project – Hartford
Project #BI-2B-381-ARC– Amenta/Emma Architects, P.C. - Total Fee \$241,284

PROJECT BRIEF– In general this project involves the design and construction for the complete renovation of the existing State Office Building (“SOB”) located at 165 Capitol Avenue in Hartford. The overall project is envisioned to include the complete restoration of the 350,000 GSF state office building, the demolition of the Buckingham Street Parking Garage, construction of a new parking garage, various internal site improvements and public space enhancements. The SOB was originally built in 1931 and is a limestone clad structure with two partial basements, a ground floor access level and five upper floors. The overall project is also envisioned to include additional improvements such as a new surface parking lot, creation of a public plaza, streetscape enhancements and various ADA upgrades.

In May 2013 the Department of Construction Services (“DCS”) issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Architect & Consultant Design Teams related to the State Office Building Renovation and New Parking Garage Project. At the conclusion of the process DCS identified Amenta/Emma Architects, P.C., (“AEA”) as the most qualified firm. In May 2014, SPRB approved the contract (PRB

#14-133) for AEA to provide design and engineering services for the completion of a predesign study which focused the evaluation of various existing conditions within the building and site. The overall compensation rate approved by the Board under PRB #14-133 included \$750,170 for basic services with an additional \$232,000 in special services. As such the total project fee approved by the Board was \$982,170. The special services detailed in the approved project scope included Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments, Hazardous Building Material Surveys, Site Borings/Geotechnical Engineering, Invasive Structural Engineering Evaluations and Traffic Engineering. The scope of work under this contract was finalized and submitted to DCS in January 2015 as the Final Conditions Assessment and Concept One Program Document Report.

In October 2015, the Board approved a new contract (PRB File #15-240) AEA to provide Architect/Engineer Consultant Design Team Services for the completion of “Programming and Schematic Design Phase Services” as required for the State Office Building Renovation and New Parking Garage Project.

The overall scope of this approved contract was to compensate AEA for the initiation and completion of the schematic design and programming phase. It was envisioned that this design phase will enable AEA to key project program around three primary agencies: Office of the Attorney General, Office of the State Comptroller and the Office of the State Treasurer. The approved project scope was also intended to focus on design standards to achieve initial programming data (20% offices, required conference rooms, support space, shared space and public access), new municipal utility connections, new MEP and life safety systems, installation of all new code compliant plumbing and electrical services as well as a new food servery area. The project scope also included the restoration of the limestone panels, roof replacement, new exterior windows, renovations to the existing courtyard and all of the required coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office. The approved schematic design phase program was based on a construction budget of \$146M.

More recently in October 2016 (PRB File #16-240) the Board approved Contract Amendment #1 to compensate the consultant for the following additional project services:

- FF&E Programming – design and management services for the specification, selection and layout of “loose” furniture.
- Animation Model – Development of an animated rendering detailing the redeveloped site and surrounding area.
- Elevator Study – Evaluation of existing elevator systems inclusive of Code and ADA requirements.
- Destructive Testing Analysis – Evaluation and Testing of Various existing conditions as part of the design process.

CONTRACT AMENDMENT #2 (PRB File #18-029): DCS has now submitted Contract Amendment #2 to the Board which will compensate AEA for the following additional services:

- Parking Structure Wall & Program Revisions – design and management services for the required design modification to develop a single pre-cast panel consistent with the architectural wall assembly developed by the design team. It is envisioned that the single wall assembly will save both construction dollars and inter-trade coordination requirements. The design team is also limiting the overall height of the structure and the extent of underground construction to address existing soil conditions, rock profiles and footing drain requirements.
- East Lot Design Revisions– Due to the recently planned residential development within this area the surface parking lot details for the site are being removed from the project scope. Only minor grading and drainage improvements are now being planned for this area.
- Elevator Replacement – Replacement of the existing elevator systems inclusive of Code and ADA requirements. This work is being done per the recommendation of the 2017 Elevator Study completed by AEA.
- Special Inspection Services – Completion of special inspection requirements as developed and outlined in the statement of special inspections.

DCS has confirmed for SPRB that funding is available for this contract. Project funding was approved at the September 2015 Meeting of the State Bond Commission.

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

AEA Fee for Basic Services (PRB 14-133)	COST (\$) (BASIC)	COST (\$) (SPECIAL)	C. Budget (\$)	(%) Budget
PRE-DESIGN STUDY TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#14-133) (A)	\$750,170		\$146,000,000	0.51%
<u>SPECIAL SERVICES:</u>				
Structural Engineering & Invasive Testing (Simpson Gumpertz and Heger)		\$75,000		
Geotechnical & Borings (Welti Assoc.)		\$38,000		
Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessments (Fuss & O'Neill Inc.)		<u>+\$119,000</u>		
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B)		\$232,000		
TOTAL FEE (PRB #14-133) (A) + (B)		\$982,170	\$146,000,000	0.67%
SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (A1)	<u>+\$2,000,000</u>			
Geotechnical & Borings (Welti Assoc.) (B1)		<u>+\$57,570</u>		
BASIC SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (A) + (A1)	\$2,750,170		\$146,000,000	1.88%
SPECIAL SERVICE FEE (#15-240) (B) + (B1)		\$176,570		
PRB #16-240 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #1 – COMPLETION OF PROJECT DESIGN SERVICES AND ADDITIONAL TESTING	<u>+\$12,361,000</u>	<u>+\$846,750</u>		
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#16-240) (A) + (A1) + (A2)	\$15,111,170		\$139,736,664	10.81%
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES FEE (#16-240) (B) + (B1) + (B2)		\$1,023,320		
PRB #18-029 – CONTRACT AMENDMENT #1 – COMPLETION OF PROJECT DESIGN SERVICES AND ADDITIONAL TESTING	<u>+\$241,284</u>			
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#18-029) (A) + (A1) + (A2) + (A3)	<u>+\$15,352,454</u>		\$139,736,664	10.99%
TOTAL PROJECT FEE		\$16,375,774	\$139,736,664	11.72%

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that SPRB APPROVE Contract Amendment #2 for Amenta/Emma Architects, P.C. to provide additional design services for the State Office Building Renovation and New Parking Garage Project. The overall basic service fee of \$15,111,000 is equivalent to approximately 10.99% of the \$139,000,000+ construction budget and is generally consistent with the 11.5% maximum guideline rate for this Group B Project.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

8. VOTES ON PRB FILE:

PRB FILE #20-224 – Mr. Berger moved and Mr. Valengavich seconded a motion to approve PRB FILE #20-224. The motion passed unanimously.

PRB FILE #20-216 – Mr. Berger moved and Mr. Halpert seconded a motion to suspend PRB FILE #20-216. The motion passed unanimously.

9. NEXT MEETING – Monday, December 7, 2020.

The meeting adjourned.

APPROVED: _____ **Date:** _____
John Valengavich, Secretary