

# STATE PROPERTIES REVIEW BOARD

## Minutes of Meeting Held On July 11, 2022 – 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 July 11, 2022 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**

Ashour Gevargisnia, PM  
Peter Simmons, ADPM

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 July 7, 2022 Meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

### **2. COMMUNICATIONS**

Director Desai reminded the Board about their Site Visit to a Farm in Bolton being reviewed under PRB #22-108-A. The Meeting will start at 10AM. Directions will be sent via email after this morning's meeting.

### **3. REAL ESTATE- UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **4. REAL ESTATE – NEW BUSINESS**

### **5. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **6. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - NEW BUSINESS**

**PRB #:** 22-101  
**Origin/Client:** DCS/DMHAS  
**Transaction/Contract Type:** AE / Task Letter  
**Project Number:** BI-MH-113  
**Contract:** OC-DCS-CA-0036  
**Consultant:** WSP USA, Inc.  
**Property:** New Haven, Park St (34) Connecticut Community MHC  
**Project purpose:** CMHC Sprinklers, Ceilings, and Lights  
**Item Purpose:** Task Letter #1A

At 9:30 Mssrs. Simmons and Gevargisnia joined the Meeting to participate in the Board’s discussion of this Proposal. Both left the Meeting at 10:28.

PROPOSED AMOUNT: \$460,100

Under prior PRB Files #13-163, 18-144, 20-022 and 21-049, the State Properties Review Board approved Task Letter #6 (OC-DCS-MDE-0026) and Task Letters #3, #3A, and #3B to the On Call Contract OC-DCS-MDE-0035 to provide Multi-Discipline Engineering design and construction administration services for the balance of the sprinkler system not completed in 2002 as well as other general ceiling improvements such as new ceiling tiles, lighting and generator replacement.

Previously, DCS had retained the Consultant under Task Letter #1 (pre-construction phase) and on July 13, 2021, issued Task Letter #1 to provide pre-construction services. The Consultant’s Fee for these services was \$34,000.

The Project was Bid on December 2021, with Bids due February 23, 2022. The Bid Opening was delayed several times, most recently under Addendum #5, with the opening scheduled on April 8, 2022.

<b>Cost Estimate Range:</b>	\$ 5,409,485.00	To \$	5,978,904.00
<b>Date Plans &amp; Specs Ready:</b>	12-20-2021		
<b>Plans and Specs Download:</b>	Plans and Specs are available for electronic download from <b>CTsource</b> .		
<b>Contract Time Allowed:</b>	<b>Calendar Days:</b>	720	
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$ 2,213.00	Per Calendar Day Beyond Substantial Completion.	
	\$ 1,013.00	Per Calendar Day Beyond 90 days After Substantial Completion.	

No information is available to ascertain if DCS awarded the contract to one of the Bidders.

Under this Proposal (#22-101), DCS is now seeking approval of an additional \$460,100 to compensate the Consultant, WSP USA, Inc., for the following Scope of Work:

Provide construction administrator services during the 720-day construction phase; and Commissioning agent services.

DCS provided the following narrative in support of this request:

Supplemental request for Construction Administration services during Construction phase for the installation of a full sprinkler system, new flooring, new ceiling & lighting, new generator, a new fire pump, and associated work at CMHC: 34 Park Street, New Haven, CT 06519 as outlined in the proposal from WSP USA Inc.

The Construction Administrator’s responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following:

The Construction Administrator will monitor the General Contractor’s performance, scheduling and construction, process, shop drawings, material, and equipment submittals, review and process



3. Please provide the CA's review of the preliminary cost estimates prepared under informal Task Letter #1A.

**DCS Response:** Was no Fee available for the CA to perform cost estimate review and the scope was not included as part of Task 1A for preconstruction Services.

**Staff Response:** Article 3 of Informal Task Letter #1A states:

**3. Submittals**

The Consultant shall provide the work pursuant to the following phases within the time periods specified below or, at the option of the DAS, within extended periods to be determined by the DAS if the DAS is of the opinion that such extensions are warranted and if the DAS evidences its consent to such extensions in writing.

**3A. Pre-Construction Phase Submittal:** all submittals stated in the pre-construction phase set forth in the subject on-call contract.

Article A.2 (Pre-Design), Article C.5 (SD), Article D.3 (DD), Article E.1b and E.2b (CD), of the On-Call Contract OC-DCS-CA-0036 required review of preliminary costs. Please clarify if the Consultant provided the Deliverables as set forth in Article 3A of Task Letter #1A.

4. Please clarify if construction phase language in Task Letter #1A should be expanded for clarity to reflect the 90-day period for close out of the Project.

**DCS Response:** The CA's proposal includes Requirements. See attached. CA can revise Task Letter #1B to include.

**Staff Response:** Please revise Task Letter #1B for clarity.

5. Please clarify why DCS elected to negotiate the Consultant's Fee at a total of 5.85% of the construction budget, \$61,350 more than the accepted 5% of construction budget, or (\$360,750), which would indicate a CA-Phase Fee of \$326,750.

**DCS Response:** With the multiple staffing moves during 12 phases of construction the User Agency requested more onsite coordination from the CA than is customary.

**Staff Response:** OK

6. And under Task Letter #1A, Article 1.B.10 requires the Consultant to retain a sub-consultant to provide Cx Services. And under Article V of the On-Call Contract (OC-DCS-CA-0036, page 3 of 23), it states the following:

Commissioning Agent (CxA): If required by DAS, the Construction Administrator shall retain as its sub-consultant a Commissioning Agent. The CxA shall meet the minimum qualifications as established by DAS in Exhibit B, and shall be acceptable to DAS. The CxA will perform the scope of work identified in the task letter in conjunction with the project scope detailed in the task letter. The Construction Administrator shall be compensated for the cost of the Commissioning Agent plus five percent (5%) of such cost for the Construction Administrator's overhead and profit.

The Construction Administrator shall provide a written evaluation of the CxA's performance to date utilizing DAS' form and criteria at the completion of Design Development, Construction Documents, 50% Construction and 100% Construction.

Please clarify how the Consultant provide DCS with an objective evaluation of the Cx when, the Cx is WSP Building Commission Group. This appears to be a related entity, isn't this an inherent conflict?

**DCS Response:** The CA is independent and proposed the use of a related but independent business line for the Cx services.

**Staff Response:** DCS response did not address the inherent conflict.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that SPRB **suspend** Task Letter #1A in the amount of \$460,100 pending further response from DCS.

The overall basic service fee of 5.85% of construction cost exceeds the DCS CA Services guideline of 5.0%.

---

FROM PRB #20-177

PROPOSED AMOUNT: \$12,500 (REVISED)

At the State Properties Review Board meeting held on September 17, 2020, the Board voted to suspend this file pending DCS' resubmission of the Task letter #1C to reflect the following:

1. Correctly reflect the hourly rates for the Consultant's Principal/Project Manager; and
2. Remove the Contingency (\$30,000) clause from the Task Letter.

On October 5, 2020, DCS submitted a revised Task Letter #1C. Within the revised Task Letter, all references to the Consultant's hourly rates and \$30,000 Contingency clause have been removed from the Task Letter.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that SPRB approve Task Letter #1C in the amount of \$12,500 (revised) to provide consulting design and construction administration services on this project. The overall basic service fee of 3.44% is well within the guideline rate of 10.00% for this Group A Site Improvements Renovation Project.

PROPOSED AMOUNT: \$42,500

On October 19, 2015, under PRB File #15-234, the Board approved Task Letter #1 to the on-call contract to retain the services of the consultant for engineering design services, construction administration services and special services for the in-kind replacement of the rehabilitation of an existing two-level parking structure at Greater Bridgeport Community Mental Health Center in Bridgeport, CT. The project includes the addition of surface level parking spaces extending from the upper level of the parking structure, site storm water system upgrades, lead paint removal, and connection to a dedicated storm water system as required by the city. The Consultant Fee for services was \$188,355. The Construction Budget and Total Project Budget were established at \$2,750,000 and \$3,540,230 respectively for this project.

On September 30, 2016, under PRB File #16-229, the Board approved Task Letter #1A to the on-call contract, approving the Consultant's Fee of \$177,765, for the following expanded scope of work:

- Additional Land Surveying and geotechnical engineering around White Street
- Completion of additional site related storm drainage requirements
- Expanded Project Design Requirements for the complete removal of the deteriorated parking deck and construction of a new and expanded deck.
- Construction administration services which will include a review of shop drawings, construction observation reports, coordination of testing labs, RFI reviews, weekly job meetings and review/approval of the contractor requisitions.
- At part of this revised project scope and task letter, DCS has increased the overall Construction Budget and Total Project Budget to \$8,031,911 and \$9,768,847 respectively for this project.

On January 13, 2017, under PRB File #17-185, the Board approved Task Letter #1B to the on-call contract to retain the services of a sub-consultant for expanded survey services, totaling \$2,750. The overall Construction Budget and Total Project Budget remained unchanged at \$8,031,911 and \$9,768,847 respectively.

This project was bid on May 4, 2018 and the bids were rejected on August 23, 2018. DAS intends to rebid this project upon completion of certain of the work contemplated under this supplemental task letter. The project documents now need to be modified to meet current DAS bidding requirements and

the current building code. The consultant performed all their duties associated with previous bidding services, but DAS rejected the bids from 2018.

Under this proposed TASK LETTER #1C with the Consultant, DCS is seeking SPRB approval to expend \$12,500 to compensate the Consultant, plus a \$30,000 contingency, for the following scope of services;

- Perform site visit to review the current conditions to determine if any conditions require changes to the contract documents.
- Update the existing project documents for conformance to the 2018 State Building Code. Update the project document set to the current DAS standards.
- Provide bidding services to rebid the project.
- A design contingency of \$30,000 is included in this amendment. The principal uses of the contingency will be to compensate the Engineer for subsequent document changes resulting from the review of current conditions and for design services of the project's geotechnical engineer during the construction process.

The Construction Budget and total Project Budget have remained at \$9,560,911 and \$12,426,707, respectively.

Task Letter #1– BVH Fee (PRB #15-234)	Engineers Base Fees	Special Services	Total Fee	Construction Budget (\$)	% of Budget
Schematic Phase Documents	\$40,177				
Design Document Phase	\$31,057				
Contract Document Phase	\$49,266				
Tracing & Masters/Bidding	\$1,500				
Construction Administration	<u>\$30,000</u>				
Engineer's Base Fee (PRB #15-234) (A)	\$152,000			\$2,750,000	5.52%
Special & Sub-Consultant Services:					
Geotechnical Engineering		\$15,785			
Site Survey Services		<u>+\$20,570</u>			
Engineer's Special Services Fee (B)		\$36,355			
Task Letter 1A (PRB File #16-229) – Expanded Project Scope (A2) and (B2)	\$161,615	<u>+\$16,150</u>			
Task Letter 1B (PRB File #17-185) – Additional Survey Services (A3)	<u>+\$2,750</u>				
Task Letter 1C (PRB File #20-177) – Additional Survey Services (A4)	<u>+\$12,500</u>				
Contingency		+\$30,000			
Total Basic Service Fee (A1) + (A2) + (A3) + (A4)	\$328,865			\$9,560,911	3.44%
<b>TOTAL PROJECT FEE (A) + (B)</b>		\$82,755	\$411,620	\$12,426,707	3.31%

BVH has been approved for the following Tasks under this on-call series (PRB #14-285):

- |                   |   |                  |             |
|-------------------|---|------------------|-------------|
| • Task Letter #1  | Bridgeport MHC – Replace. Parking Project | \$ 152,000       | (#15-234)   |
| • Task Letter #1A | Bridgeport MHC – Replace. Parking Project | \$ 177,765       | (#16-229)   |
| • Task Letter #1B | Bridgeport MHC – Replace. Parking Project | \$ 2,750         | (#17-185)   |
| • Task Letter #2  | Three Rivers CC Lab Renovations           | \$ 48,757        | (Informal)  |
| • Task Letter #3  | 300 Corporate Roof & RTU Survey           | \$ 23,500        | (Informal)  |
| • Task Letter #4  | HCC Lafayette Hall Renovations Project    | \$ 15,000        | (Informal)  |
| • Task Letter #5  | NVCC Founders Hall Renovations            | \$ 3,900         | (Informal)  |
| • Task Letter #6  | Wethersfield DOC Steamline Replacement    | \$ 15,000        | (Informal)  |
| • Task Letter #7  | Enfield Court House Roof Replacement      | \$ 0             | (Cancelled) |
| • Task Letter #8  | Torrington Court House Drainage Improvs.  | \$ 94,000        | (Informal)  |
|                   | <b>TOTAL FEES</b>                         | <b>\$532,672</b> |             |

Staff had following questions:

1. What is the reason that this project will be submitted for the 3<sup>rd</sup> time to the bid room?

**DCS Response:** When this project originally went to the bid room the DCS front end documents changed at the time same time and the bid package was rejected. The bid package was required to be changed to the new front end. This was not the fault of the A/E, they had met the requirements of the contract at the time of submission.

**Staff Response:** OK

2. Please clarify why DCS rejected bids in August 2018.

. FORMAL / INFORMAL / SET-ASIDE

GECMHC Parking Garage Repairs  
1635 Central Avenue  
Bridgeport, CT  
Project BI-MH-121

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES  
460 COLUMBUS BLVD., SUITE 1302  
HARTFORD, CT 06103

BID OPENING DATE: July 11, 2018  
PROJECT NO.: BI-MH-121  
AGENCY: \$8,353,232 D.A.S.  
PAGE NO: 1 OF 1

Addendum #1, 2, 3, 4, 5

TABULATION OF BIDS

BIDDER	SECURITY	BASE BID	SUPPLEMENTAL BIDS	
Lawrence Bravelli, Inc., Farmington, CT		7,724,000.		
Mumford Brothers Incorporated, Plainville, CT		9,236,000.		
Norral Builders, Inc., Cheshire, CT		9,130,000.		
Lakona Building Group, LLC, Meriden		10,340,000.		
O-G Industries, Inc., Torrington, CT		8,990,000.		

This is certified as a true and accurate summary of bids:  
Apparent low bidder: \_\_\_\_\_  
Base Bid: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Supplement No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Total Bid: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Bid opened: Date: 7/11/2018 Time: 1:00 P.M.  
Witnessed by: *Michelle Walter*

18 JUL 11 PM 1:00  
PROCUREMENT

**DCS Response:** The notification informing all bidders of bid rejections is attached. (20180823144409725).

Thank you for your bid that was opened on July 11, 2018 for the above referenced project. We regret to inform you that in accordance with Section 4b-94 of the Connecticut General Statutes the Department of Administrative Services, Construction Services found cause to reject all bids. The reason for the rejection of all bids is errors, conflicts and ambiguities in the Project Manual that may have resulted in varying interpretations of bid requirements by Bidders that include, but were not limited to, the following:

- Project Scope of Work;
- Base Bid Work;
- Defined Unit Prices work added to or deducted from the Contract Sum;
- Named Subcontractors.

The Project Manual will be revised to correct any errors and ambiguities and the Project will be re-bid in the near future.

**Staff Response:** OK

3. When is DCS planning to rebid this project?

**DCS Response:** DCS will be moving forward with this project as soon as these additional tasks are completed.

**Staff Response:** OK

4. Please clarify the difference in hourly rates for the Principal/Project Manager under this proposal (\$225/\$190 per hour, respectively), with the rates for the same positions recently approved for the Consultant in January 2020 for MEP services (\$220/\$180/hour, respectively), when all other hourly rates for proposed staff under this proposal are identical to the rates under MEP-0048.

**DCS Response:** You are correct this was a typo. These rates will be changed on the TL.

5. Has DCS verified with DEEP whether re-registration of the DEEP Stormwater permit and an extension of Flood Certification will be required? If not, shouldn't that be verified so that the cost can be included in this TL?

DCS Response: DCS Handles the re-registration fee and the designer will not have any significant duties associated with this item and there for should I have no costs associated with this item.

Staff Response: OK

6. What geotech services will be required for the project during the construction phase or it will be provided by others? Should that scope and cost be included with this TL? If others, should the reference be deleted?

DCS Response: A portion of this project involves installing a dedicated storm line in a city street this roughly 750ft of excavation in a local Bridgeport street. We have no way of knowing what Geotech might be required until we open the ground in this area. This is one of the reasons why we are requesting the contingency you mention in item 8.

Staff Response: OK

7. Will Special Inspector be required for this project? If yes, will DCS hire a separate Special Inspector or will BVH hire one? Should the scope and cost be included in this TL?

DCS Response: DCS has a separate internal process for hiring special inspectors and that will not be handled by the A/E.

Staff Response: OK

8. If there are any anticipated additional services for this project, it should be included with this TL and not seek contingency. Contingencies cannot be allowed. Document update based on site visit and code related updates are already included in the scope.

DCS Response: Contingencies have been included in contracts approved by SPRB. The language used for such contingencies and the amount was developed in conjunction with SPRB. We do not expect any additional services at this point. we are using the contingencies to cover any additional services that come up during either construction or additional design revision that may come to light after the field investigations are performed. Our possible needs for the construction phase include possible Geotech services that may be uncovered when excavations begin on both the site and in the surrounding city streets. These Geotech items will not be known until we begin the project and full excavations begin.

Staff Response: Staff inquired with DCS Legal regarding the contingency.

While the concept of a design contingency certainly originated in connection with a particular formal contract, I do not believe that there was a confirmed understanding that its use was limited to only such contracts. Certainly, the related concept of “not to exceed fee” for design services appears in contracts, amendments and task letters. The rationale for utilization of a contingency, moreover, applies to all such contract documents, namely, the authority to proceed with necessary design work, according to the contingency terms, in a timely manner so as to avoid either work stoppages or work being performed prior to a supplemental task letter submission and approval. In this case, there are two situations that provide compelling reasons for its use – the lapse of time since the plans and specifications were completed and bid, and the nature of work. If any condition has changed necessitating a change in design, it can be accomplished without delaying the re-bid. More importantly, the project involves 800 linear feet of excavation in city streets as well as additional excavation on site. Encountering obstructions or unknown site conditions may necessitate additional geotechnical work and resulting design changes to address the conditions. A contingency provides accountability for its use, not only by the terms of the contingency (not within the current scope, not the result of consultant’s deficient or dilatory work etc.), but also in its subsequent submission to, and review by, SPRB. Should the use, cost, or any other factor raise a concern or condition, SPRB has the right to call the matter to our attention to consider on a go-forward basis. I am unaware of any instance where we have reported use of a design contingency that raised any issue with SPRB. And, of course, the contingency is a capped amount.

Lastly, while the total design fee here may be less than a typical formal contract, the construction budget, at \$9.5M, and the work required, is substantial. This is all the more reason for having the flexibility to get the project bid as soon as possible and then to be able to respond to issues as they arise. The amount of the contingency is a small percentage of the project’s construction budget. For these reasons, I think that the contingency is appropriate for this supplemental task letter.

Staff Response: DCS should be submitting a supplementary Task Letter for services, geotechnical services in this instance, when the scope of the services are well defined, not under a blanket contingency with unknown scope.



**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that SPRB suspend Task Letter #1C in the amount of \$42,500 to provide consulting design and construction administration services on this project, pending resubmission of modified task letter to reflect the following changes:

1. Correctly reflect the hourly rates for the Consultant’s Principal/Project Manager; and
2. Remove the Contingency (\$30,000) clause from the Task Letter.

---

**FROM PRB #17-185**

Re: PRB # 17-185 – BVH Integrated Services, P.C. – Task Letter #1B  
Greater Bridgeport Mental Health Center– Phase II – Parking Structure Project  
Project #BI-MH-121, Contract # OC-DCS-MDE-0028, Fixed Fee - \$2,750

---

PROJECT BRIEF– In general, this project involves the required engineering design and construction administration services for the in-kind replacement of the existing concrete deck parking structure as well as an additional 50-60 at grade parking spots. The overall scope of this project is envisioned to include the construction of a new cast in place concrete parking deck with additional amenities such as lighting, walkways, drainage improvements, fire protection and emergency call boxes.

In November 2014, SPRB approved BVH Integrated Services, P.C. (“BVH”) as one of five firms under the 5th *On-Call Multi-Disciplinary Engineering (“MDE”) Consultant Services* contracts. This project is one of seven Task Letters that BVH has been assigned under this series. BVH has been approved for the following task letter(s) to date:

• Task Letter #1	Bridgeport MHC – Replace. Parking Project	\$ 152,000	(#15-234)
• Task Letter #1A	Bridgeport MHC – Replace. Parking Project	\$ 177,765	(#16-229)
• Task Letter #2	Three Rivers CC Lab Renovations	\$ 48,757	(Informal)
• Task Letter #3	300 Corporate Roof & RTU Survey	\$ 23,500	(Informal)
• Task Letter #4	HCC Lafayette Hall Renovations Project	\$ 15,000	(Informal)
• Task Letter #5	HCC Renovations Traffic Improvements	\$ 3,900	(Informal)
• Task Letter #6	Enfield Court House Roof Replacement	\$ 25,000	(Informal)
• Task Letter #7	<u>Torrington Court House Drainage Improvs.</u>	<u>\$ 94,000</u>	<u>(Informal)</u>
	<b>TOTAL FEES</b>	<b>\$539,922</b>	

TASK LETTER #1B is subject to SPRB approval because the combined value of this Task Letter and Task Letters 1 & 1A for this project exceeds \$100,000. The Construction Budget and Total Project Budget were originally established at \$2,750,000 and \$3,540,230 respectively for this project. More recently, DCS has increased the overall Construction Budget and Total Project Budget to \$8,031,911 and \$9,768,847 respectively.

As detailed in the scope letter from BVH to DCS dated April 25, 2017 the \$2,750 is intended to compensate BVH for the following expanded project scope:

- Additional land surveying to add client agency requested revisions to the handicapped and employee parking areas. This work area is outside of the parking garage survey scope of services previously provided in the base contract.

DCS has confirmed that funding is available for this project. As summarized in the following table, the engineer’s *base fee* as a percentage of Construction Budget is as follows:

Task Letter #1– BVH Fee (PRB #15-234)	Engineers Base Fees (\$)	Special Services	Total Fee	Construction Budget (\$)	% of Budget
Schematic Phase Documents	40,177				
Design Document Phase	31,057				
Contract Document Phase	49,266				
Tracing & Masters/Bidding	1,500				
Construction Administration	<u>+30,000</u>				
Engineer’s Base Fee (PRB #15-234) (A)	\$152,000			\$2,750,000	5.52%
Special & Sub-Consultant Services:					
Geotechnical Engineering		15,785			
Site Survey Services		<u>+20,570</u>			
Engineer’s Special Services Fee (B)		\$36,355			
Task Letter 1A (PRB File #16-229) – Expanded Project Scope (A2) and (B2)	\$161,615	<u>+\$16,150</u>			
Task Letter 1B (PRB File #17-185) – Additional Survey Services (A3)	<u>+\$2,750</u>				
Total Basic Service Fee (A1) + (A2) + (A3)	\$316,365				3.94%
<b>TOTAL PROJECT FEE (A) + (B)</b>		\$52,755	\$368,620	\$8,031,911	4.59%

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that SPRB APPROVE Task Letter #1B for BVH Integrated Services, Inc. to provide additional survey services on this project. The overall basic service fee of 3.94% is well within the guideline rate of 10.00% for this Group A Site Improvements Renovation Project.



**FROM PRB #16-229**

Re: PRB # 16-229 – BVH Integrated Services, P.C. – Task Letter #1A  
Greater Bridgeport Mental Center– Phase II – Parking Structure Replacement Project  
Project #BI-MH-121, Contract # OC-DCS-MDE-0028, Fixed Fee - \$177,765

**PROJECT BRIEF**– In general, this project involves the required engineering design and construction administration services for the in-kind replacement of the existing concrete deck parking structure as well as an additional 50-60 at grade parking spots. The overall scope of this project is envisioned to include the construction of a new cast in place concrete parking deck with additional amenities such as lighting, walkways, drainage improvements, fire protection and emergency call boxes.

In November 2014, SPRB approved BVH Integrated Services, P.C. (“BVH”) as one of five firms under the 5th *On-Call Multi-Disciplinary Engineering (“MDE”) Consultant Services* contracts. This project is one of seven Task Letters that BVH has been assigned under this series. BVH has been approved for the following task letter(s) to date:

- Task Letter #2 Three Rivers CC Lab Renovations \$ 48,757 (Informal)
- Task Letter #3 300 Corporate Roof & RTU Survey \$ 23,500 (Informal)
- Task Letter #4 HCC Lafayette Hall Renovations Project \$ 15,000 (Informal)
- Task Letter #5 HCC Renovations Traffic Improvements \$ 3,900 (Informal)
- Task Letter #6 Enfield Court House Roof Replacement \$ 25,000 (Informal)
- Task Letter #7 Torrington Court House Drainage Improvs. \$ 94,000 (Informal)

TOTAL FEES \$210,157

TASK LETTER #1A is subject to SPRB approval because the combined value of this Task Letter and Task Letter 1 for this project exceeds \$100,000. The Construction Budget and Total Project Budget were originally established at \$2,750,000 and \$3,540,230 respectively for this project. As detailed in the scope letter from BVH to DCS dated August 17, 2016 the \$177,765 is intended to compensate BVH for the following expanded project scope:

- Additional Land Surveying and geotechnical engineering around White Street
- Completion of additional site related storm drainage requirements
- Expanded Project Design Requirements for the complete removal of the deteriorated parking deck and construction of a new and expanded deck.
- Construction administration services which will include a review of shop drawings, construction observation reports, coordination of testing labs, RFI reviews, weekly job meetings and review/approval of the contractor requisitions.

At part of this revised project scope and task letter, DCS has increased the overall Construction Budget and Total Project Budget to \$8,031,911 and \$9,768,847 respectively for this project.

DCS has confirmed that funding is available for this project. As summarized in the following table, the engineer's *base fee* as a percentage of Construction Budget is as follows:

Task Letter #1– BVH Fee (PRB #15-234)	Engineers Base Fees (\$)	Special Services	Total Fee	Constructio n Budget (\$)	% of Budget
Schematic Phase Documents	40,177				
Design Document Phase	31,057				
Contract Document Phase	49,266				
Tracing & Masters/Bidding	1,500				
Construction Administration	+30,000				
Engineer's Base Fee (PRB #15-234) (A)	\$152,000			\$2,750,000	5.52%
Special & Sub-Consultant Services:					
Geotechnical Engineering		15,785			
Site Survey Services		+20,570			
Engineer's Special Services Fee (B)		\$36,355			
Task Letter 1A (PRB File #16-229) – Expanded Project Scope (A2) and (B2)	+\$161,615	+\$16,150			
TOTAL Basic Service Fee (A1) + (A2)	\$313,615	\$52,505			
<b>TOTAL PROJECT FEE (A) + (B)</b>			\$366,120	\$8,031,911	4.56%

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that SPRB APPROVE Task Letter #1A for BVH Integrated Services, Inc. to provide consulting design and construction administration services on this project. The overall basic service fee of 4.56% is well within the guideline rate of 10.50% for this Group A Site Improvements Renovation Project.

**FROM PRB #15-234**

Re: PRB # 15-234 – BVH Integrated Services, P.C. – Task Letter #1  
Greater Bridgeport Mental Center– Phase II – Parking Structure Replacement Project  
Project #BI-MH-121, Contract # OC-DCS-MDE-0029, Fixed Fee - \$188,355

PROJECT BRIEF– In general, this project involves the required engineering design and construction administration services for the in-kind replacement of the existing concrete deck parking structure as well as an additional 50-60 at grade parking spots. The overall scope of this project is envisioned to include the construction of a new cast in place concrete parking deck with additional amenities such as lighting, walkways, drainage improvements, fire protection and emergency call boxes.

In November 2014, SPRB approved BVH Integrated Services, P.C. (“BVH”) as one of five firms under the 5th *On-Call Multi-Disciplinary Engineering (“MDE”) Consultant Services* contracts. This is the fourth Task Letter that BVH has been assigned under this series. BVH has been approved for the following task letter(s) to date:

• Task Letter #2	Three Rivers CC Lab Renovations	\$ 48,757	(Informal)
• Task Letter #3	300 Corporate Roof & RTU Survey	\$ 23,500	(Informal)
• Task Letter #4	<u>HCC Renovations Traffic Improvements</u>	<u>\$ 15,000</u>	<u>(Informal)</u>
	TOTAL FEES	\$ 87,257	

TASK LETTER #1 is a new formal task letter and subject to SPRB approval because the value of the task letter for this project exceeds \$100,000. The Construction Budget and Total Project Budget have been established at \$2,750,000 and \$3,540,230 respectively for this project. As detailed in the scope letter from BVH to DCS dated December 22, 2014 the \$188,355 is intended to compensate BVH for the following project scope:

- Preparation of SD through CD level design documents for the project area
- Completion DD Level design plans inclusive of geotechnical and site survey requirements; both as special service.
- Execution of project bid phase including a review of bid proposals and contractor scoping
- Construction administration services which will include a review of shop drawings, construction observation reports, coordination of testing labs, RFI reviews, weekly job meetings and review/approval of the contractor requisitions.

DCS has confirmed that funding is available for this project. As summarized in the following table, the engineer’s *base fee* as a percentage of Construction Budget is as follows:

Task Letter #1– BVH Fee (PRB #15-234)	Architect Base Fees (\$)	Special Services	Total Fee	Construction Budget (\$)	% of Budget
Schematic Phase Documents	40,177				
Design Document Phase	31,057				
Contract Document Phase	49,266				
Tracing & Masters/Bidding	1,500				
Construction Administration	+30,000				
Engineer’s Base Fee (PRB #15-234) (A)	\$152,000			\$2,750,000	5.52%
Special & Sub-Consultant Services:					
Geotechnical Engineering		15,785			
Site Survey Services		+20,570			
Engineer’s Special Services Fee (B)		\$36,355			
<b>TOTAL PROJECT FEE (A) + (B)</b>			\$188,355	\$2,750,000	6.85%

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that SPRB APPROVE Task Letter #1 for BVH Integrated Services, Inc. to provide consulting design and construction administration services on this project. The overall basic service fee of 5.52% is well within the guideline rate of 10.50% for this Group A Site Improvements Renovation Project.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

**8. VOTES ON PRB FILE:**

**PRB FILE #22-101** – Mr. Berger moved and Mr. Halpert seconded a motion to suspend PRB FILE #22-101. The motion passed unanimously.

**9. NEXT MEETING** – Special Meeting, Tuesday, July 12, 2022.

The meeting adjourned.

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
John Valengavich, Secretary