

WAKEFIELD PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE
WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY MEETING MINUTES

Date:	Thursday, December 3 rd , 2020
Location:	Virtual "Zoom" Meeting
Time:	7:00pm

Name		Present
Joseph B. Bertrand	Chair, Permanent Building Committee	✓
Timothy Demers	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Charles L. Tarbell	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Jerry Hammersley	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Jason Cohan	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Christopher Callahan	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Janine R. Fabiano	Permanent Building Committee	✓
John McDonald	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Tom Galvin	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Marc Muccio	Permanent Building Committee (non-voting)	✓
Philip Renzi	Permanent Building Committee (non-voting)	✓
Wayne Hardacker	Permanent Building Committee (non-voting)	✓
Steven Skory	Chief, Wakefield Police Department	✓
Craig Calabrese	Deputy Chief, Wakefield Police Department	✓
Richard Dinanno	Wakefield Police Department	✓
Joe Conway	Director, Wakefield DPW	✓
Lyn Stapleton	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Shane Nolan	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Janet Slemenda	HKT Architects	✓
Any Dunlap	HKT Architects	✓

I. Joe Bertrand opened the Public Safety portion of the meeting at approx. 7:20pm.

II. Shane Nolan presented the Leftfield OPM Report

1. Administrative Actions

Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes of the 11/05/20 Permanent Building Committee: Wakefield Public Safety were presented for review. It was noted that there was a typo in the title block and a couple of attendees were not listed as present. Shane Nolan will make corrections.

Chip Tarbell made a motion to approve the Wakefield Public Safety Meeting Minutes dated 11/05/20 as amended. Seconded by Jason Cohen.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

Invoices

The November 2020 Wakefield Public Safety Invoice Summary was presented and reviewed.

Chip Tarbell made a motion to approve the payment of Leftfield's Invoice #1 in the amount of \$5,000.00. Seconded by Jason Cohen.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

Designer Contract Amendment #1

HKT Architects Designer Amendment #1 was presented and reviewed. The total additional services include a lump sum of \$746,863 for basic design/engineering service and a not to exceed value of \$175,359 for reimbursable/supplemental services. It was noted that the reimbursable/supplemental services will be billed only as required for the project. The total revised Designer Services contract value is \$1,012,222. It was noted that there were additional services provided in the original HKT contract for the Study phase and these need to be accounted for in Amendment #1. Janet Slemenda will review the final accounting for the Study Phase and provide the correct amount for inclusion in the Amendment.

Joe Bertrand confirmed the Amendment #1 has not been reviewed by Town Council. As soon as the correction is made it will be sent to Town Council for review.

Chip Tarbell made a motion to approve HKT Designer Amendment #1 subject to correction/confirmation of final study contract value and review by Town Council. Seconded by Jason Cohen.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

Leftfield PM will issue a Notice to Proceed to HKT pending formal execution of Amendment #1 which will allow HKT to schedule their consultants and proceed with the project.

2. Project Schedule

A preliminary design schedule was presented for review. The schedule shows the proposed design phases with target dates for PBC review and approvals at each phase. It was noted this is a working document and will be further reviewed and refined with HKT.

Phil Renzi raised a question about the involvement of the Advisory Working Group during the design phase. It was noted that HKT/LPM will coordinate meetings with the Advisory Working Group as needed to progress the design and meet the schedule.

3. Project Budget

A draft Overall Project Budget was presented for review. Shane Nolan went through each category of the budget including Administration, Design Costs, Construction, Miscellaneous Costs, Furniture and Equipment and Project Contingencies. It was noted that this is a preliminary budget. As the project moves through the schematic design the budget categories will be reviewed in more detail including the confirmation of the construction cost and contingencies.

Chip Tarbell made a motion to approve the Preliminary Project Budget dated 12/05/20 in the amount of \$9,600,000. Seconded by Jason Cohen.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.



4. Other Business/Discussion

Shane Nolan presented an overview of the construction delivery methods available for the Public Safety project. These include Design Bid Build (DBB) and Construction Manager at Risk (CMR). SN provided similarities between the two methods, advantages and disadvantages of each and an outline of types of project each method is most appropriate for. Lynn Stapleton gave an overview of the process to hire a CMR.

Janice asked about the level of change orders on a CMR project and how they are handled. SN noted that under the CMR method the construction manager is expected to do a more thorough review of changes before they are submitted to the Owner for review. Therefore, it would be expected that the change order process should be more streamlined. Joe Bertrand and Chip Tarbell spoke to their experience with each method of construction delivery.

Janine Fabiano made a motion to proceed with the Construction Manager at Risk for the Wakefield Public Safety project. Seconded by Jason Cohen.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

Marc Moccio, Phillip Renzi and Wayne Hardacker noted their agreement with proceeding under the CMR method.

III. Next Permeant Building Committee was schedule for December 17th, 2020 at 7:00pm.

*Chip Tarbell made a motion to adjourn meeting at 8:15pm. Seconded by Jason Cohen.
Approved unanimously.*

Attachments:

- 12/03/20 Leftfield OPM Report

Town of Wakefield

PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING

RENOVATION AND UPGRADE

Permanent Building Committee Meeting

December 03, 2020



WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

AGENDA:

1. Administrative Actions

- Approval of November 5th, 2020 Permanent Building Committee Meeting Minutes
- Approval of November 2020 Invoices
- Approval of Designer Contract Amendment #1

2. Project Schedule

- Review Preliminary Design Schedule

3. Project Budget

- Review Project Budget Report

4. Other Business/Discussion

5. Next Meeting


- Permanent Building Committee Meeting

1. Administrative Actions

- Approval of November 5th, 2020 PBC Meeting Minutes

WAKEFIELD PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE		WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY MEETING MINUTES
Date:	Thursday, November 5, 2020	
Location:	Virtual "Zoom" Meeting	
Time:	7:00pm	
Name		Present
Joseph B. Bertrand	Chair, Permanent Building Committee	✓
Timothy Demers	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Charles L. Tarbell	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Jerry Hammersley	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Jason Cohen	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Chris Colahan	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Chris B. Forcino	Permanent Building Committee	✓
John McIsaac	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Tom Galvin	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Marc Muccio	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Philip Renzi	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Wayne Hardacker	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Steven Skory	Chief, Wakefield Police Department	✓
Craig Calabrese	Deputy Chief, Wakefield Police Department	✓
Kevin McCall	Wakefield Police Department	✓
Shane Pelletier	Wakefield Police Department	✓
Andy Reardon	Wakefield Police Department	✓
John Sullivan	Chief, Wakefield Fire Department	✓
Tom Purcell	Deputy Chief, Wakefield Fire Department	✓
Joe Conway	Director, Wakefield DPW	✓
Lyn Stapleton	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Shane Nolan	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Jim Rogers	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Linda Liperto	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Jarret Semmola	HKT Architects	✓
Any Dunlap	HKT Architects	✓

1. Joe Bertrand introduced Janet Stenenda from HKT Architects. JB reminded attendees that HKT were the design firm that worked with the PBC on the initial study for the proposed upgrades to the Public Safety building. JB noted that there is an option to retain HKT as the project moves forward into the detailed design and construction phases. JB asked JS to give an overview of HKT, their role in the project to date and plan moving forward, should they be retained.



THE RIGHT CHOICE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT

JS introduced Amy Dunlap of HKT Architects. JS presented a slideshow to the PBC. JS noted that both she and AD have considerable experience in the design and construction of public safety building. JS would continue as the main point of contact on the project and be supported by AD. AD reviewed the list of consultants that HKT propose for the project. These are the same group that worked on the feasibility study and are familiar with the project. AD provided information of HKT's previous and current public safety building experience. AD also provided examples of HKT projects that were addition/renovations of existing buildings. AD noted that the project would be a new building. AD noted that the project would be an initial study including programming and building system surveys. AD noted many of the issues found in the current building and highlighted the proposed design to address these. JS provided an overview of the next steps and process going forward including completing surveys of existing conditions, confirmation of program and project budget.

JB opened the meeting to questions/comments from attendees. Chief Steven Skory introduced members of the Police Department attending the meeting. SS noted some of the critical issues that need to be addressed including evidence processing, storage and need for bullet proof glass. JB noted that these would all be discussed in detail at future Working Group/PBC meetings.

At this point JB thanked HKT for their work to date and his evening's presentation. JS and AD left the meeting.

2. Joe Bertrand introduced Lyn Stapleton from Leftfield PM. LS in turn introduced other members of the LPM team, Jim Rogers, Shane Nolan and Linda Liperto.
- JB noted that the Owners Project Manager Selection Group had selected Leftfield as the project OPM. JB, Chip Tarbell and LS have been in correspondence regarding the contract and fee for the OPM services. JB noted that the proposed contract was distributed to PBC members prior to this evening meeting. JB opened the meeting to questions/comments on the proposed LPM contract. Phil Renzi asked about the lump sum fee and monthly payment schedule, in particular what happens if the project is delayed. JB noted that the project would be a new building. JB noted that the project would be an initial study including programming and building system surveys. JB noted many of the issues found in the current building and highlighted the proposed design to address these. JS provided an overview of the next steps and process going forward including completing surveys of existing conditions, confirmation of program and project budget.

As the design progresses and the phasing plan is developed. The fee is based on a 12-month construction duration. If the project were to exceed this there may be an additional fee request to retain the LPM full time clerk on site.

Chip Tarbell made a motion to approve the Leftfield contract and fee proposal of \$380,000 to provide OPM Services for the design and construction phases of the proposed Public Safety building upgrades. Seconded by Philip Renzi.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

3. Joe Bertrand reverted back to the designer selection for the Public Safety building. JB asked Lyn Stapleton to give an overview of the options available to the PBC for designer services. LS noted Option 1: Retain HKT. LS advised that the original contract allow for HKT's services agreement to be amended and extended to detailed design and construction services.
- Option 2: Prepare a new Request for Services. This would require the public procurement of design services, including review of submissions, interviewing interested firms and executing a new contract. LS advised that the timeframe to do this is approx. 2 months.



THE RIGHT CHOICE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT

JB opened up for discussion. Chief Steven Skory noted that he was happy with the performance of HKT during the study phase. SS reminded the PBC that there are options to address the deficiencies are limited in the constraints of existing building. SS feels that HKT has addressed these in the study and that hiring a new firm would likely not lead to any new design proposals. Chief Michael Sullivan and deputy Craig Calabrese shared SS view.

Chip Tarbell made a motion to retain the services of HKT Architects for the design and construction phases of the proposed Public Safety building upgrades pending an acceptable contract amendment and fee negotiations. Seconded by Jerry Hammersley.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

4. Joe Bertrand noted the next steps are to verify the project budget, program and scope of work. Working Groups will be set up to oversee this and report back to the PBC. JB confirmed that Town meeting previously approved a to budget of \$9.6m for the project.
5. Lyn Stapleton gave a brief overview of the contractor procurement options available for this project. These are Design Bid Build (DBB) and Construction Manager at Risk (CMR). A decision on which way to proceed will be made at a letter date.
6. The next Wakefield Permanent Building Committee meeting was scheduled for: Thursday, November 19th, 2020.
7. Chip Tarbell made a motion to adjourn at 8:20pm. Seconded by Marc Muccio.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

WAKEFIELD PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE
WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY MEETING MINUTES

Date:	Thursday, November 5, 2020
Location:	Virtual "Zoom" Meeting
Time:	7:00pm

Name		Present
Joseph B. Bertrand	Chair, Permanent Building Committee	✓
Timothy Demers	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Charles L. Tarbell	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Jerry Hammersley	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Jason Cohan	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Christopher Callahan	Permanent Building Committee	✗
Janine R. Fabiano	Permanent Building Committee	✓
John McDonald	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Tom Galvin	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Marc Muccio	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Philip Renzi	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Wayne Hardacker	Permanent Building Committee	✓
Steven Skory	Chief, Wakefield Police Department	✓
Craig Calabrese	Deputy Chief, Wakefield Police Department	✓
Kevin McCaul	Wakefield Police Department	✓
Shane Pelletier	Wakefield Police Department	✓
Amy Ronda	Wakefield Police Department	✓
Michael Sullivan	Chief, Wakefield Fire Department	✓
Tom Purcell	Deputy Chief, Wakefield Fire Department	✓
Joe Conway	Director, Wakefield DPW	✓
Lyn Stapleton	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Shane Nolan	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Jim Rogers	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Linda Liporto	Leftfield Project Management	✓
Janet Slemenda	HKT Architects	✓
Any Dunlap	HKT Architects	✓

1. Joe Bertrand introduced Janet Slemenda from HKT Architects. JB reminded attendees that HKT were the design firm that worked with the PBC on the initial study for the proposed upgrades to the Public Safety building. JB noted that there is an option to retain HKT as the project moves forward into the detailed design and construction phases. JB asked JS to give an overview of HKT, their role in the project to date and plan moving forward, should they be retained.



JS introduced Amy Dunlap of HKT Architects. JS presented a slideshow to the PBC. JS noted that both she and AD have considerable experience in the design and construction of public safety building. JS would continue as the main point of contact on the project and be supported by AD. AD reviewed the list of consultants that HKT propose for the project. These are the same group that worked on the feasibility study and are familiar with the project. AD provided information of HKT's previous and current public safety building experience. AD also provided examples of HKT projects that were addition/renovations and completed in phased and/or occupied buildings. AD went through the process completed during the initial study including programming and building system surveys. AD noted many of the issues found in the current building and highlighted the proposed design to address these. JS provided an overview of the next steps and process going forward including completing surveys of existing conditions, confirmation of program and project budget.

JB opened the meeting to questions/comments from attendees. Chief Steven Skory introduced members of the Police Department attending the meeting. SS noted some of the critical issues that need to be addressed including evidence processing, storage and need for bullet proof glass. JB noted that these would all be discussed in detail at future Working Group/PBC meetings.

At this point JB thanked HKT for their work to date and this evenings presentation. JS and AD left the meeting.

2. Joe Bertrand introduced Lyn Stapleton from Leftfield PM. LS, in turn, introduced other members of the LPM team, Jim Rogers, Shane Nolan and Linda Liporto.

JB noted that the Owners Project Manager Selection Group had selected Leftfield as the project OPM. JB, Chip Tarbell and LS have been in correspondence regarding the contract and fee for the OPM services. JB noted that the proposed contract was distributed to PBC members prior to this evening meeting. JB opened the meeting to questions/comments on the proposed LPM contract. Phil Renzi asked about the lump sum fee and monthly payment schedule, in particular what happens if the project exceeds the schedule on which these are based. LS advised that the design phase is expected to follow the projected schedule. The construction phase is harder to project at this point. This will be determined as the design progresses and the phasing plan is developed. The fee is based on a 12-month construction duration. If the project were to exceed this there may be an additional fee request to retain the LPM full time clerk on site.

Chip Tarbell made a motion to approve the Leftfield contract and fee proposal of \$380,000 to provide OPM Services for the design and construction phases of the proposed Public Safety building upgrades. Seconded by Philip Renzi.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

3. Joe Bertrand reverted back to the designer selection for the Public Safety building. JB asked Lyn Stapleton to give an overview of the options available to the PBC for designer services. LS noted: Option 1: Retain HKT. LS advised that the original contract allows for HKT's services agreement to be amended and extended to detailed design and construction services.

Option 2: Prepare a new Request for Services. This would require the public procurement of design services, including review of submissions, interviewing interested firms and executing a new contract. LS advised that the timeframe to do this is approx. 2 months.



JB opened up for discussion. Chief Steven Skory noted that he was happy with the performance of HKT during the study phase. SS reminded the PBC that there are options to address the deficiencies are limited in the constraints of existing building. SS feels that HKT has addressed these in the study and that hiring a new firm would likely not lead to any new design proposes. Chief Michael Sullivan and deputy Craig Calabrese shared SS view.

Chip Tarbell made a motion retain the services of HKT Architects for the design and construction phases of the proposed Public Safety building upgrades pending an acceptable contract amendment and fee negotiations. Seconded by Jerry Hammersley.

On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

4. Joe Bertrand noted the next steps are to verify the project budget, program and scope of work. Working Groups will be set up to oversee this and report back to the PBC. JB confirmed that Town meeting previously approved a to budget of \$9.6m for the project.
5. Lyn Stapleton gave a brief overview of the contractor procurement options available for this project. These are Design Bid Build (DBB) and Construction Manager at Risk (CMR). A decision on which way to proceed will be made at a later date.
6. The next Wakefield Permanent Building Committee meeting was scheduled for: Thursday, November 19th, 2020.
7. *Chip Tarbell made a motion to adjourn at 8:20pm. Seconded by Marc Muccio.*
On a roll call vote the motion was approved unanimously.

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

1. Administrative Actions

- Approval of November 2020 Invoices

Vendor	Invoice #	Budget Category	Invoice Date	Description of Services	Invoice Amount
LeftField	1	OPM – Schematic Design	11/30/20	OPM Services: Designer Procurement/Project set Up	\$5,000.00
				TOTAL:	\$5,000.00

MEMORANDUM

To: Stephen Maio; Joseph Bertrand
From: Lynn Stapleton, LeftField, LLC
Date: December 3, 2020
Re: Walton Public Safety – November 2020 Invoice Summary
Cc: Shane Nolan, Jim Rogers, LeftField, LLC

Enclosed for approval and processing, please find the following invoices:

INVOICES					
Vendor	Invoice #	Budget Category	Invoice Date	Description of Services	Invoice \$
LeftField	1	OPM – Schematic Design	11/30/20	OPM Services - Designer Procurement/Project Set-up	\$5,000.00
				TOTAL:	\$5,000.00

The invoice is consistent with the approved Total Project Budget and has been committed against the established budget category indicated.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the Lynn Stapleton, Owner's Project Manager, LeftField, LLC at 508-269-0457.



Joseph B. Bertrand
 Permanent Building Committee Chair
 Town of Wakefield
 1 Lafayette Street
 Wakefield, MA 01880

Invoice Date: 11/30/20
 Invoice No: 1

FOR: Owner's Project Management Services
 Wakefield Public Safety Renovations/Addition Project
 1 Union Street, Wakefield, 01880

Professional Services from November 1, 2020 to November 30, 2020

OPM Services	Amount
11/30/20 Invoice Amount per Fee Proposal	\$ 5,000.00

Total Labor: \$ 5,000.00

Reimbursable Expenses	Amount
Reimbursables 11/01/20 - 11/30/20	\$0.00

Total Expenses: \$0.00

Total this Invoice: \$ 5,000.00

Contract Status	Budget	Previous	Current	Total To Date	Balance
Feasibility Study/Schematic Design	\$20,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
Design Development Phase	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
Construction Documents Phase	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
Bidding/Construction Phase	\$270,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$270,000
Close-out Phase	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
OPM Services Total:	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$360,000
Reimbursable Expenses Total:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Contract:	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$360,000

Please Remit Payment To:
 LeftField, LLC
 17 Highfield Lane
 Norwell, MA 02061

APPROVED BY:

 Joseph Bertrand/Chip Tarbell
 Chairman/Secretary
 Permanent Building Committee
 Date: December 3, 2020

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

1. Administrative Actions

- Approval of Designer Contract Amendment #1

CONTRACT FOR DESIGNER SERVICES AMENDMENT NO. 1

WHEREAS, the TOWN OF WAKEFIELD ("Owner"), and HKT ARCHITECTS, INC. (the "Designer") (collectively the "Parties") have entered into a Contract for Design Services for the Wakefield Public Safety Building Project located at Union Street in Wakefield, MA on December 07, 2016, "Contract", and

WHEREAS, effective as of December 3rd, 2020, the parties wish to amend the contract:

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises and the mutual covenants contained in this Amendment, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and legal sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Parties, intending to be legally bound, hereby agree as follows:

- The Owner hereby authorizes this Designer's Contract Amendment No. 1 for Basic Services with a total lump sum value of \$246,862 and Supplemental Services with a total not to exceed value of \$125,859 pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in the Contract, as amended.

These services will be performed per the attached HKT Architects proposal dated December 1st, 2020 (updated December 2nd, 2020).

- For the performance of services required under the Contract, as amended, the Designer shall be compensated by the Owner in accordance with the following Fee Schedule:

Fee for Basic Services	Original Contract Amount	Previous Amendments	Amount of This Amendment	After This Amendment
Feasibility Study	\$ 90,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 90,000
Schematic Design	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 89,853	\$ 89,853
Design Development	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 117,145	\$ 117,145
Construction Documents	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 186,181	\$ 186,181
Bidding	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 43,690	\$ 43,690
Construction Administration / Completion Phase	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 309,994	\$ 309,994
Fee for Supplemental Services				
Pre-Design Study Verification (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 6,536	\$ 6,536
Survey (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 9,629	\$ 9,629
Geotechnical Engineering (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 18,186	\$ 18,186
Hazardous Materials Consultant (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Laser Scanning (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 49,255	\$ 49,255

Stormwater Management (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 9,205	\$ 9,205
Cost Estimating	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 10,900	\$ 10,900
Reconciliation/Value Engineering (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,750	\$ 1,750
Hydrant Flow Test (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 54,398	\$ 54,398
Building Envelope Consultant (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,500
FFE Design (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 923,222	\$ 1,123,222
Total Fee	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 0	\$ 923,222	\$ 1,123,222

This Amendment is a result of extending Basic Designer Services to perform the remainder of the Designer Services required under the Contract, as amended, including but not limited to: Study findings, Schematic Design, Design Development, Bidding, Construction Administration and Close Out.

- The Construction Budget shall be as follows:

Original Budget:	\$0,600,000
Amended Budget:	\$2,600,000

- The Project Schedule shall be as follows:

Original Schedule:	N/A
Amended Schedule:	N/A

- This Amendment contains all of the terms and conditions agreed upon by the Parties as amendments to the original Contract. No other terms and conditions shall be deemed to exist or bind the Parties, and all other terms and conditions of the Contract, as amended, remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Owner and the Designer have caused this Amendment to be executed by their respective authorized officers.

OWNER:
TOWN OF WAKEFIELD

Joseph B. Bertrand
Permanent Building Committee Chair

By: _____
Date: _____

DESIGNER:
HKT ARCHITECTS, INC.

By: _____
Date: _____

CONTRACT FOR DESIGNER SERVICES
AMENDMENT NO. 1

WHEREAS, the TOWN OF WAKEFIELD (“Owner”) and HKT ARCHITECTS, INC., (the “Designer”) (collectively, the “Parties”) entered into a Contract for Designer Services for the Wakefield Public Safety Building Project located at 1 Union Street in Wakefield, MA on October 07, 2016, “Contract”; and

WHEREAS, effective as of December 3rd, 2020, the parties wish to amend the contract:

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises and the mutual covenants contained in this Amendment, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and legal sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Parties, intending to be legally bound, hereby agree as follows:

1. The Owner hereby authorizes this Designer’s Contract Amendment No. 1 for Basic Services with a total lump sum value of \$746,863 and Supplemental Services with a total not to exceed value of \$175,359, pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in the Contract, as amended.

These services will be performed per the attached HKT Architects proposal dated December 1st, 2020 (updated December 2nd, 2020).

2. For the performance of services required under the Contract, as amended, the Designer shall be compensated by the Owner in accordance with the following Fee Schedule:

Fee for Basic Services	Original Contract	Previous Amendments	Amount of This Amendment	After This Amendment
Feasibility Study	\$ 90,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 90,000
Schematic Design	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 89,853	\$ 89,853
Design Development	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 117,145	\$ 117,145
Construction Documents	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 186,181	\$ 186,181
Bidding	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 43,690	\$ 43,690
Construction Administration /Completion Phase	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 309,994	\$ 309,994
Fee for Supplemental Services				
Pre-Design/Study Verification (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 6,536	\$ 6,536
Survey (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$9,629	\$ 9,629
Geotechnical Engineering (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$18,186	\$18,186
Hazardous Materials Consultant (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$5,000	\$5,000
Laser Scanning (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 49,255	\$ 49,255

Stormwater Management (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 9,205	\$ 9,205
Cost Estimating Reconciliation/Value Engineering (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 10,900	\$ 10,900
Hydrant Flow Test (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,750	\$ 1,750
Building Envelope Consultant (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 54,398	\$ 54,398
FFE Design (Amend. #1)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,500
Total Fee	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 0	\$ 922,222	\$ 1,012,222

This Amendment is a result of extending Basic Designer Services to perform the remainder of the Designer Services for the Project including review/verification of Feasibility Study findings, Schematic Design, Design Development, Bidding, Construction Administration and Close Out.

3. The Construction Budget shall be as follows:

Original Budget:	<u>\$6,650,000</u>
Amended Budget	<u>\$6,650,000</u>

4. The Project Schedule shall be as follows:

Original Schedule:	<u>N/A</u>
Amended Schedule:	<u>N/A</u>

5. This Amendment contains all of the terms and conditions agreed upon by the Parties as amendments to the original Contract. No other understandings or representations, oral or otherwise, regarding amendments to the original Contract shall be deemed to exist or bind the Parties, and all other terms and conditions of the Contract, as amended, remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Owner and the Designer have caused this Amendment to be executed by their respective authorized officers.

OWNER:
TOWN OF WAKEFIELD

Joseph B. Bertrand
(print name)
Permanent Building Committee Chair
(print title)

By: _____
(signature)
Date: _____

DESIGNER:
HKT ARCHITECTS, INC.

(print name)

(print title)

By: _____
(signature)
Date: _____



William R. Hammer AIA, LEED-AP
Janet M. Siemenda AIA, LEED-AP
Amy J. Dunlap LEED-AP BD+C

December 1, 2020
Update December 2, 2020

Mr. Joseph Bertrand
Permanent Building Committee
Wakefield Town Hall
1 Lafayette Street
Wakefield, MA 01880

Re: Wakefield Public Safety Building

Dear Mr. Bertrand:

We are pleased to submit our proposal for all phases of the above referenced project. This proposal includes work that will be completed by HKT Architects Inc. (HKT), Pare Corporation (Pare), Lim Consultants Inc. (Lim), Garcia Galuska & DeSousa, Inc. (GGD), Ray Dunetz Landscape Architects (RDLA), AKF Group (AKF), TCi Tortora Consulting, Inc. (TCi), Kalin Associates (Kalin), Building Envelope Consulting Inc. (BEC), and WSP USA Inc. (WSP).

Though this is not a huge project, it is complicated and challenging to add these types of additions onto an existing building which has a limited site and one that will be expected to stay in operations. We reviewed the project scope, as we know it, with the entire design team and asked them to be as aggressive as possible with their fee proposals. The revised base proposal has been significantly reduced from our original proposal.

The proposed fees for Supplemental Services have also changed since our previous proposal. In reviewing the final scope of these services with our team, there was some clarifications of scope that did modify the total amount. As previously discussed, some of these services may not be needed at all while others are necessary for the first steps. Those include a Pre-Design phase for reviewing the concept with the Working Group, the survey, geotechnical borings and report, and building scans to create the computer model.

Several items such as the Building Envelope Consultant, Value Engineering and Reconciliation Services may also not be required by the project or desired by the Town. If the project does not require a specific Supplemental Service, you will not be charged for it.

Scope of Work:

To summarize, our base work will include the design, permitting and construction oversight of renovations and additions to the existing public safety building at 1 Union Street, Wakefield, MA.

This is not a building that will pursue any LEED® Certification or Net Zero goals.

All work will be coordinated and approved by the Permanent Building Committee (PBC), the Police Department (PD), the Fire Department (FD) and Leftfield, Owners Project Manager (OPM).

The following paragraphs describe the phases of the project and the work that will be completed in each of those phases. We have broken our fee down into a base fee for traditional architectural and engineering design services and a separate menu of services that are traditionally considered Supplemental Services. These Supplemental Services are provided separately so that you may review them independently and consider them in relation to your overall project budget.

Schematic Phase: The purpose of this phase is to establish the general scope and schematic design and to present that in a form that achieves Town of Wakefield understanding and acceptance. Work on this phase will begin once a completed Pre-Design Phase, building scan, geotechnical analysis and site survey are completed and approved by the PBC. The schematic design that best meets the agreed upon project objectives will be developed.

At all stages of the design, all applicable Building Codes, including MAAB and ADA will be followed to ensure a code compliant design. The principal elements and deliverables for this phase include the following:

1. Workplan: Finalize project objectives, scope and schedule.
2. Architectural: Schematic plans, sections and elevations will be developed.
3. Civil/Site: Complete a review of the concept site plan and make recommendations. Complete due diligence as related to design constraints, permitting and other information relative to the project. Pare understands that the site currently utilizes municipal water and sewer utilities. Based on this information, Pare does not anticipate improvements to the municipal system would be required as a result of the proposed additions in this project. After completing these reviews, and getting feedback on the suggested revisions, Pare will create a schematic plan for issuance.
4. Landscape Architecture: Two schematic landscape plan alternatives will be developed.
5. Structural: Analyze the existing building structure and design reinforcements to the existing structure as required to support the proposed gravity loading from the proposed architectural and MEP improvements. Design the proposed additions to comply with the current building codes. Perform investigative site visits during the design phase to facilitate the design and detailing of structural modifications.
 - a. Review of geotechnical report for design of foundation system provided by others.
6. Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, Fire Protection and Technology Systems Infrastructure: Outline specifications and schematic design level drawings as well as update to design narratives, as necessary.
 - a. HVAC: System design will include a central heating plant and chilled water plant, reused existing systems such as rooftop units, an air handling unit, and heating and ventilation unit. Also, will include a kitchen ventilation system, variable refrigerant flow ductless cooling units, and automatic temperature controls system.

- b. Plumbing: Systems include domestic water distribution, natural gas distribution, water heating equipment for domestic use, sanitary distribution, plumbing fixtures, and connections to appliances. Stormwater drainage system within the building is included in plumbing scope.
 - c. Fire Protection: Design will include head end layouts for the building which will be superimposed on reflected ceiling plans. The systems will be coordinated with the other trades and will be reviewed with the Fire Department. Service, alarm facilities, pumps, major runs of piping, and equipment will be shown on the drawings. Calculations necessary to comply with the requirements of the code will be performed. Sizing of the installed sprinkler piping network will be specified to be by the Sprinkler Contractor with review and approval by GGD. During the analysis and code review phase, GGD will review the project, advise of the relevant code requirements, and assist in discussions with the fire and building officials to determine the scope of required fire protection. GGD will assist in witnessing a flow test if required, however, other than witnessing any costs associated with completing the flow test will be billed as a reimbursable expense. That service is included under Supplemental Services.
 - d. Life Cycle Cost Analysis energy modeling of MEP systems is included under the basic services. Additional energy modeling for Utility Company rebate programs, e.g. Advanced Building, etc., and LEED documentation and LEED Energy modeling would be considered an additional service.
 - e. Electrical: Design will include incoming power, interior and exterior building lighting, security including new IP CCTV cameras, access control system, fire alarm, and power distribution requirements for the building. Provisions for Photovoltaic Array (PV) is included in the basic fee; however, design of the PV array system is excluded. Technology is included as part of the basic services which includes voice and data network infrastructure.
- 7. Outline specifications will be developed. All specifications will use CSI 6-digit, 3-part format.
 - 8. Cost Estimating: An independent cost estimate will be prepared once schematic design is completed.
 - 9. Code Analysis: A preliminary analysis will be completed of the proposed schematic design drawings. A summary report will outline code compliance under the International Existing Building Code with Massachusetts amendments.
 - 10. Project Schedule: A preliminary project schedule will be developed in consultation with PBC and Leftfield.
 - 11. Presentations to the PBC are included.
 - 12. Owner approval of Schematic Design shall be provided prior to proceeding with Design Development.

Design Development Phase: This phase develops and documents the proposed design including building components from all major disciplines. All major decisions are reached in this phase in order to minimize modifications during the construction document phase.

The principal elements for this phase include the following:

1. Architectural: Development of schematic plans, elevations, sections and details. Coordination of all work developed during this phase.
2. Civil/Site:
 - a. Drawings will be advanced as required. Included are general site plans, grading plans, demolition, erosion and sediment control plans, drainage and utility plans and details.
 - b. Stormwater Management Narrative: Pare is anticipated preparing a Stormwater Narrative provided with the Design Plans. Pare anticipates the project being considered a redevelopment and therefore will not be required to fully comply with the stormwater standards. A memo is anticipated to be required to show what standards the site complies with and detail the constraints that prohibit full compliance with the same. Pare is not anticipating preparing any stormwater calculations or designing any stormwater best management practices at this time.
 - c. Dependent on initial conversation during schematic design additional work may include Stormwater Management related services. Those steps are outlined under Supplemental Services.
3. Structural:
 - a. Develop plans.
 - b. Prepare technical specifications.
4. Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, Fire Protection and Technology Systems Infrastructure: Systems will be accurately defined and appropriately detailed for this phase of work.
5. Specifications: Drafts of full specifications will be completed.
6. Cost Estimating: An independent cost estimate will be prepared once design development is completed.
7. Project Schedule: The project schedule will be updated.
8. Presentations to the PBC.
9. Owner approval of Design Development: Any and all changes to the plans will be completed during this phase.

Construction Documents: This phase creates the bid ready construction documents. Submission of a set of plans and specifications will be provided for the Town for review once during the CD phase and once prior to bidding. Work will be continued during Town review so that the schedule can be met.

The principal elements and deliverables for this phase include the following:

1. Complete all documents required for public bid:
 - a. Architectural
 - b. Civil/Site
 - c. Landscape Architecture
 - d. Structural
 - e. Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, Fire Protection and Technology Systems Infrastructure
 - f. Specifications: Finalize and coordinate with Owner's Division 0 documents.
2. Cost Estimating: One independent cost estimate will be completed during this phase sometime between 75% and 90% completion of construction

documents. Exact timing of the estimate will be dependent on the project schedule and will be reviewed with PBC and Leftfield.

3. Code Analysis: A final review of proposed construction documents with an update summary report to reflect the documents.
4. Project Schedule: The project schedule will be updated.
5. Presentations to the PBC.
6. Owner approval of Contract Documents for Bid.

Bidding: This process is governed by M.G.L. c 149 44A-M. the design team will be responsible for coordinating the bid process and providing support during that process.

The principal elements and deliverables for this phase include the following:

1. Bidding documents.
2. Pre-bid conference.
3. Coordination and issuing of addenda. All consultants will participate as required.
4. Review of low bid filed sub-bidder and general contractor and recommendation to the Town.

Contract Administration: The design team will administer the project for the Town, as related to the plans and specifications developed during the preceding phases. We assume construction will last 12 months with an additional month of project closeout time.

1. Provide general administration of the contract.
 - a. Attend pre-construction conference.
 - b. Construction Observation:
 - i. Architectural: Up to 56 meetings. Meeting quantity is based on 52 weeks of construction and four weeks of closeout with weekly meetings. This schedule assumes no additional meetings on site per week.
 1. Site visits, review of submittals and punch list.
 - ii. Civil/Site:
 1. Up to two site visits at appropriate intervals.
 2. Punchlist: Two site visits.
 - iii. Landscape Architecture: Landscape architect will attend one tagging trip at the nursery if required, work with the contractor to place the plants.
 - iv. Structural:
 1. Review of submittal related to primary structure.
 2. Preparation of the Statement of Structural Tests and Inspections as required by Massachusetts State Building Code.
 3. A maximum of 8 site visits to observe work progress and preparation of corresponding field report.
 - v. Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, Fire Protection and Technology Systems Infrastructure:
 1. One construction administrator from GGD will provide up to one site visit per month.

2. The design team shall track Submittals, Requests for Information, Proposed Change Orders, Change Orders, Sketches, Architect's Supplemental Instructions and Proposal Requests in logs.
3. Review and process submittals and RFI's per general contract requirements.
4. Conduct job meetings as required to continue the progress of the project. The OPM will write and distribute meeting minutes. HKT will write Field Reports for distribution.
5. The design team shall review information provided by the OPM, the Contractor and Testing Agencies.
6. The design team shall review information from testing agencies and check for compliance with the contract documents.
7. The design team shall review and provide comment on the schedule of values, change order and monthly requisitions.
8. The design team shall review and provide comment on the construction schedule, construction progress and quality and on-site "as-built" drawings.
9. The design team will solicit three proposals for testing services to meet the requirements of the contract specifications and the Massachusetts State Building Code.
10. At the end of construction, the design team will develop a punchlist that indicates incomplete work or work that does not meet the contract document requirements.

Project Closeout: The final stage of the construction process is specifically devoted to close out materials and final inspections.

1. The design team will review the contractor's closeout submittals; including warranty information, Operation and Maintenance Manuals and as-built drawings and specifications.
2. The design team will conduct final inspection, issue Certificate of Substantial Completion and final affidavits.
3. The design team will develop a monetized punchlist of all work remaining prior to final acceptance.

Base Fee:

The base fee work includes the following design team members:

HKT Architects Inc.:	Architecture
Pare Corporation:	Civil/Site Engineering
Lim Consultants Inc.:	Structural Engineering
Garcia Galuska & DeSousa, Inc:	Mechanical Engineering
	Electrical Engineering
	Plumbing Engineering
	Fire Protection Engineering
	Technology Infrastructure Systems
Ray Dunetz Landscape Architects:	Landscape Architects
AKF Group:	Code Analysis
TCi Tortora Consulting Inc.:	Cost Estimating
Kalin Associates:	Specifications

The base fee is a lump sum of \$746,863 (Seven hundred forty-six thousand eight hundred sixty-three). The fee includes all of the consultants that have been named herein. Reimbursable expenses are included.

The fee shall be broken down into the following phases of the work:

PHASE	COST
Schematic Design	\$89,853
Design Development	\$117,145
Construction Documents	\$186,181
Bidding	\$43,690
Contract Administration	\$309,994
TOTAL BASE FEE	\$746,863

Supplemental Services Fees:

The following Supplemental Services fees are provided for your consideration. These services are typically provided outside of a base fee. Some services may not be required as they are dependent on the final design of the project.

Supplemental Services include design by team members noted and coordination and mark-up by HKT:

HKT Architects Inc.
WSP USA Inc.
Pare Corporation
UEC – Universal Environmental Consultants
TCi Tortora Consulting Inc.
Garcia Galuska & DeSousa, Inc.
Building Envelope Consulting Inc.

The remaining Supplemental Services fees are noted below and are \$175,359 (One hundred seventy-five thousand three hundred fifty-nine dollars). Reimbursable expenses are included.

The fees are broken down into the following:

SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES	COST
Pre-Design	\$6,536
Survey	\$9,629
Geotechnical Engineering	\$18,186
Haz Mat	\$5,000
Laser Scanning, Point Cloud Registration, and 3D Revit Model Development	\$49,255
Stormwater Management Design	\$9,205
Value Engineering Services (assumes once)	\$4,700
Reconciliation with Owner's Estimator (assumes twice: SD, DD or CD)	\$6,200

SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES	COST
Hydrant Flow Test	\$1,750
Building Envelope Consultant	\$21,550
Envelope - Drone Inspection	\$1,100
Envelope - Boom Lift Inspection	\$5,146
Envelope - Exploratory Demolition	\$15,776
Envelope - Roof Scan	\$4,400
Envelope - Water Testing	\$6,426
FFE Design	\$10,500
TOTAL PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES	\$175,359

Pre-Design Phase: The purpose of this phase is to reassess the plan based on meetings with the Working Group and update the concept as necessary.

1. Use existing proposed plans as starting point for discussion.
2. Meet with the Working Group to update program and consider impact of any changes on overall plan or budget.
3. Present findings to PBC.

Survey: This task by WSP involves research, field survey and CAD drafting to develop the existing conditions for the exterior site for the project. All information will be collected and documented under the direction of a Massachusetts Licensed Land Surveyor. Horizontal datum shall be Massachusetts State Plane Coordinate System of NAD 1983 and vertically on NAVD 1988.

1. Conduct research at the Assessor's office or online GIS to obtain the property lines and abutters owner information to show on the plan. The property lines, easements and right of ways will be shown as approximate on the plan.
2. Establish a survey baseline on site means of Real Time Kinematic GPS techniques. Horizontal and vertical control will be observed on the respective datum's.
3. Run a closed traverse around the project area.
4. Run a level loop within the project limits for the main control of the survey and benchmarks.
5. Conduct an on the ground field survey to locate the following: top and bottom of curb, walks, buildings, striping, ramps, fences, walls, utilities, signs, etc.
6. Obtain inverts for drainage and sewer structures found in the area.
7. Obtain plans of record for all utilities located within the project limits to show on the plan. All underground utilities based on plans of record will be shown as approximate on the plan.
8. Set Temporary Bench Marks within the project area for future construction.
9. Produce an electronic file in AutoCAD Civil 3D 2018 along with a DTM. Plans stamped by a Massachusetts Professional Land Surveyor will be provided.

Geotechnical Engineering: The intent of the proposed services is to implement a subsurface exploration and testing program and to prepare a geotechnical design basis report. The report will present the results of the subsurface exploration as well as provide soil (and rock, if encountered) parameters for use in the design of

below-ground structures. Based upon this understanding, Pare proposes the following scope of work:

1. Prior to commencing the subsurface exploration program, Pare will file a Locate Request Form with Dig Safe and coordinate the locating of private utilities with the owner/client.
2. Pare will perform a review of data available for the site including, but not limited to available geological maps and reports for this area.
3. Pare will provide field observation and coordination for the investigation program. Field personnel will observe drilling conditions, visually identify the SPT soil samples, and record groundwater levels (if encountered) during the advancement of the explorations. Samples will be visually identified using the Burmister classification system. The retrieved samples will be placed in glass containers labeled with the boring location, sample number, sample depth and other pertinent data, and transported to Pare's office for review, analysis, and storage.
4. Pare will subcontract a drilling contractor to undertake borings as detailed in the table below. The borings will be performed to the depths indicated to characterize the subsurface conditions at the site.
 - a. Assume 3 borings to a depth of 25 feet.Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) will be performed in the boring in accordance with ASTM D1586, continuously for the first 10 feet, then at 5-foot intervals or change in strata thereafter. In the event bedrock is encountered within the borings, a 5 foot NX-size core will be attempted.

The exploration program will be reviewed and coordinated with the client prior to implementation of the exploration program to reflect the most recent changes to the anticipated site layout.

No instrumentation will be installed in the borings. The borings will be backfilled with sand and/or cuttings upon completion.

5. Pare will prepare typed logs of the explorations using gINT software. The logs will include estimated surface elevations based upon available topographic mapping, identification of soil stratum, sample identifiers and data, and field test results, and groundwater levels. Pare will prepare an exploration location plan in AutoCAD Civil 3D 2019 based upon the topographic plan provided by the client, for inclusion in the final report. Boring and test pit locations will be determined using a handheld GPS having sub-foot accuracy.
6. As a part of the preparation of the report, geotechnical laboratory tests on selected soil will be performed to verify field visual classifications, refine soil properties, and evaluate the potential for reuse. It is anticipated that two (2) grain size analyses (ASTM D6913) will be completed to evaluate the granular soil strata.

Upon completion of the subsurface investigation, Pare will prepare a geotechnical letter report suitable for schematic design of the additions. The report will provide design parameters required for schematic design at the site. An electronic PDF copy of the report will be provided.

1. Please note that this scope of work does not include an assessment of the presence of oil or hazardous materials at the site, and the characterization of the excavated soil or groundwater that may be generated as a result of the planned construction or site work.
2. Outside Services: Drilling of the test borings will be undertaken by a licensed driller registered in Massachusetts.
3. Only one mobilization of the drilling and excavation equipment is required for this scope.
4. The project is subject to the prevailing wage requirement.
5. Pare will coordinate access to the site with the Client/Owner. Closure of parking areas and access roads around the existing facility will be required to perform the borings.
6. Work on weekends, nights, and holidays, if required, is not included herein and will be at additional cost.
7. If needed, a source of water is to be made available to the drilling subcontractor during the field work.
8. During the subsurface investigation, some information and tasks will need to be provided or performed by Others. This includes the following:
 - a. Access to the areas of the proposed explorations.
 - b. A copy of plans depicting existing topography, site layout and grading.
 - c. Anticipated foundation loads.
 - d. Existing utility drawings within the proposed footprint of the additions.
 - e. Review and clearance of marked boring locations by facility personnel.

HazMat: EUC will complete a basic inspection for hazardous materials.

Laser Scanning and Point Cloud Registration and 3D Revit Model

Development: *This effort will take approximately 9 weeks to complete from an authorization to proceed.* This task will utilize a phase shift HDS 3D Laser Scanning technology capable of measuring 1,000,000 points per second to obtain detail on the interior and exterior facades of the buildings. The HDS 3D Laser Scanning surveys will obtain digital images and point cloud data of the interior and exterior of the buildings. Cyclone software will be utilized to register the scans and delete the noise anomalies from the point cloud. The point cloud deliverable will be imported into Autodesk Revit 2018 to allow for development of the 3D model of the visible existing architectural, structural, MEP/FP and site components of the buildings and area described above. WSP recommends the following approach:

1. Establish survey control at ground level of the project and coordinate the grid system by setting fixed targets and obtaining x,y,z coordinates on the targets using a Leica 1200 robotic total station.
2. Conduct data collection efforts utilizing the RTC 360 Laser Scanners and the cyclone software to obtain digital images and point cloud information of the interior and exterior of the building. At least three similar targets will be captured at each scan location.
3. ***Work with onsite personnel to move and replace 20-30 ceiling tiles for clear space visibility.***
 - a. Determination of tiles to be removed shall be directed by the client
4. Use the Cyclone software to register and unify the point cloud.

5. Use the Cyclone software to edit the point cloud to remove any noise anomalies from the data set.
6. Prepare an electronic data file, in Leica TruView format, of 3D interactive digital Images. Install a copy of Leica TruView software on the HKT computer system.

The work does not include the following: destructive investigation, coordination for access to areas of the buildings. This proposal assumes that there will be no construction activity and the building is fully in use.

3D Revit Model Development: This task will utilize Autodesk Revit 2018 to develop the 3D Model for the visible existing architectural, structural, MEP/FP and site components inside and outside the building. Development of the models for the structural, architectural and fire protection components will be completed using the point cloud and be suitable as a basis for design and demolition plan sets. The point cloud will be imported into Revit and components will be modeled using the point cloud. Only the architectural, structural and fire protection components of the interior and exterior building that are visible in the point cloud data will be modeled. Modeled elements shall be placed on the existing phase to allow for use in creation of demolition, sequencing, and proposed plans.

Level of Development 200- Interior partitions, doors and windows will be depicted based upon available default families contained in the software. Custom families may be used for instances that do not match the existing library of data. Structural elements will be modeled using the visible dimension from the laser scan data, no connection or reinforcing details will be included. No MEP modeling shall be included in these areas.

Level of Development 300- Architectural and structural components will generic elements, not construction as it is not visible. Components will be modeled to a greater detail to include moldings, railings, fixtures, and signage. MEP elements will be modeled as generalized systems and assemblies. These include: main distribution shown for piping and duct systems and air handling units. Multiple conduit runs will be modeled as a single object representing the extents of the raceway's volume. Conduits and elements smaller than 2" in diameter will be excluded. WSP recommend the following approach:

1. Export point cloud data for the architectural, structural, MEP/FP and site components for import into Autodesk Revit 2018.
2. Convert Point cloud dataset into RCP and RCS formats.
3. Link point clouds into Revit 2018.
4. Develop levels for each floor within the space
5. Develop elements relative to the level created in LOD 200 and 300
6. Create elements on the Existing Phase

Stormwater Management Design: If the Town requires, Pare will incorporate the design of sustainable and low impact stormwater management techniques for control of stormwater runoff. It is anticipated that the proposed stormwater management design will include a closed drainage system with on-site best management practices that provide water quality treatment, groundwater recharge, and detention in accordance with the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook. Pare anticipates that this will be accomplished through a combination of stormwater facility improvements and may employ water quality swales, tree box filters,

bioretention areas, sand filters, permeable surfaces, underground stormwater detention systems, or other best management practices to obtain no net increase in the rate of runoff from the site, if required.

Pare will prepare a reduced project narrative and stormwater management report in accordance with the redevelopment requirements of MassDEP Stormwater Handbook for submission during the project's permitting process. The Stormwater Management Report will include the required Stormwater Management System Operation and Maintenance Plan (OMP) and Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan (LTPPP).

Stormwater Management Subsurface Soil Investigations: Pare will witness up to one day of test pits within the proposed stormwater management areas to provide subsurface soil characteristics and estimation of seasonal high groundwater. Test pit logs summarizing our observations will be prepared for reference and inclusion in the bid package.

1. Pare has assumed that an excavator and operator for this work will be provided by the client or owner and therefore no fee for this is included.

Value Engineering: Should the services of the professional cost estimator be required to develop value engineering options, those services would be provided as an additional service. The proposed supplemental services fee includes one VE efforts. If more are required the cost will be the same for the second round of VE work.

Reconciliation with Owner's Estimator: If the PBC chooses to contract with a second independent estimator and wishes to reconcile those estimates with TCi, those services would be provided as an additional service. The proposed supplemental services fee includes two reconciliation efforts; once during schematic design, and once during design development or construction documents.

Hydrant Flow Test: GGD will complete a flow test to determine water pressure available for fire protection design.

Building Envelope Consulting: BEC conduct an initial meeting on site with public safety officials to review all pertinent information (construction drawings, correspondence, previous repair history, water infiltration, etc.) in their possession that relate to the building envelope in order to gain an understanding of existing issues and concerns. BEC will perform a visual inspection of the building envelope (exterior walls, roofs, windows, doors, lintels, sealants, etc.) to determine the current general condition of the building envelope. The inspection will be conducted from the ground using binoculars and from accessible areas.

1. In addition, further close-up inspection may be performed with an unmanned aerial vehicle (a drone) or a boom lift if the binocular inspection identifies any significant areas of concern. BEC may utilize a contractor to perform a minimal amount of selective exploratory demolition under BEC direction to determine latent conditions and key details of the building envelope components such as flashing, counter-flashing and roof insulation. All areas where exploratory demolition is performed will be returned to their previous condition. BEC may also perform a scan of the low-slope roofing in order to identify existing moisture below the roof

membrane. If elevation drawings are available, BEC will mark them up to identify all areas of deterioration. In addition, BEC can perform targeted water testing to identify the source of any active water infiltration.

2. Upon completion of the document review and field analysis, BEC we will work with HKT to develop the proper scope of work to address any deterioration and correct deficiencies that affect the performance of the building envelope, contribute to water infiltration and are not in compliance with the Building Code.
3. BEC will assist HKT with the bidding process including attending a pre-bid walk-through, addressing questions or concerns from bidders and reviewing the bids. During the construction project, BEC will review submittals, shop drawings, etc., perform inspections of on-going work, be present for any testing that may be performed by independent testing agencies, attend project meetings as needed and review payment requisitions to ensure accuracy of the work completed. BEC will also review closeout documents as needed and provide a punch list of outstanding work items related to the building envelope.

FF&E Design: As part of our basic fee, we will provide general furniture plans based on programming needs which will be used for electrical and IT infrastructure planning purposes. At the PBC direction, HKT can provide additional furniture planning, selection and installation services for the public safety building. For this proposal, we assume the PBC will contract with a furniture vendor from the State contract bid list. Should the PBC wish to publicly bid a furniture package, this scope of services and fee might change. Proposed services include reviewing furniture programming and available furniture lines for each room/space with PBC and updating plans as required. HKT would then contact vendors from the State contract bid list to arrange showroom tours with HKT and PBC and then select a vendor to work with. HKT would coordinate with the vendor to select furniture recommendations and present those to the Town. HKT would also select all furniture finishes and fabrics and present those to the Town. Once final furniture selections are made, HKT will review the vendor's drawings, details and specifications and the final furniture order. After installation, HKT will prepare a punchlist and a final review of the furniture.

Assumptions, Exclusions and Additional Services:

The following is a list of assumptions and items that have not been included at this time. Depending on the direction the project takes some or all of these, as well as others not yet defined, could require work by some members of the design team. These assumptions and exclusions include:

1. No Prequalification of Bidders is included. For a project of this size it is not required per Massachusetts general law.
2. Structural Exclusions:
 - a. Structural Tests and Inspections as required by Chapter 17 of the Massachusetts State Building Code
 - b. Design, shop drawing review and site inspection of seismic restraints for mechanical, electrical, plumbing and fire protection systems.
3. MEPFP:
 - a. Changes recommended by value engineering are considered an extra service.

- b. Any changes required following approval by Owner are considered to be extra services.
- 4. Civil: Significant changes in the project schedule, additional permitting which may be required, site constraints that are identified through the design phase, and project changes that result in the need for additional engineering efforts are considered out-of-scope items and are not included in this proposal.
 - a. The use of ground penetrating radar or similar underground utility locating services to identify the locations and depths of underground utilities is not included in this proposal.
 - b. Temporary offsite improvements required during construction including parking, sidewalks, utilities, and roadway improvements have not been included in this proposal.
 - c. This proposal has been prepared to complete the required local permitting, if needed for the project and does not include any state permitting. State permitting services can be provided, as needed, under a subsequent agreement.
- 5. Communications Antenna: No work is assumed on communications antennas.
- 6. Photovoltaic array design is excluded from the base fee but may be provided as an additional service.
- 7. Technology equipment procurement including but not limited to network switches, servers, laptops, computers, wireless access points, interactive whiteboards, etc., which are considered technology FF&E, is excluded.
- 8. Application for building code or accessibility code variances will be considered an additional service.
- 9. Construction changes based upon Owner requests or substitutions will be considered an additional service.
- 10. Construction site visits over the budgeted amount will be performed on a time and materials basis.
- 11. Review of construction submittals shall be limited to two per submission. Additional reviews will be considered an additional service and billed on a time and materials basis.
- 12. Permitting not specifically addressed in this proposal is excluded.
- 13. Permitting application, filing, review, notification or other fees are excluded.
- 14. Cost for any required police details are excluded.

Any work that is beyond the scope of work shall be billed as additional services either on a time and materials basis or we will make an additional proposal with a lump sum fee or not to exceed fee. In no case will we commence any additional services without your written approval. Hourly rates for all design team members are attached as a separate item.

If there are additional services that are required by one or more of our consultants, we will invoice their costs plus a mark-up of 10%.

We will invoice you monthly and we will bill as a percentage of the completed work. Payment is due in thirty (30) days of the invoice date.

Schedule:

It is assumed that the first phase of the project will last 9 weeks and will include survey, geotechnical, building scans and pre-design. The draft schedule is as follows:

- 9 weeks: Pre-Design, Survey, Geotechnical and Laser Scan
- 8 weeks of schematic design
- 10 weeks of design development
- 12 weeks of construction documentation
- 6 weeks of bidding/contract
- 12 months of construction administration
- 1 month of closeout

We hope to start work once we have a signed agreement in place.

We are very excited about this project and we look forward to a very successful collaboration.

Very truly yours,
HKT Architects Inc.



Janet M. Slemenda , LEED AP BD+C
Principal

cc: Amy J. Dunlap, HKT
File

file: I:\HKT Projects\22023 Wakefield Public Safety\Administration\Contract + Budget\Original Proposal\22023 Proposal Revision 20-12-02.docx

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

2. Project Schedule: Preliminary Design Schedule

Designer Contract Award

- Review Designer Amendment, Fee Proposal & Scope of Work

Nov 5th - December 3rd

Feasibility Study/Schematic Design

- Update Schematic Design Estimate
- PBC Review & Approval of SD & Project Budget

Dec 3rd – April 1st
March 8th – March 19th
April 1st

Design Development

- Design Development Estimate
- PBC Review & Approval of DD Estimate

April 2nd – June 10th
May 17th – May 28th
June 10th

Construction Documents

- 60% Construction Documents
 - 60% Construction Documents Estimate
 - PBC Review & Approval of CD60 Estimate
- 100% Construction (Bid) Documents

June 11th – Sept 3rd
June 11th – July 16th h
July 19th – July 30th h
Aug 12th
July 16th – Sept 3rd

Bidding

Review Bids & Award Contracts

PBC Approval/Construction Notice to Proceed

Construction

Sept 8th – Sept 29th
Sept 29th – Oct 13th
Oct 14th
Phasing - TBD

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

3. Project Budget:

ADMINISTRATION (Owners Project Manager, Advertising, Printing, Owners Insurance, Misc. Admin. Costs)	\$410,000
ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING (Architectural and Engineering Costs, Supplemental & Reimbursable Services)	\$922,222
PRE-CONSTRUCTION & CONSTRUCTION (CM Pre-Construction (if applicable), Construction Costs)	\$6,715,000
MISC. PROJECT COST (Utility Costs, 3 rd Party Testing & Inspections, 3 rd Party Commissioning, Other Project Costs)	\$160,000
FURNITURE FIXTURES AND EQUIPMENT (Office & Other Misc. Furniture, Dispatch Furniture, Communications Equipment, Building Security)	\$645,300
CONTINGENCY (Owners and Construction Contingency)	\$747,478
TOTAL PROJECT	\$9,600,000

Wakefield Public Safety Project - Wakefield, MA

DRAFT FOR REVIEW

December 3, 2020

Total Project Budget Status Report

Description	Total Project Budget	Authorized Changes	Revised Total Budget	Total Committed	% Cmtd to Date	Actual Spent to Date	% Spent to Date	Balance To Spend
ADMINISTRATION								
Legal Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Owner's Project Manager	\$ 380,000	\$ -	\$ 380,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 380,000
Schematic Design	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 20,000
Design Development	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 30,000
Construction Contract Documents	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 40,000
Prequalification/Bidding	incl above	\$ -	#VALUE!	\$ -	#VALUE!	\$ -	0%	#VALUE!
Construction Contract Administration	\$ 270,000	\$ -	\$ 270,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 270,000
Closeout	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 20,000
Cost Estimates	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Reimbursable & Other Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Advertising (and Printing)	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 5,000
Permitting	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Owner's Insurance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Other Administrative Costs	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 25,000
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 410,000	\$ -	\$ 410,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 410,000
ARCHITECTURE & ENGINEERING								
A/E Basic Services	\$ 753,399	\$ -	\$ 753,399	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 753,399
Feasibility/Schematic Design	\$ 96,389	\$ -	\$ 96,389	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 96,389
Design Development	\$ 117,145	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Construction Contract Documents	\$ 186,181	\$ -	\$ 186,181	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 186,181
Bidding	\$ 43,690	\$ -	\$ 43,690	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 43,690
Construction Contract Administration	\$ 309,994	\$ -	\$ 309,994	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 309,994
Closeout	incl above	\$ -	#VALUE!	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	#VALUE!
Other Consultant Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Extra and Reimbursable Services	\$ 168,823	\$ -	\$ 168,823	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 168,823
Survey	\$ 9,629	\$ -	\$ 9,629	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 9,629
Other Reimbursable Costs	\$ 21,855	\$ -	\$ 21,855	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 21,855
HazMat Engineering & Monitoring	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 5,000
Geotechnical & Geo-environmental	\$ 18,186	\$ -	\$ 18,186	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 18,186
Building Envelope Consultant	\$ 49,255	\$ -	\$ 49,255	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 49,255
Scanning Services	\$ 54,398	\$ -	\$ 54,398	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 54,398
FFE Design	\$ 10,500	\$ -	\$ 10,500	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 10,500
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 922,222	\$ -	\$ 922,222	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 922,222
CONSTRUCTION COSTS								
Pre-Construction	\$ 65,000	\$ -	\$ 65,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 65,000
Construction	\$ 6,650,000	\$ -	\$ 6,650,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 6,650,000
Change Orders	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 6,715,000	\$ -	\$ 6,715,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 6,715,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT COSTS								
Utility Company Fees	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 30,000
Testing Services	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 30,000
Commissioning	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 50,000
Other Project Costs	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 50,000
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 160,000	\$ -	\$ 160,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 160,000
FURNISHINGS & EQUIPMENT								
Furnishings & Equipment	\$ 409,050	\$ -	\$ 409,050	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 409,050
Technology & Communications	\$ 236,250	\$ -	\$ 236,250	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 236,250
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 645,300	\$ -	\$ 645,300	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 645,300
CONTINGENCY								
Construction Contingency	\$ 610,000	\$ -	\$ 610,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 610,000
Owner's Contingency	\$ 137,478	\$ -	\$ 137,478	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 137,478
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 747,478	\$ -	\$ 747,478	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 747,478
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET	\$ 9,600,000	\$ -	\$ 9,600,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 9,600,000
<i>(sum of all sub-totals above)</i>								

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

4. Other Business/Discussion

4.1 Construction Procurement Options:

Design-Bid-Build (DBB) – The traditional project delivery method, which typically involves three sequential project phases: the Design Phase, with a Designer who will design the project; the Bid Phase, when a General Contractor is procured; and a Construction Phase, when the project is built by the General Contractor.

With D-B-B – you are purchasing a building in accordance with detailed plans and specifications

Construction Management At Risk (CMR) – CMR delivery method was introduced in the 2004. This method involves procuring a Construction Manager as a consultant to the Owner during the Design Phase. When the design is at least 60% complete, the Owner and the CMR will agree upon a Guaranteed Maximum Price ("GMP") as a cap for the Contract Price.

With CM at Risk – you are hiring a professional service firm which builds buildings

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

4.1 Construction Procurement Options:

Similarities between Design-Bid-Build (DBB) and Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) delivery:

1. Both require DCAMM certification under “General Building Construction”
2. Prequalification of GC’s/CM’s is the first step in a two phase process (prequalification is discretionary for DBB projects below \$10m)
3. Both methods of procurement require 100% performance and payment bonds
4. Both processes are required to follow the Sub Filed/Trade Bid requirement for certain trades. This equates to approximately 50% of the construction value.
5. The contract amount (Lump Sum or GMP) may be increased during construction through a change order in the event of unforeseen/unanticipated construction costs or other circumstances necessitating a contract amendment.

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

4.1 Construction Procurement Options:

Design Bid Build:

Advantages

- Traditional, more streamlined approach.
- Design is complete and scope fully defined prior to bidding/construction award
- One single bid period after Construction (Bid) Documents are 100% complete
- Using prequalification process limits poor contractors from bidding (discretionary below \$10m)
- Award to lowest responsible bidder provides maximum competition
- Lump sum construction cost set prior to construction start

Disadvantages

- No contractor input in design, planning or value engineering
- Design and construction are sequential, may lead to a longer schedule duration
- No choice in General Contractor; lowest responsible bidder prevails
- Construction cost unknown until bids are received, may require redesign and rebid if bids exceed budget
- Typically does not allow for early bid packages by the same General Contractor

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

4.1 Construction Procurement Options:

Construction Manager at Risk: MGL Chapter 149

Advantages

- Ability to interview and select CM based on qualifications and experience of the proposed team
- CM is involved in the design process and provides input on schedule, logistics, phasing and constructability
- CM prepares construction cost estimates and provides value engineering input.
- CM participates in the Trade Contractor prequalification process
- CM provides front end and general condition input for sub contractors
- Early access to building and ability to review plans/specifications with existing conditions reduced inconsistencies
- Allows for early bid packages to accelerate construction schedule

Disadvantages

- Approval required by the Office of Inspector General
- Bidding early requires extra due diligence in covering complete scope of work
- Higher cost due to CM preconstruction and CM management fees
- CM has little real “risk” due to built in contingencies and allowances

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

4.1 Construction Procurement Options:

Design Bid Build: MGL Chapter 149

DBB is most appropriate for less complicated projects on open, clean sites with:

- Minimal risk of concealed site and/or building conditions
- Adequate time to fully design into 100% construction documents
- Minimal logistical challenges
- Conventional schedule/schedule flexibility

Construction Manager at Risk: MGL Chapter 149

CMR is best suited for complex projects that are challenging to define and involve:

- High probability of concealed conditions
- Complex logistical constraints
- Historical buildings
- Occupied renovations
- Additions tied into existing buildings

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

4.1 Construction Procurement Options:

Design Bid Build: Selection Process

No action required at present

Construction Manager at Risk: Selection Process

Step 1: Submit Application to Office of Inspector general (OIG) demonstrating:

- Authorization to proceed from governing body to contract with CMR
- Plan & procedures are in place to procure and manage CMR
- Services of qualified OPM have been retained
- Procedures to ensure fairness in competition, evaluation and reporting throughout procurement process
- Estimated construction cost is greater than \$5,000,000
- CMR has been determined as appropriate for the building project and reasons for determination

WAKEFIELD PUBLIC SAFETY | OPM REPORT

4.1 Construction Procurement Options:

Step 2: Establish a Prequalification Committee comprised, at a minimum of:

- At least two representatives from Awarding Authority
- Representative from OPM
- Representative from Designer

Step 3: Prepare and advertise Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for CMR services

- Prequalification Committee reviews Statements of Qualification's (SOQ) and must prequalify at least 3 CMR firms

Step 4: Establish a Selection Committee (may be the same as the Prequalification Committee)

Step 5: Prepare and distribute Request for Proposals (RFP)

Step 6: Receive, evaluate and rank the CMR proposals

- Conduct interviews with CMR firms

Step 7: Negotiate non fee contract terms with the highest ranked CMR and execute contract