



CAPITAL IMROVEMENT PROJECT (CIP) REQUEST - FY26  
FORM A - DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

Project Title:	Cummings School Warming Center		
Project Address:	42 Prescott St		
Department:	Capital Projects & Planning		
Project Mgr.:	Ralph Henry	Email:	<a href="mailto:rhenry@somervillema.gov">rhenry@somervillema.gov</a>
New Project or Modification:	New Project		

Department Priority:	Necessary	First	Updated:	
----------------------	-----------	-------	----------	--

Rank your project(s) in order of priority from your point of view. If you propose four projects, rank them 1, 2, 3, 4, with 1 being the highest, and so forth.

**Project Description/Scope of Work:**

Design and construction of the Cummings School Warming Center. This project will involve renovations to the Cummings School/Prescott Wing located at 42 Prescott Street in Somerville for the purpose of housing a Warming Center in the spaces. The scope includes new exterior concrete walkways, access ramps and safety rails, modification of main entry to meet ADA compliance, electrical, fire alarm, flooring, ceilings, restroom renovations, and HVAC. The project will have two add alternates; 1: flooring abatement and 2: BMS controls enhancements.

**Justification:**

**Relationship to Other Projects:**

n/a

Category: Please check all appropriate boxes

- ☐ Architectural/Engineering Feasibility Study
- ☒ Architectural/Engineering Construction Document Services & Construction Admin
- ☒ Building Alteration/Repair/Renovation/Addition/New Construction
- ☐ Building Improvements (non-construction)
- ☐ Purchase of Equipment (incl. vehicles, office equipment, hardware, etc.)
- ☐ Information Technology Systems/Platforms (e.g. cloud based, internet based, etc.)
- ☐ Street/Sidewalk/Monument Improvements
- ☐ Water Improvements
- ☐ Sewer Improvements
- ☐ Land Development
- ☐ Land Acquisition
- ☐ Land Disposition
- ☐ Parks and Open Space
- ☐ Other

**Operational Impact:**

What impact will this project have on operational costs?

- ☐ Reduce Cost (greater than 5%)
- ☐ Reduce Cost (less than 5%)
- ☐ Cost Unchanged
- ☐ Increase Cost (less than 5%)
- ☒ Increase Cost (greater than 5%)

Design and Construction Project Funding												
Total Estimated Cost		Prior Years Funding	FY 25	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 29					
Capital Costs:												
Feasibility Study	\$ -											
Land Acquisition/Appraisal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Environmental Remediation/LSP	\$ -											
Demolition & Site Clearance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Owner's Proj. Mgr./Clerk of the Works	\$ -											
Designer Services (SD through CA)	\$ 70,000			\$ 70,000								
Construction	\$ 575,000	\$ -		\$ 575,000			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Insurance (builder's risk, addtl. Policies)	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Furniture & Equipment (FFE)	\$ -			\$ -								
Police Details	\$ 10,000	\$ -		\$ 10,000			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Contingency	\$ 145,000			\$ 145,000								
Other (Specify)	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total:	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Estimate provided by project team in conjunction with design estimator.												
Please provide suggested sources. This section will be finalized jointly by Finance and the Department.												
		Prior Years Funding	FY 25	FY 26	FY 27	FY 28	FY 29					
Funding Sources:												
Stabilization Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -									
GO Bonds	\$ -	\$ -										
Retained Earnings	\$ -											
General Fund	\$ -											
Special Assmnt.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -									
Ch. 90	\$ -											
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -									
Receipts Reserved	\$ -											
Other (Specify) - Stabilization	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ -	800,000			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other (Specify)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total:	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Evaluation Committee Use Only:												
Reviewed and Approved By:												
Requesting Department				Date			Version					
Auditing				Date			Draft					
Purchasing				Date			Revised					
				Final Approval			Accepted					

## Cost Estimate Quality Control

### Questions & Answer Options

The following questions are used to determine the appropriate starting points for contingency and soft costs

*What is the current phase of the project lifecycle / procurement?*

Concept - Initial general proposal for a new project or procurement

Evaluation - Studying different options to fulfill identified need

Preliminary Design - Refining scope of preferred option

Final Design - Defining details of project / procurement

Pre-Construction - Project / procurement ready to bid

Construction - Contract awarded, managing potential change orders

*What is the basis of the cost estimate?*

Judgement based on comparison to historical projects / similar expenses

High-level calculation based on comparison to historical unit costs

Semi-detailed unit cost calculation

Detailed unit cost calculations based estimated quantities

Detailed unit cost calculations based firm take-offs of final design quantities

Firm bid from contractor / vendor

*Who prepared the cost estimate?*

City of Somerville Subject Matter Expert

Consultant with expertise in the project / procurement (e.g. Architect, Engineer)

Professional cost estimator

Hard bid (e.g. contractor, vendor)

*Was the cost estimate reviewed by an independent third party, and/or more than one cost estimate prepared?*

Yes

No

The following questions are used to properly escalate / inflate costs to the time of investment

*When was the cost estimate prepared or last updated?*

(enter date)

*To what date was the cost estimate escalated?*

(enter date, typically mid-point of construction, if escalated)

*If the investment is a lump-sum, what is the estimated date of the expense?*

(enter date)

*If the investment is a project with multiple payments, what are the start and end dates of the expense?*

(enter start date)

(enter end date)

$$F=P(1+i)^n$$

ft cost calculations

pared and reconciled?

## Cost Estimate Contingenies & Soft Costs

Based on Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering (AACE) Classification Matrix

Project Lifecycle	AACE Classifications			
	AACE Class	Project Definition	Methodology	Prepared by
Concept	5	<5%	Historical project comparison, Judgement	CoS SME
Evaluation	4	5 to 15%	Historical project comparison, Gross unit cost	CoS SME
Preliminary Design	3	15 to 30%	Semi-detailed unit cost	Design consultant
Final Design	2	30 to 70%	Detailed unit costs with estimated take-offs	Design and/or cost est. consultant
Pre-Construction	1	70 to 100%	Detailed unit costs with firm take-offs	Design and/or cost est. consultant
Construction / Delivery	1	100%	Detailed unit costs with firm take-offs	Contractor and/or consultant

**Note:** Matrix is based on vertical & horizontal construction projects; however, the methodology shown is not applicable to all projects. Orange fields are the input values based on the questions on the Quality Control tab. The first set of Blue fields are the default values for calculating contingency and soft costs. There will likely be a second set of Blue fields for projects / procurements not at hard-bid lifecycle, we can use. Grey fields are sub-totals. Note that for projects / procurements not at hard-bid lifecycle, we can use the Yellow fields for soft costs calculated based on Orange input amounts and Blue percentages. The Green fields are the calculated all-in costs that become the input for the CIP form.

Fit for Purpose				
Fit for Purpose	Escalated Estimate Input	Undefined		
		Scope Contingency	Scope-Adjusted Estimate (G&H)	Design & Management
Concept screening	\$1.00	20%	\$1.20	15%
Feasibility study, Alternative screening	\$1.00	12%	\$1.12	15%
Value management, Project funding authorization	\$1.00	10%	\$1.10	15%
Value management, Project funding authorization	\$1.00	5%	\$1.05	15%
Project funding authorization, Hard bid preparation			\$1.00	2%
Change order approval			\$1.00	2%

ould be applied to other procurements (e.g. IT equipment, fleet vehicles, real estate) by drawing analogies. The first set of questions drive the correct row, the second set of questions escalate / inflate the proponent's estimate. The third set of questions are cases in which we will want to adjust those percentages at the administrative level. The fourth set of questions carry an "undefined scope" or "design" contingency to account for inevitable scope creep. The fifth set of questions are these fields should be overridden at the user level if actual costs are known (e.g. we have a designer's estimate).

Input and Calculations					
Design & Management	Construction Services	Construction Services	Police Details	Police Details	Sub-Total (K,M,O)
\$1.38	15%	\$1.38	7%	\$1.28	\$1.64
\$1.29	15%	\$1.29	7%	\$1.20	\$1.53
\$1.27	15%	\$1.27	7%	\$1.18	\$1.51
\$1.21	15%	\$1.21	7%	\$1.12	\$1.44
\$1.02	15%	\$1.15	7%	\$1.07	\$1.24
\$1.02	15%	\$1.15	7%	\$1.07	\$1.24

ologies to the project lifecycle & cost estimate methodology  
 initial cost estimate.

contract in place) or not appropriate (e.g. no Construction Services or Police Details for IT equipment).

	Output
Owner's Contingency	Total Project Cost (P,Q)
20%	\$1.97
20%	\$1.84
20%	\$1.81
20%	\$1.73
20%	\$1.49
20%	\$1.49
