

Here is my review and rating of the four proposals for the design renovations of the existing Hudson Fire and EMS Facility, based on qualifications, understanding of the project, design fee, and experience:

Proposal Ratings

1. K2M Design

- **Qualifications: Excellent.** K2M's direct involvement in completing the master plan and facility assessment for the existing Hudson Fire and EMS building provides them with an unparalleled understanding of the project. Their team offers specialized Fire Station & EMS expertise, notably led by Vaughan Miller, a retired Deputy Fire Chief and trained designer by AIA.
- **Understanding of the Project: Excellent.** Their prior work on the facility's assessment means they already possess deep insights into the building's current condition and the necessary improvements. They propose a design that addresses existing limitations and prepares the station for future demands.
- **Design Fee: Lowest most inclusive cost.** The firm's proposal is the lowest of all consultants that submitted proposals and includes all of the items as depicted in the RFP.
- **Experience: Excellent.** K2M has successfully designed and delivered numerous public fire and EMS facilities. Their experience on the Hudson facility's master plan is particularly relevant, and they list other significant police and fire safety services building projects.

2. Brandstetter Carroll Inc. (BCI)

- **Qualifications: Excellent.** BCI has 45 years of experience serving public sector clients and a large portfolio of over 200 public safety projects. They are well-versed in industry best practices and standards (NFPA, ICC, IAFC, IAFF, WBDG, FEMA) and maintain a consistent change order percentage of 1-2%, significantly below the national average. Their Public Safety Architect, Eric M. Chambers, AIA, will be involved throughout the project.
- **Understanding of the Project: Very Good.** BCI demonstrates a clear understanding of the project's Phase I budget (\$5,000,000) based on the K2M assessment. Notably, they proactively address the need for a hardened storm shelter, which was not explicitly stated in the RFQ and not required. They asked the most questions of the other 3 consultants.
- **Design Fee: 3rd highest fee.**
- **Experience: Excellent.** BCI has extensive experience with 105 Fire and EMS Stations in their portfolio. They provide detailed examples of recent and ongoing projects, including renovations and new constructions of fire stations and EMS facilities, with specifics on size, budget, and scope.

3. The Thrasher Group, Inc.

- **Qualifications: Very Good.** The Thrasher Group is a full-service architectural and engineering firm with over 300 staff members. Their Canton office's proximity to Hudson

allows for responsive on-site support. Their Project Manager is Bill Cook, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP. The firm benefits from strong sub-consultants, Karpinski Engineering and Barber & Hoffman, Inc., who bring specialized mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire protection, and structural engineering expertise, that I have experienced with on previous projects.

- **Understanding of the Project: Very Good.** Thrasher recognizes the critical role of public safety facilities and aims to design spaces that enhance efficiency and support future growth. Their sub-consultant, Barber & Hoffman, we do not know them, explicitly references the 2025 Needs Assessment Study and its recommendations for the project scope and estimated construction cost of \$6.1M.
- **Design Fee: Good.** 2nd highest amount and close to K2M. Thrasher explains that lump sum or not-to-exceed bids are based on an agreed-upon scope, with out-of-scope work billed separately. Their sub-consultant, Barber & Hoffman, provides a fee proposal for their structural engineering services broken into two phases, along with the estimated construction cost. I interviewed them and asked if they had everything included and they stated they did.
- **Experience: Very Good.** Thrasher has some track record in fire and EMS facility design and modernization. They list several relevant projects, including renovations, additions, and new builds of fire stations, and their sub-consultants add further depth with their experience on various fire and police facilities.

4. GPD Group

- **Qualifications: Very Good.** GPD Group is an experienced planners and designers of multi-service public facilities. They emphasize delivering essential services and maintaining cost, quality, and schedule controls throughout a project..
- **Understanding of the Project: Good.** GPD Group expresses a general understanding of the project as a meaningful investment in public safety and community infrastructure aimed at enhancing spaces and improving operational efficiency. However, their proposal lacks the specific details and direct references to the Hudson facility's needs assessment that the other proposals provided. It appears they are either too busy to take on this project or they were just fishing to see if they could get it.
- **Design Fee: 4th** highest and actually more in-line with % of design to construction costs.
- **Experience: Very Good.** While GPD Group states experience as planners and designers of multi-service public facilities, the provided snippets do not specifically detail past fire and EMS building projects they have completed. The only project examples visible are for other types of municipal buildings, making it difficult to assess their direct experience in this specialized area.

Summary:

Based on the comprehensive review of the proposals across qualifications, understanding of the project, design fee considerations, and experience, I would recommend **K2M Design. based on:**