

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 986TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY JANUARY 8, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, 10TH FLOOR CHARLES RIVER ROOM, MCCORMACK BUILDING, ONE ASHBURTON PLACE, BOSTON, MA 02108.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the 985th December 18, 2019 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 985th December 18, 2019 meeting by Elise Woodward seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. **VISITORS:**

None

4. **NEW BUSINESS: Board Business**

The Board discussed some of the following (outline attached):

1. Operational Issues Update and Discussion

- 1A - DSB Regulations – The Board will review and vote to close on this matter on February 5, 2020
Claire Hester will send out an email to the members for comments due back the Tuesday before this meeting.
- 1B - Video Policy – This policy will remain in place – see Board Policies on Boardvantage
- 1C - Public Comment Period – The public will get 5-10 mins to ask general questions at the end of the meeting – tabling this item for more discussion
- 1D - Paperless File Storage – Getting this information online. What data is currently sortable? What is Autocene going to be able to sort? The board requested that the DSB be able to retrieve firm and project information from July 2018 to current. Bill Perkins will provide more information to the Board on how to retrieve information on prime and sub consultants such as financial (from Sec. 9 of the application), MBE/WBE participation, project information, etc. – tabling this item to February 5, 2020
- 1E - Errors Policy – This policy will remain the same until Autocene is fully implemented– see Board Policies on Boardvantage
- 1F - Boardvantage Training – Training information for Boardvantage will be on March 18, 2020
- 1G - M.G.L. 7c§44-58 Update – The Board will review at the February 5, 2020 meeting with the DSB Regulations
- 1H - DSB Guidelines – The Board will review on March 18, 2020
- 1I - Website – Re-design website once Autocene is fully implemented
- 1J - DSB Forms – See Jessica Tsymbal's application comments on Autocene below
- 1K - DSB Member Theme Discussion – Liz Minnis from DCAMM will be present at the next meeting January 22, 2020.
Claire email the members; members will review the topics and the top 3 most popular themes will be generated by the Board and discussed at this meeting with DCAMM.

2. Autocene Discussion (Attached comments from Jessica Tsymbal on DSB application)

Jessica made a presentation to the Board to discuss her comments on the online application. She will work with Bill to update the application form. Bill informed the Board that he has two speaking engagements next month at the BSA and ACEC on the new online process using Autocene. The Board wants a firm date set for the project application process in Autocene. Roberto Melendez did place a statement on our website that all firms must be registered and submit a disclosure form in Autocene starting January 2020. Bill stated that he spoke to a couple of firms that promised to fill out the test application, but to date has not done so. The Board told Bill to reach out to other firms again to perform a test application submittal in Autocene. He will report back to the Board at the next couple of meetings.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn by Martha Blakey Smith, seconded by David Chappell. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2020, at 8:40 a.m.

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shivers

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 987TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY JANUARY 22, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, 21ST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM ONE, MCCORMACK BUILDING, ONE ASHBURTON PLACE, BOSTON, MA 02108.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Virginia Greiman	Public Member
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Kenneth Wexler General Contractor

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the 986th January 8, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 986th January 8, 2020 meeting by Elise Woodward seconded by Virginia Greiman. Gregory Brown abstained. Motion was approved.

3. **VISITORS:**

Kimberly Jane	Families for Justices As Healing
Rafael Diaz	DHK Architects, Inc.
Liz Minnis	DCAMM
Leslie Credle	Families for Justices As Healing
Simons Broskini	Kleinfelder
Liz Yusem	Kleinfelder
Renee Leplante	SMRT
Betsey Chace	Families for Justices As Healing
Melissa Nussbaum	Families for Justices As Healing
Ash Trull	Families for Justices As Healing
Wayne Gething	DHK
Janhan M.	Families for Justices As Healing
J. Nah	Families for Justices As Healing
Jenny Hinkle	Families for Justices As Healing
Jennifer Shelby	Architectural Engineers
LaShena	Families for Justices As Healing
Terie	Families for Justices As Healing
Ayanna	Families for Justices As Healing
Jeffrey Quick	DOC
Emmanuel Andrade	DCAMM
Jeff Garriga	Finegold Alexander Architects
C. Wozniak	Kleinfelder
Jeff DeVean	STV
Kayla Skerry	STV
Rebecca Berry	Finegold Alexander Architects
Cloe Fazio	DCAMM
Andrew Lapp	MIL
Ben Salzberg	MAARNG
Pawel Honc	Amenta Emma Architects
Diana Nicklaus	Saam architecture
Meghan Welborn	Margulies Perruzzi
Brian McPherson	DCAMM
Pat Temple	QPD LLC/Springfield Prep Charter School
Evan Warner	STV/Springfield Prep Charter School
Bill Spirer	Springfield Prep Charter School
Susann Schlaud	MDS
Dorrie Brooks	Jones Whitsett Architects

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Request for Extended Service for Study and Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades Men's and Women's Correctional Centers, Ludlow and Chicopee – Sheriff's Office – Hampden County
DSB List #14-14, Item #2 - #SDH-2015

The Board reviewed the extended services for DHK Architects, Inc. for the Replacement of Perimeter Security Fence and Alarm System in the amount of \$191,387 to complete this project.

On a motion by Martha Blakey Smith to approve the extended services for DHK Architects, Inc., seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

B. Board Business discussion with DCAMM

The Board discussed the following items with DCAMM

- MBE/WBE – How to get new MBE/WBE firms to apply
- Design Team Collaborative
- Design Excellence
- Urban Design Experience

C. DSB List #19-40, #DOC2002, Bay State Correctional Center - Women's Facility, 28 Clark St., Norfolk Fee: \$50,000,000 ± - Final estimate to be determined by Study; \$650,000 (Study); Schematic and Final Design is to be negotiated, 6 Applicants

Members from the Families for Justices As Healing (FJAH) were present to share their concerns with the Board regarding building a new prison. In response to the attached letter sent to Governor Baker from the members of FJAH, Rebecca Sherer stated that as a Board the members do not get involved with any monetary value or contracting for any projects set before them. The members role is strictly to select designers for state agencies. Once a designer is selected and given to the agencies the Board does not get involved further. The Board suggested that the members of FJAH get in touch with a representative at Department of Correction (DOC) or maybe a state representative.

Jeffrey Quick from DOC and Emmanuel Andrade from DCAMM were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. After reviewing the six (6) applications the Board voted to select the following three (3) firms to be interviewed on Wednesday February 5, 2020:

Finegold Alander Architects
Kleinfelder Northeast, Inc.
SMRT Architects & Engineers

On a motion by Martha Blakey Smith to interview the above firms on February 5, 2020, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

D. DSB List #19-41, #32, Study & Design of Architectural Repairs, Renovations and Upgrades, Massachusetts Military Division – Statewide (House Doctor), Fee: \$500,000 12 Applicants

Review of the twelve (12) applications resulted in determination that two (2) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

Ames & Whitaker Architects, PC had no WBE firm nominated, did not meet MA Ownership Requirements and nominated a structural engineer with a pending registration number. On a motion to disqualify Ames & Whitaker Architects, PC. by Gregory Brown, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved unanimously.

Caolo & Bieniek Associates, Inc. nominated a structural engineer with a pending registration number. On a motion to disqualify Caolo & Bieniek Associates, Inc. by Gregory Brown, seconded by Elise Woodward. Jessica Tsymbal and Alan Ricks opposed. Motion was approved.

Ben Salzberg and Andrew Lapp, both from MAARNG were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. After a discussion the Board voted to select the following four (4) unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

CSS Architects, Inc.
DHK Architects
Saam Architecture, LLC
William Pevear Architects, Inc.

On a motion by Gregory Brown to select the above firms for the Massachusetts Military Division House Doctor, seconded by Elise Woodward. Motion was approved unanimously.

- E. **DSB List #42, SPCS1**, Roosevelt Avenue Renovation and Construction, 2071 Roosevelt Avenue, Springfield Preparatory Charter School, Springfield, ECC: \$10.5 million for construction. Total project cost is \$14 million, Fee for Schematic Design and Final Design is to be negotiated, 3 Applicants

Pat Temple, from QPDC, LLC, Evan Warner from STV-DPM and Bill Spirer from Springfield Preparatory Charter School were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. After a discussion the Board voted to select the following three (3) ranked finalists for this project:

Jones Whitsett Architects, Inc. (23 points)
Miller Dyer Spears, Inc. (19 points)
Habeeb & Associates Architects (12 points)

On a motion by Virginia Greiman to select the above ranked firms for the Springfield Preparatory Charter School, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

On a motion to adjourn by Gregory Brown, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2020, at 8:40 a.m.

Submitted by: Claire H. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shivers

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 988TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY MARCH 4, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, 21ST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM ONE, MCCORMACK BUILDING, ONE ASHBURTON PLACE, BOSTON, MA 02108.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the 987th January 22, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 987th January 22, 2020 meeting by Gregory Brown seconded by Elise Woodward. Motion was approved.

3. **VISITORS:**

Ben Szalewicz	Salem State University
Andrew Patterson	BIA studio
Alex Dorn	William Pevear Architects
Melissa Kuronen	Ellenzweig
Mary Martin	Dyer Brown
Jennifer Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Valerie Rushez	GUND Partnership
Lindsey Luker	Gensler
Balram Chamaria	B+AC
Susan Elmore	Cambridge Seven
Mary Gillis	Jones Architecture
Naoia Melim	Jones Payne
Abbie Goodman	ACEC
Doreen Bennett	BWA Architecture

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. DSB List #20-01, SSU2019, Study & Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, Salem State University (House Doctor) Fee: \$1,000,000, 21 Applicants

Review of the twenty-one (21) applications resulted in determination that one (1) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

EYP Architecture and Engineering, PC did not meet the Massachusetts ownership requirements. On a motion by Gregory Brown to disqualify EYP Architecture and Engineering, PC, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

Ben Szalewicz from Salem State University was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. After a discussion the Board voted to select the following five (5) unranked finalists for this House Doctor project. There was a tie breaker between Habeeb & Associates Architects with 5 points and BWA Architecture with 4 points.

BIA, studio
CambridgeSeven
Ellenzweig
Habeeb & Associates Architects
Jones Architecture, Inc.

On a motion by Elise Woodward to select the five firms listed above for the Salem State University House Doctor, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

B. Board Business

- Autocene (attached application and features summary)

Abbie Goodman from the ACEC was present during this discussion. She brought concerns from the engineering community and architectural community, per John Nunnari about hiding pertinent project information in the disclosure and application form. The Board agreed that if firms want information from the DSB a public records request will have to be filed with the DSB. Bill stated that Autocene will add a hide/share button for firms to check as a temporary solution for now.

Alan Ricks will review the instructions for the application.

The Board will vote on the application in Autocene at the next operational Board meeting.

5. MOTION TO ADJOURN: The Board adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn by David Chappell, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY, March 18, 2020, at 8:40 a.m.

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Patricia Sherr

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

AMENDED MINUTES OF THE 989TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY APRIL 15, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the 988th March 4, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 988th March 4, 2020 meeting by Janice Bergeron seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved.

3. **VISITORS:**

Janet Lever	Rowse Architects
Brian McPherson	DCAMM
Antonio Leite	DCAMM
Gary Bigelow	Bunker Hill Community College
Marion Roosa	Habeeb Architects
Jennifer Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Lori Kauffman	CBT Architects
Jessica Howlett-Cobbs	
Celeste Soares	Turowski2 Architecture
Pamela Perini	Perini Security
Katie Gething	DHK
Kathy Dionne	SMRT
John Prudente	DCAMM
Tamar Macuch	Habeeb Architects
Charles Kelsey	DCAMM
Liz Minnis	DCAMM
Robin Greenleaf	ARC Engineers
Nancy Rockwell	Norfolk County
Steven Habeeb	Habeeb Architects
Susan Goldfischer	DCAMM

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Presentation on DCAMM Affirmative Marketing Plan

Brian McPherson presented the DCAMM Construction and Design Affirmative Marketing Plan to the Board. Susan Goldfischer and Charles Kelsey were available to answer questions from the Board. DCAMM had an event at the State House for MBE/WBE firms which was a great networking opportunity for firms. Brian encouraged the members to go to the DCAMM website to view the 2019 Annual Report. Brian was invited to attend another DSB meeting in the future.

B. DSB List #20-03, #NCC2020, Study & Design of General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, Norfolk County, Dedham, Brookline, Quincy, Wrentham and Stoughton (House Doctor), Fee: \$500,000, 8 Applicants

It was brought to the Board's attention that there was a minor error in the advertisement. The Maximum Fee Per Contract read \$300,000 and it is supposed to read \$500,000. It was correct under the Contract Type reading \$500,000 (Page 1 of the DSB

Advertisement). Ken moved to proceed with the advertisement and not re-advertise, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Nine (9) proceeding forward and two (2) against this motion to proceed.

The Board wants Bill Perkins to put two (2) items on the next agenda on adopting procedures and protocols on how to handle discrepancy that come before the Board and how will the Board review anything that will go public with the DSB letterhead on it.

Review of the eight (8) applications resulted in determination that one (1) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

DHK Architects had no specification consultant nominated and no code consultant nominated. On a motion to disqualify DHK Architects by Gregory Brown, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

Nancy Rockwell from Norfolk County was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. After a discussion the Board voted to select the following three (3) unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

CSS Architects, Inc.
Habeeb & Associates Architects
SMRT Architects and Engineers

On a motion by Gregory Brown to select the above firms for the Norfolk County House Doctor, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved unanimously.

C. Request for Extended Services: Bunker Hill Community College for Goldman Reindorf Architects (GRA)

Gary Bigelow from Bunker Hill Community College was present to explain the projects that Goldman Reindorf Architects are currently involved in performing.

A motion by Jessica Tsymbal rejecting the original request for extended services by Bunker Hill Community College, seconded by Gregory Brown. Ken Wexler opposed.

Another motion was made by Martha Blakey Smith to allow Bunker Hill Community College to approve the extended services for Goldman Reindorf Architects (GRA) and to increase the contract by 25%, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved. Ken Wexler opposed.

Martha Blakey Smith recommended that Bunker Hill Community College submit a new request for a rapid response house doctor to the DSB. Rebecca Sherer asked Martha if she would work with Gary and Bill on the rapid response house doctor project.

D. Board Business

- Bunker Hill Community College

Marty Smith will assist Gary Bigelow from Bunker Hill with crafting and expediting an RFP for additional projects.

- M/WBE Selection/Pool

Schedule as quickly as possible for next available meeting, discussion about subconsultant and M/WBE selection/pool, including as many agency personnel as interested

- Procedures and Protocols

The Board requested that Bill Perkins put the following items on the next agenda: Adopting procedures and protocols on how to handle discrepancies that come before the Board.

- Identify and Implement Remote Voting for next meeting

Rebecca asked Bill to inform the Board what voting procedures (current and confidential) will be conducted at our next meeting. Jessica suggested Google forms.

- Research and discuss what analytics and how frequently to assist the Board

Jessica walked the Board through her analysis; it will be discussed at one of the next meetings. The Board requested that DCAMM be present during this meeting.

- Research boards ability to discuss sensitive data in a confidential setting with relevant agencies.

- Bullet list of Board Business

Rebecca asked Bill to work on a bullet list with her and Alan. Claire will put it on the agenda for the next meeting.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:26 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn by Elise Woodward, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Sherr

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 990TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY APRIL 29, 2020 AT 9:00 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Kenneth Wexler General Contractor

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the 989th April 15, 2020 meeting were voted to be amended and approved at the next meeting. On a motion to amend and review the minutes of the 989th April 15, 2020 meeting at the next meeting by Elise Woodward seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved.

3. **VISITORS:**

Sara Ruggiero	STV
John Nunnari	AIA
Jennifer Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Kayla Skerry	
Molly Moore	MDS
Anna Luciano	

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Board Business

- Remote Board meetings will be held at 8:30 a.m.
- Board business spreadsheet from Rebecca, not discussed today, will be on agenda for next meeting for the Board to look at and decide how best to utilize
- DSB Regulations: Provide dated tracked change versions of CMR 3.00 and CMR 4.00 for review in advance of next meeting.
- Remote Voting Procedures: Short term use (up to 2 meetings) of Zoom for remote voting - Motioned by Janice Bergeron to use Zoom for remote voting up to two meetings, seconded by Virginia Greiman, Jessica Tsymbal and Dave Chappell opposed.
- Autocene voting: Version 2 – Board will be provided login information to Autocene – discuss at next meeting on how to proceed with Autocene voting and when will it become available to use.
- Evaluation Criteria Subcommittee (task force) (Marty Smith, Dan Carson, Janice Bergeron) (invite Liz Minnis and Antonio Leite from DCAMM) for week of the May 18, 2020.
- Subcommittees must post meetings and take minutes.
- Subcommittees will meet in the off week and will report at a full Board meeting
- Autocene & Analytics Subcommittee (task force) (Elise Woodward, Dave Chappell, Janice Bergeron, Alan Ricks) two additional members to consult as time permits for Virginia Greiman and Jessica Tsymbal. Will meet with Autocene the week of May 4th
- Autocene applications accepted as of July 1, 2020 with 3-month concurrency period where the old format will be accepted. Firms must be registered in Autocene by October 1, 2020. This will be updated on our website May 1, 2020.
- Telecommuting during COVID 19: Add open meeting requirement: MGL Chapter 30A section 20 (d) to Boardvantage and notify board by email when posted.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, May 13, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rubena Shiver

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 991ST MEETING, WEDNESDAY MAY 13, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

The amended minutes of the 989th April 15, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to amend and approve the minutes of the 989th April 15, 2020 meeting by Gregory Brown, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved.

The minutes of the 990th April 29, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 990th April 29, 2020 meeting by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

All minutes will be posted on the website.

3. VISITORS:

Liz Minnis	DCAMM
Brian McPherson	DCAMM
Beth Eromin	DCAMM
Susan Goldfischer	DCAMM
Charles Kelsey	DCAMM
Richard Hadley	Massasoit Community College
John Caffelle	Massasoit Community College
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Gail Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Kara Guss	TSKP Studio
Kevin Webb	STV, Inc.
Chris Iwerks	BIA, Studio
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architecture
Sela Bailey	BIA, Studio
Thomas Iskra	BVH
Sean Landry	LBPA
Ned Collier	ICON Architecture
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet
Marie McNally	
Amy Barrett	LLB Architects
Marnie Kaplan	MPA
Amanda Hanley	LDA Architects
Katie Gething	DHK, Inc.
Alex Dorn	William Pevear
Stephanie Beals	TSKP Studio
Deanne	McGuinness Group
Susan Cook	NV5
Shavonne Bivens	STV, Inc.
Irene Kang	DCAMM
Robin Greenleaf	ARC Engineers
Jennifer Reagan	Bergmeyer

Lian Davis	
Balram Chamaria	BplusA
Tom Galvin	Lagrasse Architects
Emily Glavey	DCAMM
Antonio Leite	DCAMM
Ken Feyl	Lagrasse Architects
Melissa Forbes	Jones Payne
Natasha Espada	Studio Enee
Jerry Osborn	OAIPS
Darryl Filippi	Bergmeyer
Jennifer Shelby	ARC Engineers
Lindsey Luker	Gensler
J Nasser	MP Architects
Sharon Gray	SchwartzSilver
Morgan Devlin	LLB Architects
Ellen Anselone	Faa, Inc.
Erica Jackson	Faa, Inc.
Jenny Reagan	
Katherine Klepacki	Kuhn Riddle
Jenny Burton	DCAMM
Kathleen Porter	LBPA
Aelan Tierney	Kuhn Riddle
Charles Roberts	Kuhn Riddle
William Pevear	William Pevear
Richard Jones	Jones Architects
John Nunnari	BSA
Abbie Goodman	Engineering Center
Mark Yanowitz	Lagrasse Architects
Imran Khan	MP Architects
Nadia Melim	Jones Payne
John Heinrich	
Rebecca Berry	Faa, Inc.
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Christopher Lane	Faa, Inc.

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. DCAMM Presentation

Brian McPherson from DCAMM discussed the new language for MBE/WBE Participation in project criteria advertisements noted below:

MBE/WBE Participation

The Commonwealth is committed to helping address the disparity in the participation of minorities and women in design. Along with the MBE and WBE participation goals which reflect ownership status set forth below, the Designer Selection Board and DCAMM are interested in learning about the applicant firm's approach and commitment to diversity in its HR policy, its overall business practices and in assembling this project team. Firms are encouraged to be creative in assembling their teams by considering dividing the work of a particular discipline, when appropriate, including work it would typically provide in house, partnering, offering opportunities to qualified firms with which it or its consultants have not previously worked or firms that may have less experience working on public projects, and other means that provide additional opportunities for MBE and WBE firms in new ways.

Applicants, as prime firm and team lead, should include in their application, under Section 10, a Diversity Focus Statement directly addressing their approach to enhancing diversity in assembling the team for this project, including a clear description of each working relationship, and in their overall HR and business practices. The Designer Selection Board strongly encourages teams composed of firms that expand the overall breadth of different firms working on DCAMM projects. See also Evaluation Factors.

In accordance with M.G.L. C.7C, §6 and Executive Orders 526, 559 and 565, the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM) has established a minimum combined MBE/WBE participation goal of 17.9% of the overall value of the study and final design contracts for this project. Applicants must utilize a mix of both MBE and WBE firms whose participation, when added together, meets the overall combined goal set for the Contract. The combined goal requires a reasonable representation of both MBE and WBE firm participation. The Combined MBE/WBE goal must be met within the list of requested prime and sub-consultants and those MBE/WBE firms with which they team. MBE/WBE firms providing extra services, such as surveying or testing, can also contribute to the overall MBE/WBE participation on the project.

All applicants must indicate in their applications how it or its consultants will meet these goals and will be evaluated on that basis. Further information about the MBE/WBE Program appears in the "Participation by Minority Owned Businesses and Woman Owned Businesses," in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Contract for Study, Final Design, and Construction Administration

Services (January 2019) at Attachment C, and on the Supplier Diversity Office website: <http://www.mass.gov/sdo>. Applications from MBE and WBE firms as prime consultant are encouraged. Applicants that are themselves MBE or WBE certified will be required to bring a reasonable amount of participation by a firm(s) that holds the certification which is not held by the applicant to the project.

Proposed MBE/WBE participation plans that include solely MBE or solely WBE participation or have only nominal participation by one or the other to meet the combined goal, will not be considered responsive. Applicants are strongly encouraged to utilize multiple disciplines and firms to meet the MBE/WBE goal. Consultants to the prime can team within their disciplines in order to meet the MBE/WBE goal but must state this relationship on the organizational chart (Section 6 of the application form).

Also added to the project criteria for Additional Diversity Programs below:

Additional Diversity Programs:

Veteran Owned Business Participation Benchmark - Chapter 108 of the Acts of 2012; Executive Order 565

The Commonwealth encourages the participation of Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Business Enterprises ("SDVOBE") and Veteran-Owned Business Enterprises ("VBE") on its design projects. The benchmark for combined SDVOBE and VBE participation on DCAMM and other Executive Branch agencies design projects is 3% of the contract price as set forth in the standard DCAMM Study and Design Contracts referenced above.

In addition the Commonwealth encourages the participation of Disability-Owned Business Enterprises (DOBEs) and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Business Enterprises (LGBTBEs) firms on its design projects (see Executive Order 565 -No. 565: Reaffirming and Expanding the Massachusetts Supplier Diversity Program | Mass.gov.

Rebecca Sherer would like to DCAMM to keep the Board informed on how the process is working.

- B.** DSB List #20-04, MCC2020, HD1, Study and Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, Massasoit Community College, Brockton and Canton, (House Doctor), Fee: \$750,000, 34 Applications

Review of the thirty-four (34) applications resulted in determination that six (6) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

ATANE had no MBE firm nominated, no sustainability design consultant nominated and did not meet MA Ownership Requirement. On a motion to disqualify ATANE by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

B Goba had no 8b for the code consultant McCormack Architecture, no 8b for the structural engineer RJ Freel Associates and no 7 (resume) for Fen Chen. On a motion to disqualify B Goba by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

Beacon had no 8b for Weston Sampson. On a motion to disqualify Beacon by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

Gorman Richardson Lewis had no sub-consultant acknowledgement form for Owl Engineers. On a motion to disqualify Gorman Richardson Lewis by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

ICON Architecture had no electrical engineer nominated. On a motion to disqualify ICON Architecture by Gregory Brown, seconded by Jessica Tsymbol. Motion was approved unanimously.

Moody Nolan had no #9 submitted with the application. On a motion to disqualify Moody Nolan by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

Richard Hadley and John Caffelle both representing Massasoit Community College were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. After a discussion the Board voted to select the following three (3) unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

Bergmeyer Associates, Inc.
DREAM Collaborative, LLC
Studio Enee, Inc.

On a motion by Gregory Brown to select the above three (3) firms for the Massasoit Community College House Doctor, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved unanimously.

A. Board Business

Elise Woodward reported to the full Board on the Autocene Sub-Committee - This Sub-Committee had met twice on May 5th and 12th. The minutes of May 5th have been approved and posted on the DSB website.

We received an excellent demonstration from Vikram and Penny from Autocene and it is an impressive platform.

The Sub-Committee recommended that the full Board discuss the following:

Voting - The importance of having a roll call vote in public as opposed to a private vote according to the Attorney General's opinion.

The full Board voted unanimously on an open roll call for submitting votes for projects. No blind voting is allowed.

The full Board had a discussion on weighted voting - Elise Woodward motioned to move to maintain the weighted voting option in Autocene, seconded by Gregory Brown. Alan Ricks opposed. Motion was approved.

References and evaluations – The recommendation as of yesterday's sub-committee meeting that firms be allowed to insert their own references and evaluations as opposed to the DSB staff. The sub-committee recommends that references and evaluations be limited to the past 5 years so that members do not have old references and evaluations. All references and evaluations will be available in the system for members to view at any time. The comment in our conversation at today's regular board meeting is that it would be helpful that evaluations be differentiated according to the PIC and Project Manager; this is something the sub-committee had not actively discussed, but Elise will take it to the sub-committee for further review and it will be advantageous to the full Board.

Elise Woodward motioned to move to maintain the capability in Autocene for firms to enter a minimum of 5 references and 5 evaluations from work in the past 5 years and that the system be enabled to maintain all evaluations and references for board members to review.

Alan Ricks motioned to move that all evaluations within the last 5 years are displayed and that the firms can select up to 5 references within the last 5 years. If firms begin to exceed 5 evaluations within that time period, the Board will revisit this motion. Seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved unanimously.

Privacy functionality – This is an important decision for the full Board to make. The current default is shared and available for everyone to view. The firm has the ability to go into their information and click hide and only their contact information would be available. The full Board should vote on whether default should be hide or share.

Elise Woodward made a motion to make "hide" default, seconded by Jessica Tsymbal. Motion was approved unanimously.

Rebecca Sherer wants this information conveyed on our website and in the Autocene instructions for applicants.

Board member registration approval - Board members should register in Autocene. Members should test drive and get to know the system. Members can view firms, project reports and enhanced SDO categories as well.

Other Board Business:

- Rebecca Sherer would like to propose that the next meeting go until Noon and members get some of the Board Business under control. Tasks will be added to the next agenda.
- If members send out an email to the full Board to discuss tasks, board members cannot continue communication until it is presented on an agenda and discussed at a regular Board meeting. There will be no DSB discussions outside of regular board meetings. We need to conform to the Open Meeting Law and stay transparent.
- Jessica Tsymbal suggested that we start at the bottom of the alphabet when reviewing applications at future meetings every now and then.
- Alan Ricks requested that we put instructions in the applications to align resumes with the roles they are being proposed for. (code consultant, specification consultant sustainability consultant and any in-house roles and ensure the team members resume reflects that experience.
- Rebecca Sherer would like the Board to come up with thoughts on how to better review the applications.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of May 13, 2020 by Gregory Brown, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, May 27, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire H. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Sherr

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 992nd MEETING, WEDNESDAY MAY 27, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the 991st, May 13, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 991st May 13, 2020 meeting by Elise Woodward, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. **VISITORS:**

Abbie Goodman	The Engineering Center
Jacquie Hughes	BER Engineering
Anna Luciano	Nitsch Engineering
Andrea Baranyk	NC Architects
Caroline Fitzgerald	RMF
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet
Steven Habeeb	Habeeb Architects
Steven Karan	BER Engineering
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Board Business

- New DSB Regulations

The Board discussed the DSB Regulations 3.00 and 4.00. Elise would like to understand what the process is for making these changes – does this Board have to vote on them or are these changes going to be made irrespective of this Board's opinion. Bill stated that he didn't present it exactly this way to the Special Counsel; he is not aware if the Board has the authority to develop their own regulations or if it comes from Administration and Finance but will ask that question. The Board requested that Claire upload the following for the 3.00 and 4.00 Regulations to the Boardbook – Original Copy, Copy with track changes and Final Revised Copy with no edits. There will be no motion for the regulations at this time and it will be put on agenda for next available meeting. The members were asked to please review and be prepared to discuss at the meeting.

- Criteria and Analytics Sub-Committee Update

The Sub-Committee meeting was held on May 20, 2020 and will be held every 2 weeks.

During the sub-committee meeting on May 20, 2020 there were representatives from DCAMM, ACEC, AIA and designers. The following were briefly discussed and DCAMM will respond at the next sub-committee meeting in two weeks:

- a. Evaluation factors/Selection criteria
- b. How DCAMM managers review applications
- c. Evaluation Matrix in Autocad

- d. DCAMM categorization of applicants – less qualified, qualified, well qualified – explanation

Most of the meeting was discussing this category and how it effects the overall decision process. We need to have a more standardized process for user agencies reviewing applications and making comments on firms. The public did not realize that agencies provided evaluations (user agency comments) to the DSB during the application review meetings and that firms cannot respond to those comments beforehand. The designers had concerns about how much the agencies comments play in the board's decision making on a personal level or overall board decision. The designers want to be able to get copies of the agency's comments which are available after the review meetings; firms can request information by submitting a Public Records Request with the DSB. DCAMM will come back to the sub-committee with more information on how to comment on firms without using less qualified, qualified, well qualified.

Rebecca wanted to be careful on how the Board utilizes the word evaluation" vs. comments, these are user agency comments not evaluations. Another thing is that the Board uses these comments to make the best decision for the user agency, the designer and the Commonwealth. The comments are based on the RFP that is structured and based on that criteria that is requested by the applicants as to whether they are meeting that criteria with the addition on some additional data on regarding on whether they worked with the firm before, funding and performance. It is used as a tool to help the Board complete a better decision-making process.

Jessica looks at it as a way for user agencies to organize their thoughts and for them to look at the different applications and proposals that can vary widely and help them organize their thoughts about how they view each of the proposals one against the other. She doesn't see it as one firm does better than the other.

Abbie's concern is that the Autocene system will post information and be part of a file and other agencies would also have access to the user comments. The Board understands this concern and user comments would not be able to be viewed unless a public request is filed with the DSB.

- Sub-Committee Update on Autocene

The Autocene sub-committee approved the meeting minutes of the May 12, 2020 meeting and Claire posted in Boardvantage.

Elise gave a brief summary of the meeting on Autocene for May 27, 2020. We reviewed the application process in Autocene and could see actively how designers can upload and customize their applications and to see how designers would add evaluations and references themselves. Vikram reviewed the application sections and the way sub-consultant's verifications would work and how PDF's would be easily attached to the files to customize for the Prime and Sub-Consultants. There will be space for 5 references to be included within the last 5 years, chosen to be included or not. The firm will be able to see all their references in the system and identify the ones they want to include in an application. You need to be a user of Autocene in order to submit a reference. If the author of the references is not a user in Autocene, the references would be sent to the DSB Staff to be uploaded into Autocene. We looked at the Content Management Section which is the Firm disclosure online. We discussed how far back old project files would be incorporated into Autocene. We didn't vote on this, but we realized that new project files would be going into Autocene, and over a period of time a year or two there would probably be enough old files to satisfy the document preservation requirements. Bill showed us a list of requirements for maintaining old minutes and old correspondence. The sub-committee thought that it was not worth spending time to go back and put old material into Autocene at this time and continue to hold old paper files until such time that we do not need it anymore. It was pointed out that some agencies will request to continue and extend an older project and at that time that older project information be uploaded into Autocene Dave asked about the hide/share and to his point, it was approved by the full board that *hide* be set to default and that a firm has the option to share their project information. The hide button would only show the firm's contact information. There was no change of the voting process. We looked at the Project Criteria and application review and the elements will be incorporated in June 2020. We briefly discussed the desire to have Autocene generate components of an Annual Report summary but did not see a demonstration on how that works yet. There is a link with Certrak, which is an application that the SDO staff uses to have monthly uploads and trying to get them into Autocene that will show the certification of SDO firms (M/WBE) and will know if the certification is current.

Janice spoke to the full board and is very happy with the Autocene program and said they did a fantastic job incorporating our recommendations. She said that there are 4 outstanding issues but are waiting for the other sub-committee before the sub-committee can finalize and bring it back to the full Board.

- Agenda for the June 10, 2020 DSB Meeting

Rebecca wants to make sure that board business gets added to every agenda at the end of meetings. If for some reason we don't have enough time to discuss then we do it at the next meeting. She wants the two sub-committees to update at every meeting though. Bill was concerned that there would not be enough time to discuss board business and roll out Autocene in July. Janice suggested maybe we could add an extra meeting. The Criteria and Analytics sub-committee meeting is scheduled for June 3rd and Autocene sub-committee is scheduled for June 9th. It was proposed approved to have a board meeting on the same day as the sub-committee for about ½ hour after the two sub-committee meetings. Another proposal to start the regular board meeting on June 10th start at 8:00am. It was approved by the Board that Claire add the 2 sub-committee's discussion to the end of the agenda for the June 10th meeting. The sub-committees will send Claire a bullet list of information and if there are any action items that the board needs to undertake at the June 10th meeting.

- Status of Tasks from DSB meetings (4/15, 4/29, 5/13)

Tasks from 4/15/2020 Meeting Minutes

- Bunker Hill Community College – Marty noted that she contacted Gary Bigelow from Bunker Hill and has not heard back from him and he is probably not going forward with projects.
- M/WBE Selection Pool – Closed
- Procedures and Protocols – Autocene should handle this – Closed
- Identify and Implement Remote Voting- We have a temporary fix and working with Autocene on what the final voting procedures will be in Autocene.
- Research and discuss what analytics – This will be part of the sub-committee
- Research boards ability to discuss sensitive data in a confidential setting – Table, will check with Autocene

Tasks from 4/29/2020 Meeting Minutes

- Remote Board meetings to start at 8:30am – Approved
- Board business spreadsheet – Have not gone through, but will try to get to it at some point
- DSB Regulations 3.00 and 4.00 – Reviewing at the June 24th meeting
- Remote Voting – Discussed
- Autocene Voting – Under the sub-committee
- Evaluation Criteria – Under the sub-committee
- Sub-committee meetings and minutes – DSB is posting meetings and minutes
- Sub-committee meetings – Meetings have been scheduled for sub-committee meetings
- Autocene & Analytics Subcommittee (task force) – Done
- Autocene applications accepted as of July 1, 2020 with 3-month concurrency period where the old format will be accepted. Firms must be registered in Autocene by October 1, 2020. This will be updated on our website May 1, 2020. – Done
- Telecommuting during COVID 19: Add open meeting requirement: MGL Chapter 30A section 20 (d) to Boardvantage and notify board by email when posted. – Done

Tasks from 05/13/2020 Meeting Minutes

- If members send out an email to the full Board to discuss tasks, board members cannot continue communication until it is presented on an agenda and discussed at a regular Board meeting. There will be no DSB discussions outside of regular board meetings. We need to conform to the Open Meeting Law and stay transparent. - Done
 - Jessica Tsymbal suggested that we start at the bottom of the alphabet when reviewing applications at future meetings every now and then. – Will do at the next meeting
 - Alan Ricks requested that we put instructions in the applications to align resumes with the roles they are being proposed for. (code consultant, specification consultant sustainability consultant and any in-house roles and ensure the team members resume reflects that experience. – Part of the sub-committee and will be addressed
 - Rebecca Sherer would like the Board to come up with thoughts on how to better review the applications. – Was added to the Board Business
- Discuss Methodology to Review Applications per 5/13 meeting

Rebecca had thoughts on Design Excellence that had been mentioned in review. In terms of reviewing applications instead of going through page by page. Is there a way to evaluate firms in a representative way by who we know is qualified and giving some direction to those firms we don't think are as qualified on a more generic level.

Janice thoughts on user agency comments could be done with more of a numerical type of grading so its not so subjective. Not sure if we have identified a process for this. It was her impression that we will do away with well qualified, qualified, less qualified. Ginny asks that if Janice means a number for each section and come up with a total number.

Elise asked if the Board could split the applications up to each member would be responsible for reviewing in detail fewer application and make a recommendation to the Board about the pro and cons of each application. Ginny does not think this will work because everyone will have their own opinion and that all members must review every application. Dan said that he agrees with Ginny and he said that each member bring to the table a different experience and expertise and if you assign to one person they could miss something that someone else would find. Jessica suggested a more blended approach of what we do now and what Elise recommended and assign tasks (rotating members) for how light the M/WBE participation is and what firms need for a stronger section 8. Ginny disagrees and again think it divides the responsibilities of members. She would rather take responsibility for reviewing all applications than leaving it for another member. She would not feel comfortable voting unless she reviewed all applications. It can get very confusing if we start assigning responsibilities to members. Jessica said that we would all review the applications, but a blanket statement could be pointed out so that it is not being read out at every meeting. Elise wanted to know what is wrong with the deliberation process now. Some members think it is too long of a process. Rebecca said that there is a little improvement now because she does not go page by page and will go to 8, 9 and 10 and ask members to comment on these sections. Ginny likes the way it is being done and Rebecca moves it along now. We have improved the number of applications at each meeting now, we will only review approximately 40 instead of over 50 applications per meeting. Claire is now uploading the applications directly to Boardbook so that we have time to review.

Greg thinks we are moving in the right direction with the review process. Since he has been on the board the longest, he thinks Rebecca is doing a good job trying to move it along. We should keep the discussion to 5 mins. for each application.

Dave likes the way we are doing it now; he can go through all the sections then a board member makes a comment and he missed it. If you go through it too quickly, you will miss information, he does not want to lose that part of it.

Jessica said that we keep asking for constructive feedback from firms, we have a few firms here today, can we ask them.

Rebecca thanks everyone for their comments and she thinks there is room to grow.

Andrea from Northeast Collaborative Architects, out of CT. She is looking to get some work in Massachusetts and wants to get a sense of how the members review firms from outside Massachusetts.

Rebecca suggested that she attend another public meeting that has a project review, contact Claire and Roberto who are good resources on how to complete an application. Also request a firm's application that has been successful for a project that you could look at it and see what makes it a good application. Greg commented that since we are moving to Autocene, her firm needs to start the registration process. Bill will reach out to Andrea.

Anna from Nitsch Engineering, who are sub-consultants on DSB applications. She thinks we are making good process on moving to Autocene. She likes Janice's suggestions on ranking numbers for the evaluation criteria, so that firms can see what specific areas they need to improve.

Rebecca will revisit this topic when Autocene is up and running and everyone is comfortable with using it.

- Review Spreadsheet of Board Business and Prioritize Tasks
 - Executive Committee Process – Upload to Boardbook
 - Refine Board Vote – This has been addressed - Closed
 - Sub-consultant Registration – Covered in Autocene - Closed
 - Meeting Review Process – Will be revisited once in Autocene
 - Autocene Launch – We have a schedule of July 1st and a sub-committee
 - Video Policy – Will be revisited after pandemic
 - Paperless File Storage – Sub-committee discussed and will continue to maintain paper records for older projects.
 - Informational Interview Policy – One-page bullet to give to new firms (low priority) Janice will look at Jessica's document and share with sub-committee and then come back to the board with a recommendation
 - Public Notice Format – Standardization of the advertisement and owning the evaluation criteria – sub-committee is working with DCAMM to put together a standard list of evaluation criteria that could be picked by PM's at DCAMM to put in the RFP and an ongoing conversation with DCAMM on how to assure that RFP's will be properly reviewed and edited before advertised.
 - Applicant Error Policy – Covered in Autocene
 - Boardvantage Functionality – Closed item because we are moving to Autocene
 - MGL Review Update – Review the regulations between now and the next meeting
 - Designer Selection Guidelines – low priority to review – will revisit at a later date
 - Website Updates/Refreshment – the website will be updated and refreshed with updated information and easy to navigate. Rebecca requested that Roberto contact EOTTS and get a short-term solution and let the agency know that we are launching an electronic platform that is across agencies and need access to make basic changes so that applicants can readily register in Autocene. Roberto will make sure that the information is updated.
 - Remote Participation/Voting – We have a temporary way of doing this, closed issue. Moving to Autocene
 - Electronic Voting - Autocene
 - Board Membership and Succession – We have members that need to be replaced and re-appointed. This is a high priority. Greg needs to be high on this list. Bill stated that he is regularly in touch with the Governor's Office. He has not gotten a response probably because of the pandemic. We do have 5-6 candidates, but this has been put on hold because of the pandemic. Rebecca wants this put on the agenda for every board meeting wants an update on this issue. Claire said the members spreadsheet is on the Boardbook. Rebecca asked Claire to send out the information of when a member needs to be replaced and/or re-appointed.
 - New Board Member Information – Rebecca would like a one-page bullet list of the role and responsibility of a new member and what they are getting themselves into. Be in Boston so many times a year, work remotely so many times a year, how many applications we review generally and how long the time commitment is, board business, things we encounter as a board member, no members firm will be able to apply while on the board and one year after leaving the board. One sheet for a prospective board member. Elise volunteered to look at it with a little information from Claire and Roberto.
 - M/WBE Data Review – Autocene
 - Prime/Sub Data Review – Autocene
 - DCAMM Quarterly Updates - Ongoing
 - Boardbook Tutorial – Posted in Boardbook and website
 - Andover CBI protest - Closed
 - COOP Document – This is an emergency procedure document due to pandemic. It is posted on the Boardbook.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of May 27, 2020 by Gregory Brown, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, June 10, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shivers

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 993RD MEETING, WEDNESDAY JUNE 10, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
--------------------	---------------

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

The minutes of the 992nd, May 27, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 992nd May 27, 2020 meeting by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. VISITORS:

Abbie Goodman	The Engineering Center
Liz Minnis	DCAMM
Steve O'Connor	DCAMM
Beth Eromin	DCAMM
Stephen Sutterlun	Bplusac
Steven Watchorn	CBI Consulting LLC
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architects
Marion Lewis-Roosa	Habeeb Architects
Caroline Fitzgerald	RMF
Stephen Rose	Stephen Rose
Thomas Iskra	BVH
Christine Verbitzki	Gund Partnership
Ned Collier	ICON
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet
Jennifer Shelby	ARC Engineers
Justine Kubo	ICON
Brooke Wilson	CHA Companies
Valerie Puchades	Gund Partnership
Caitlin Daniels	CBI
Morgan Devlin	LLB
Stephanie Beals	TSKP Studio
Amanda Sawyer	CHA Companies
Tamara Macuch	Habeeb
Scott Mandeville	Moody Nolan
Steven Habeeb	Habeeb
Mary Ann Agresti	The Design Initiative
Emma Rocha	CBI
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Jim Albrecht	Sturgis Charter School
Paul Marble	Sturgis Charter School

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Request for Continued Services for Woodard & Curran

MCI Norfolk – Wastewater Plant Replacement
Project #DOC1805

Representing DCAMM were Steve O'Connor, Liz Minnis and Beth Eromin. DCAMM is requesting approval from the Board to contract with Woodard & Curran for remaining design services on a project for improvements to a wastewater treatment facility operated by the Department of Correction (DOC) at its MCI-Norfolk facility. Woodard & Curran were properly appointed in accordance with the laws governing design services for public works to perform the study and engineering work necessary to complete the construction documents for the project as a public works project. The transition of the project to a building project procurement submit to M.G.L. c 149, §§ 44A-44H, and the additional services need to revise the existing design materials and administer the contract in compliance with statutory requirements, is, in DCAMM's opinion, a "succeeding state....of the same project". The Board reviewed and discussed DCAMM's request for the continued services with Woodard & Curran. After a brief discussion the Board voted to approve the request to continue the services with Woodard & Curran for the MCI Norfolk Wastewater Plant Replacement according to the M.G.L. c7C §44.

In accordance with M.G.L. c. 7C, § 52, the Board voted to approve the continued services with Woodward & Curran for the MCI-Norfolk - Wastewater Plant Replacement.

On a motion to approve the continued services with Woodard & Curran for the MCI Norfolk Wastewater Plant Replacement by Gregory Brown, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved unanimously.

B. DSB List #20-07, Sturgis2020, Sturgis 441 Main Renovation, Sturgis Charter School, Hyannis, Fee: To Be Negotiated, 9 Applicants

Review of the nine (9) applications resulted in determination that one (1) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

GUND Partnership had no Section #9 included in the application. On a motion to disqualify GUND Partnership by Gregory Brown, seconded by Jessica Tsymbal. Ken Wexler, Elise Woodward, Virginia Greiman and Alan Ricks were opposed to disqualifying GUND Partnership. Motion was approved to disqualify GUND Partnership.

Jim Albrecht and Paul Marble, both representing Sturgis Charter School were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. After a discussion the Board voted to select the following 3 ranked finalists for this project:

The Design Initiative (27 points)
CSS Architects (13 points)
Habeeb & Associates (9 points)

On a motion by Kenneth Wexler to select the above ranked firms for the Sturgis Charter School, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

C. Board Business

- New DSB Regulations

The Board discussed and voted to approve the DSB Regulations CMR 811 3.00 and CMR 811 4.00.

Motion to approve the DSB Regulations CMR 811 3.00 and CRM 811 4.00 by Marty Blakey Smith, seconded by Elise Woodward. Jessica Tsymbal abstained. Motion was approved.

- DCAMM Diversity Statement

The Board reviewed the DCAMM Diversity Statement below:

Diversity emphasis in Designer Selection:

The Commonwealth is committed to helping address the disparity in the participation of minorities and women in design. We would like to point out a couple of changes in our current DCAMM advertisements to promote this effort.

In the **Affirmative Marketing** Section of the ads – we describe the goals for M and WBE participation, but we are also looking for what we call a 'Diversity Focus Statement' – which is your opportunity to describe your approach to diversity in your firms and in the formulation of your applicant teams. We are encouraging creativity in forming teams, and in dividing up the anticipated work of the projects.

Question 10 in the application form is the space to provide 'any additional information or description of resources supporting the qualifications of your firm and that of your subconsultants for the proposed project' – this is the identified space to include your Diversity Focus Statement in addition to other materials responding to the evaluation factors and experience requested in the ad.

Link to DSB:

[Find Designer Selection Board Projects | Mass.gov](#)

Rebecca requested that a link pertinent to the Governor's Executive Order be put in the application document and be posted on our website. The Board wants firms to tell the Board (within the application) how they are working together on M/WBE with their subs and how will they meet the M/WBE goals. Some of the members do not want to end up with a boiler plate paragraph; the members want a direct answer. There are certain agencies that have different M/WBE requirements than DCAMM. The Board wants to make sure that every advertisement includes this statement. The Criteria Sub-Committee will discuss this statement with DCAMM on June 15, 2020 at 3pm and report back to the Board.

- Autocene Sub-Committee Update – Elise gave a brief summary below

Vikram from Autocene gave a demonstration of the templates for printing and sharing, content management submission to show how the project documents are uploaded into the Autocene system, and the online repository of materials; this is all managed by DSB staff. We were able to view the list of firms, their disclosures, opportunity to see old project files, old meeting minutes, correspondence, office policies and procedures. We learned that the archivist requested that we only need to keep the 3 finalists' materials for each project. There is a link in Autocene that will allow the staff to automatically generate successful, unsuccessful and disqualification letters to the applicants. There was some discussion about MDOT and NAICS documentation and possible changes to the Massport evaluations. MBTA has agreed that they will submit their evaluations voluntarily. It is still to be determined to see if it is possible to generate the elements of the Annual Report and Diversity Report.

Rebecca questioned as to what things do the sub-committee still have on their list to follow up on and/or address. Elise said that these are not on the sub-committee list but on Autocene's list of features within Autocene to be completed so that they can be demonstrated so she understood that the generated letters, electronic link to Certrak for SDO firms, automated Annual Report and possible refinements on some of the other elements are all works in progress. She is very impressed with Autocene and how easy it seems it is to maneuver within the system. Dave stated that Autocene is very responsive to comments and questions.

We are all set to launch the Autocene system on July 1, 2020 as stated on the DSB website. Elise said that all the members should register in Autocene. Rebecca requested that between now and the next board meeting that members be registered. If there are any questions, please come prepared at the next meeting with any questions for Claire regarding the registration process in Autocene.

Bill is working on getting a couple of volunteer firms to work on submitting an application through Autocene before the roll out on July 1, 2020.

- Criteria and Analytics Sub-Committee Update

There was not a quorum for the June 3, 2020 Sub-Committee meeting; the meeting was cancelled. The next sub-committee meeting is on June 15, 2020 at 3pm.

- DSB Member Introduction and Informational Interview Outline

We will add the discussion for the DSB Member Introduction by Elise Woodward and the Informational Interview Outline by Janice Bergeron at a future meeting.

5. MOTION TO ADJOURN: The Board adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of June 10, 2020 by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY, June 24, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shiner

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 994TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY JUNE 24, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer (left at 11:25am)
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor (left at 11:10am)
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member (left at 11:30am)
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP Registered Architect

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

The minutes of the 993rd, June 10, 2020 meeting were approved.

On a motion to approve the minutes of the 993rd June 10, 2020 meeting by Kenneth Wexler, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. VISITORS:

Nancy Banks	B2Q
Liza Bouton	HMFH
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architects
Jennifer Bentley	BHPlus
Marion Roosa	Habeeb Architects
Caroline Fitzgerald	RMF
Michael Keane	Civitects
Keith Campbell	Next Phase Architects
Brooke Wilson	CHA Companies
Nick Brooks	DREAM Collaborative
Amanda Hanley	LDa Architects
Celeste	Turowski2 Architecture
Dagmar Von Schwerin	PRA
Katie Gething	DHK
Harold Levkowicz	HDR, Inc.
Robin Greenleaf	ARC Engineers
Alexis Noel	Alexis Noel Architecture
Molly Moore	MDS
Laura Arritt	Prellwitz Chilinski
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Balram Chamaria	BplusA
Lara Neubauer	DREAM Collaborative
Rachel Rauscher	Moody Nolan
Christine Verbitzki	GUND Partnership
Jennifer Shelby	ARC Engineering
Abbie Goodman	Engineering Center
Nicole Green	KBA Architects
Janet Nolan	Gale Associates, Inc.
Lindsey Luker	Gensler
Valerie P.	GUND Partnership
Morgan Devlin	LLB Architects
Andrew Romero	RGB
Alexis Noel	Nault Architects
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants
Scott Mandeville	Moody Nolan
Chad Reilly	HDR
Nadia Melim	Jones Payne
Dominick Roveto	HDR, Inc.
Thomas O'Connor	Bridgewater State University

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. DSB List #20-06, BSU2020 HD, Study & Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, Bridgewater State University, House Doctor, Fee: \$1,000,000, 36 Applicants

The Board requested a better/faster way to review the applications because there were 36 applications. It was mentioned that the Board could focus on the applications that were strong and provide general feedback related to how people could improve their applications by highlighting what is strong. The suggestion was that unsuccessful firms could request applications that have been successful from the DSB staff. One member commented that he is not sure how the board would pick strong firms when there are 36 of them. The Board owes it to the firms to review all of them with a little bit of feedback, if any. Another member thought that the Board discussed this 2 weeks ago and the Board had agreed to keep on the same path. It was mentioned that every application should be reviewed in case another member may have missed pertinent information. Each application could be reviewed and members asked if anyone has any issues with an application. We do not want to slight any firm. Everyone's comments are taken seriously and because this issue was discussed at previous meetings, the Board will continue reviewing all of them. The discussion will be tabled for discussion at a future meeting.

Thomas O'Connor from Bridgewater State University was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. Thomas thanked the members for all their work in reviewing thirty-six applications. In his opinion there is a very good pool of capable qualified applicants. With the current changes occurring with COVID, the university does not have plans for major building projects; they are looking at deferred maintenance with the emphasis on complex mechanical issues. They prefer a small firm that the university can partner with and not become a number in a queue with other clients. Thomas looks for a high level of principal involvement as well, he likes a principal to be an equity holder in the firm, and is not just looking for a title. The university is seeking a responsive, good solid team member; cost and time frame is important as well. He said that the House Doctor firms selected will be an extension of the Bridgewater team.

Review of the thirty-six (36) applications resulted in determination that one (1) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

Brewster Thornton Group had no MBE firm nominated. A motion to disqualify Brewster Thornton Group made by Gregory Brown, seconded by Virginia Greiman was unanimously approved.

The Chair requested that during the review if the members see any repetition or have suggestions that can speed up the process, please let her know but she does not want to minimize any firms' applications. Please provide any comments on the DSB matrix, Section 8, resumes for prime and subs and Section #10.

Below is a summary of the discussion of the applications.

Amenta Emma Architects – A member commented that it is a very good application with a body of work showing limited experience within the Commonwealth; their work is mainly in Connecticut and other places. As was said before about this firm, they have 3 locations with headquarters in Connecticut, not listed in the application. Claire will work with Ms. Smith to send out an email to Amenta Emma Architects notifying them of this issue. The subs did not show a lot of detailed information and did not show specifics to the detail within the scope of work. Another member thought it was a very strong proposal and the prime, while the projects are in Connecticut, showed very comparable typologies of work, and strong design. Subs have Massachusetts projects at community colleges and types of similar work. The application was "boiler plate", but good and addressed the questions. It would have been stronger if more examples were included.

Bargmann Hendrie + Archetype – The resumes listed a lot of projects but did not list specific details. A member thought they could show more on the specification's consultant. It was thought their experience was mixed in terms of the projects presented. Another member thought it was a nice body of work, but not detailed to the specific project which hampers the Board's ability to understand what the challenges were and how they would address them.

Bergmeyer – A member thought the primes had some projects that were along the lines of what the university is looking for in this house doctor project. There was a good body of work and they did a really good job in Section #8. Another member thought the subs had good experience. Section #10 was strong and showed great design excellence and the matrix of relevant experiences with long term higher ed relationships. This is important for a large firm to be able to indicate that they had a recurring relationship to show that they have the ability to address the clients needs.

CBI Consulting – One member thought the resumes were "boiler plate" but with a strong mechanical sub. It was stated that CBI showed work at the university but was not listed in the user comments; Mr. O'Connor said those projects were before his time. Another member comment that Section 8a was one of the best so far; excellent job in explaining their projects.. It was thought the work seemed to be very envelope heavy as opposed to interior heavy. In response to questions from members, Mr. O'Connor stated they will have some exterior work but not as much as mechanical work. The campus is facing ADA type challenges, such as bathroom being made accessible for gender neutral facilities. One member had trouble going through this application and had to hunt for the answers.

CHA – Most of the members did not think the M/WBE was strong enough to meet the goals. One of the members considered the prime to have shown little higher ed experience and wasn't clear if they were new projects or their use. Mr. O'Connor stated that CHA is a bigger firm and recently purchased Daedalus, a very substantial cost estimating firm and that is the source of the majority of the Bridgewater references. There was an impression that the individuals being proposed in the application have strong experience but it looks like a complicated team because most are working in different offices. The application does not state how this will be addressed. There should be a description of how the team members in various offices will work together with the client. The members would like firms to note how all firms in and out of state will be responsive to the client. CHA did try to pull it together in Section #10 and did a good job there.

Civitects Architecture– One member was concerned that they were small with 6 people in the firm. Mr. O'Connor said that he would prefer smaller firms. They have a good body of work and showed work at Bridgewater. They also have good supporting sub-consultants. It was noted that they had the same MEP sub as seen in other applications. Mr. O'Connor was asked if he has ever had two or more house doctor firms that work on the same project. He stated that the university had a six-year complicated project and expanded the contracts of the different house doctors. Civitects did Phase 3 and another applicant performed Phase 1 and 2, and so there was an overlap.

CSS Architects – It was stated that their experience tends to be heavier on elementary/secondary schools as opposed to higher education, showing more roofs and interior work, not necessary system work. Another member noted the resumes and Section #10 did show higher education and a strong showing with mechanical. They showed many projects and a dense Section #10.

DHK Architects – A couple of the members commented on the inconsistency of the evaluations. Another member noted they showed a good body of work in Section 8a but didn't see the relevance in terms of higher education.

DREAM Collaborative – One of the members noted there was not much Massachusetts higher education work, which was also a comment from the university. A member commented that even though higher education was not listed, the projects were relevant to Bridgewater State University. The application was well organized and easy to understand, not much hidden information; it was all well presented. They are relying on Nitsch Engineering's relationship with Bridgewater State University, which was mentioned several times. It was noted that the package clearly discussed their ability to respond and be flexible to the client. Section #10 was well organized and showed a good body of work; it may not be higher education but the projects showed that they could do the kind of work the university is planning.

Gale Associates – This application was found to be less compelling than other applications. It included "boiler plate" statements not tailored to the specific project. The firm is invited to reach out to the staff for guidance as to what makes a strong application. One of the members thought the Section #8 was building envelope and exterior project specific as opposed to highlighting mechanical and electrical systems. Another member considered Section #10 to be more specific showing the disciplines that they were self-performing and the interface with their subconsultants.

Gensler – Members thought that it would be difficult for this team to meet the M/WBE goals. The application shows design excellence but it was not clear how this accomplished large firm would create a team specific to Bridgewater State University and how they proposed to work together with the client. One member was disappointed the resumes showed a list of projects without detail. In Section #10, they did make an effort to show their collaboration with the other subs on the team. Mr. O'Connor asked the Board what the PIC means to the DSB; does the DSB want a principal to have an equity position in the firm? One member thought that this was a very interesting point and she does not recall the discussion of the equity position of the PIC. She thinks this argument is compelling because especially in the very large firms that are conglomerates from many mergers and acquisitions, the individuals that are working on a client's projects may or may not have control over a firm's decisions relevant to that project; she congratulated Mr. O'Connor for bringing that to the Board's attention. The Board needs to define this or what the Board's expectations are for this and the topic will be added to the Board Business list.

Goldman Reindorf Architects – The resume showed many projects, but no description as to what was involved as relevant to this project. The firm's experience is strong on labs and with a strong MEP component. Section #8 showed comparable projects throughout the application and is one of the better Section #8's. They answered the questions in Section #10 but without much detail.

Gorman Richardson Lewis – Most members thought the M/WBE percentages would be difficult to meet the goals. The Org. Chart was confusing and hard to understand. The PIC and PM didn't show much detail in their resumes. One member could not determine if they have done state work with Chapter 149.

GUND – Most of the members agreed that the M/WBE goals would be difficult to meet. One member noted that their ADA projects are very large and not germane to this house doctor program and didn't see any Chapter 149 projects. This is a very accomplished firm that is seeking to widen their client base and the application would benefit from a specific discussion on how they plan to incorporate their design excellence stance for the building restoration work that the client will be needing. A more descriptive approach of how they propose to work with this client would have been helpful. One of the members commented that if they had taken renovation portions of their projects and spoken to the details to show how they can deal with these things it would have improved the application. It was noted in Section #10, they are relying on their subs to perform Chapter 149-149A requirements. Historically this firm has done a lot of work for the Commonwealth but it was not shown in the application. One member noted that it is not the Board's responsibility to decide on the M/WBE percentages. It was stated that the Board is not making a decision to disqualify but can mention if the M/WBE appears light and unlikely to meet the goals. It is up to the individual member to make that decision when they vote.

Habeeb & Associates – In response to a member's question, Mr. O'Connor said that the firm had successful projects on the campus. A couple of the members mentioned the team seemed light on the M/WBE and may not meet the goals; they put a strong application together and need to show more M/WBE participation. This is a strong firm with many projects, especially at Bridgewater. Thomas told the members that their sub Garcia Galuska DeSousa is a very good firm. They had one of the better Section #10's.

HDR Architecture – It was mentioned that Bridgewater thought this firm was too large for the scope of work.

HMFH Architects – It was mentioned that Bridgewater thought this is a large firm for the scope of work.

ICON - The PIC and PM showed a good body of work and are teaming with a good sub-consultants' group for MEP, civil and structural. Section #10 showed good detail with the statements of relevance and short testimonials that were laced throughout.

Johnson Roberts Associates – Section #8 was nicely composed. It was a strong proposal and good Section #10; strong cost estimating bar graph. They compiled their data very well and did a great job throughout.

Jones Architecture – They showed a good body of similar type of work to this house doctor contact. One of the members commented that this was another strong proposal, good Section #8a, seems well qualified, with diverse projects aligned to what the university needs, solid Section #10. Another member liked the matrix in Section #10 and noted it was a very effective way to show how their house doctor teams work well together.

LDa Architecture - Overall, they had a good application. One of the members liked their Section #8 and did a good job of giving areas of elements but needed more details for clarity. They had a good Section #10.

LLB Architects – Most of the members thought the M/WBE was light. They have done some work at Bridgewater State University; Mr. O'Connor said they were responsive and did their job. The PIC and PM have a lot of higher education experience, a couple in Massachusetts, and they know their way around the campus.

Margulies Perruzzi – Their experience seems to be medically related but the PM shows university work, not necessarily Massachusetts public higher education. One of the members didn't think it was as strong as other proposals when it came to what the university is looking for.

Miller Dyer Spears – One of the members looked at the PIC and PM resumes and noted the higher education work but was not exactly clear how relevant it was to the MEP focus and only showed a few Massachusetts universities. One member noted their Section #10 is more representative than their Section #8.

Moody Nolan – One of the members commented that Moody Nolan was trying to break into the market. They have higher education experience but not in Massachusetts. They have a small group in Boston and will be relying on their subs to help them. They have an in-house specifications consultant and do not show any work in Massachusetts and the specs will really become an issue. They have made progress on their application since the first application. They are tailoring their applications more to the projects, which the Board appreciates. Section #10 should be more specific on how their team in Boston would support a Massachusetts project. It might be helpful to see actual references incorporated into Section #10 so that there is some client voice in the application to their performance record. One of the members didn't consider Section #10 as strong as it did not indicate how they would cover Chapter 149. Also, it would have been good if they could show how they would differentiate themselves to enhance the client's interest.

Mount Vernon Group – The PIC resume had a small amount of higher education experience and PM didn't show projects with relevance. Another member would have liked to have understood the scope of his renovation experience. They have a good working relationship with Crowley (MEP); Mr. O'Connor said Crowley is a good company. Section #8 was just okay, but Section #10 was strong.

Nault Architects – A general comment was made about how they have the best examples regarding in-house consultant and really showed they can do both prime, cost and code consultants; they gave examples of sub-consultants (Section #8a). They proved they know what they are doing. One member thought they are doubling up on sub-consultant (2) MEP but didn't show how it would work; it would have been nice if they explained how they would divide their work. Mr. O'Connor thought it was a good idea because they showed a back-up..

Next Phase Studios – One of the members noted the application did not show relevant higher education experience in Section #8, but Section #10 answered some of that. Based on Section #9 the experience showed is housing authorities.

Perkins Eastman – One member had issues with the PIC resume; it wasn't clear which were new or renovation type projects. A couple of other members thought the PM's experience was quite relevant. The projects they showed seemed to be all renovations, except for maybe one.

Pfeufer Richardson Architects – Some members thought the M/WBE were light and would not make the goals. A member commented that they have done a lot of MSCBA work and thinks they demonstrated their ability for the work the university needs done.

Prellwitz Chilinski Associates – Higher education is well documented in the resumes and experience relevant to this project. They did a good job in Section #8a and showed good design skills. Section #10 was very responsive and showed a good body of work; nicely done.

Sorensen Partners Architects – This is a very small firm with one registered architect who is the PIC, which could be a positive. They clearly have educational experience but not much higher education. A member commented that they did come right out and mention they would be relying on their sub-consultants.

Spencer, Sullivan & Vogt – A couple of members said they would be challenged to meet their M/WBE goals. It was a difficult application to read. There is an individual on the team that had experience with Bridgewater State University; Mr. O'Connor noted it was the PM that had the experience.

The Robinson Green Beretta – A member noted that they have done a lot of higher education work but PIC and PM do not show much Massachusetts work; they are using AEi as the mechanical sub which balances it out. They are a RI firm but close to Bridgewater. There was one concern that they don't have Chapter 149 experience; Mr. O'Connor noted they do housing authorities so they should have the experience. The specification consultant is very knowledgeable in Chapter 149.

Turowski2 Architecture – Most of the members agreed the team was light on M/WBE. One member stated that this is a very strong and certified firm that will make the M/WBE requirements; it is a wonderful proposal. DCAMM tells the Board they hold the firm accountable to meet the goals. The DSB should not reject firms on M/WBE, it is not what we do. It was stated that the Board is not rejecting the firm but cautioning that they may not make the M/WBE requirements. The Board is not excluding this firm or any other firm that is light on the M/WBE. The Board would like to have another discussion with DCAMM regarding M/WBE requirements and have DCAMM clarify how they confirm that prime/subs meet the M/WBE requirements with the scope of the project.

The members agreed that this was a difficult decision to select four (4) firms; from many strong applications. One member commented that it was an extraordinary pool of applicants and made her rethink her decision after hearing everyone's comments.

After a discussion the Board voted to select the following four (4) unranked finalists for this project:

Civitects Architecture
Johnson Roberts Associates
Nault Architects
Pfeufer Richardson Architects

A motion by Gregory Brown to select the above unranked firms for the Bridgewater State University House Doctor project, seconded by Virginia Greiman was approved unanimously.

B. Board Business

- Criteria and Analytics Sub-Committee Update – Met on June 15, 2020

Ms. Smith considered it a very productive meeting with extensive discussion with DCAMM about the diversity focus. As part of the criteria, we will ask the applicant to describe the make-up of their team, its diversity and how they expect it to work and how their team works together. This should help us with the M/WBE area. If we have this as a requirement it will be a good way to deal with this issue; DCAMM does want the Board to look at this.

Secondly regarding the number of applications we had today, we are considering how to describe and create the evaluation factors so that firms will look at the project and know that it is not a good fit for them. We hope there will be more specific criteria that firms can respond to and make the Board's job easier and clearer. We will be refining this at another meeting. The Subcommittee would like to address qualifications on the sub-consultants. There are clear qualifications for architects and engineers, but less clear qualifications that determine specification consultants, cost estimators, building code consultants, historical consultant and all the other sub consultants that we see that do not have registrations. The Chair wants this item to be brought to the entire Board. The Subcommittee would like to see a template for house doctor projects and specific projects to better define the project and what user agencies are looking for.

- Autocene Sub-Committee – June 23, 2020 – Ms. Woodward gave a summary below:

Vikram from Autocene showed the sub-committee a member roster and list of applicants for voting. DSB Staff will record the vote during the meeting in Autocene. There will be voting set up for house doctors and specific projects. The final design will be brought to the Board for further discussion. Also discussed were content management and online depository with 6-8 categories of content that will eventually be accessible to the public, such as old applications, legal documents, Boardvantage files, approval letters, etc. This will be demonstrated to the Board at a future update. It was discussed that the evaluation criteria, maybe should be called evaluation factors, to differentiate from the DCAMM criteria. Discussion continued on the format of the proposals (whether it should be a word document as opposed to an InDesign document); Vikram is continuing to perfect this. A one-page summary was shown to allow a firm the option to show more than the email address and contact information, such as the diversity statement or a brief summary as to why this firm should be considered. Refinement of formatting for the application is ongoing based on comments received at the ACEC rollout and a similar rollout this week with the AIA. The meeting minutes have been approved and Claire posted in Boardvantage.

Rebecca asked for the Autocene progress and what will happen on July 1, 2020. Bill addressed that we are making good progress. The staff is making sure that all firms get registered. We have a few firms that have been helpful with testing the application online. Some subs do not have InDesign so Autocene has cleaned up the word version. We are busy but will be in good shape by July 1.

- DSB New Member Introduction

Ms. Woodward presented the introduction to the DSB and suggested the title be revised. She thanked the ED and DSB Staff for forwarding existing documents. The goal was to develop a concise description of the DSB and its inauguration in the Commonwealth, its mission, membership, chair, condition of membership, support staff, duties of the board, meeting schedule, board preparation requirements, remote participation, and the conflict of public meeting and award notice. It would be ideal for the summary to be a one-page document. Among other things, the award notice can be eliminated from this introduction and the Board may have suggestions for streamlining the document. This is an important document to have both for interested members and as guidance for new members when they are appointed to the Board, as well as a refresher for current board members.

The Chair mentioned the issue of professional insurance and suggested the law that protects a volunteer should be referenced in this document. The ED will speak to Susan Goldfischer at DCAMM and the attorney of the day at A&F to see if Board members who are considered special state employees are covered under state law. The Chair agreed to table this topic for a future meeting.

Informational Interview Outline

Ms. Bergeron will send the comments to be incorporated them into the Interview Outline. This will be discussed at a future meeting.

The Chair discussed the next agenda for July 8, 2020, confirming that Massport would be attending this meeting to discuss their 2-year exemption. The Chair will forward some information to the ED for Massport to provide to the Board.

There will be 13 applications to review and time to add to Board Business: How to better review applications. Mr. Ricks also wants DCAMM to brief the DSB on M/WBE goals. Alan would like them to come prepared to discuss (especially on projects where the scope is undetermined) how they track it and how many times are exemptions given.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of June 10, 2020 by Janice Bergeron, seconded by Marty Smith Blakey. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, July 8, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire H. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shivers

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 995TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY JULY 8, 2020 AT 8:30 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect (left at 11am)
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Virginia Greiman	Public Member (left at 11am)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

The minutes of the 994th, June 24, 2020 meeting were tabled to the next meeting on July 8, 2020. Elise volunteered to review and modify the minutes; Claire will send here a word document. Rebecca recommended meeting with Claire and Elise via Zoom to go over the minutes and finalize any changes. A motion to table the June 24, 2020 minutes by Gregory Brown, seconded by David Chappell. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Nancy Banks	B2Q
Justine Kubo	ICON Architecture
Irene Hosey	Johnson Roberts
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore and Whittier
Elayne Campos	DCAMM
Thomas Iskra	BVH
Ned Collier	ICON Architecture
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet
Scott Campbell	DCR
Will Ragano	Johnson Roberts
Dan Clark	DCR
Rita Mercado	MWRA
Sheila Remondi	DFS
Jeffrey Gagner	Mass.gov
Christina Silvestro	Liro
Liz Minnis	DCAMM
Jen Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Donald Walter	Dore & Whittier
Robert Rink	STV, Inc.
Bruce Dillon	Dore & Whittier
Maureen McAvoy	MWRA
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Maribel Fournier	DFS
Amanda Lowitz	Galante Architecture
Jessica Brown	EDM
Scott Schilt	DCAMM
Houssam Sleiman	Massport
Susan Brace	Massport
Luciana Burdi	Massport
John Colbert	MWRA
Andrew Romero	RGB
Daniel Tenney	WSE, Inc.
Brian McCusker	WSE, Inc.
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants, Inc.
Robert Hicks	Stantec
Jeffrey DeVeau	STV, Inc.
Brian Novelline	Liro

4. NEW BUSINESS:**A. EXEMPTION: Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport)**

Massport submitted a two-year exemption to the Designer Selection Board. Houssam Sleiman, Dr. Luciana Burdi and Susan Brace, from Massport were in attendance to present in PPT Massport procedures and answer questions from the Board. The Board reviewed the application for the renewal of the current exemption of Massport from the jurisdiction of the Designer Selection Board. In accordance with the Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 7C, Provision 46, the Board voted to grant to Massport a two-year exemption expiring on July 8, 2022. Massport will keep the Board advised of any changes in the panel membership and any modifications to the procedures. A motion to approve the two-year exemption for Massport by Daniel Carson, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved unanimously to approve Massport's two-year exemption to the Designer Selection Board.

B. DSB List #20-05, #7677, Quabbin Maintenance Building, MWRA, on behalf of Department of Conservation and Recreation, Belchertown, Fee: To Be Negotiated; Ecc: \$3,288,468, 7 Applicants

David Chappell recused himself from voting on this project.

Elise Woodward motioned that when a person recuses themselves, they should leave the room and not listen in on the conversation, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was unanimously approved. This policy has been approved for when any member recuses themselves from a discussion.

Rita Mercado and Maureen McAvoy from MWRA along with Dan Clark and Scott Campbell from DCR were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

Review of the seven (7) applications resulted in determination that two (2) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

Clark & Green had no Massachusetts registered electrical engineer nominated. On a motion to disqualify Clark & Green by Gregory Brown, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was unanimously approved to disqualify Clark & Green.

Hill-Engineers had no LSP (Engineer) nominated; person nominated does not have LSP license. On a motion to disqualify Hill-Engineers by Gregory Brown, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was unanimously approved to disqualify Hill-Engineers.

Below is a summary of some of the members comments for each applicant:

DiGiorgio & Associates – A member commented that they had pertinent information in Section #8 but none of the in-house subs showed additional experience. Another member thought they did a good job in Section #10 and had similar projects listed as shown for this project.

Edm Services – A few members noted that they did not have relevant experience in their resumes and Section #10, that was being asked for in this advertisement.

STV, Inc. – Their overall experience in 8a was good and section #10 was complete. One of the members liked that they submitted a diversity focus statement and arguments for why they should be selected.

Robinson Green Beretta – Their section 8a showed a lot of maintenance facilities but would have liked it if it had been reflected in the resumes. Section #10 had excellent information. One member liked how they talked about keeping change orders driven by design low. They also showed GZA's experience with the MWRA.

Weston & Sampson – They are a strong firm and their personnel have great experience. There is no diversity with this firm because they are doing everything. So many people are being assigned to this project that it is confusing as who is doing what. In the past they have done horizontal work for MWRA.

After a discussion the Board voted to select the following three (3) ranked finalists for this project:

Robinson Green Beretta (18 points)
Weston & Sampson (13 points)
DiGiorgio & Associates (8 points)

On a motion by Elise Woodward to select the above ranked firms for the Quabbin Maintenance Building project, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved. David Chappell recused from himself from voting on this project.

- C. DSB List #20-08, #DFS2002, Southeast Fire Academy Master Plan and Certified Study, Bridgewater, Fee: \$250,000 (Master Plan and Study); Ecc: \$7,708,000 (Phase I project), 6 Applicants**

Liz Minnis and Scott Schilt, from DCAMM along with Maribel Fournier and Sheila Remondi, from Department of Fire Services were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

Review of the six (6) applications resulted in determination that one (1) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

The Galante Architecture had no MBE firm nominated and no 8b or sub-consultant acknowledgement form for Building Code Consultants, LLC. On a motion to disqualify The Galante Architecture by Daniel Carson, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was unanimously approved to disqualify The Galante Architecture.

Below is a summary of some of the members comments for each applicant:

Dore & Whittier – They are using in-house specification and code consultant and their resumes did not reflect this experience, but they redeemed themselves by submitting an 8b for both. The individual who is assigned to be the architect project manager is in the Burlington VT office however he does have relevant experience and presume they have figured out how to deal with the distance. They also showed relevant ongoing experience in section #9. This was a strong application overall.

ICON Architecture – This firm is taking on four disciplines and the resumes of the principal and project manager were boiler plate. One member noted that there was no relevant experience in section #8a. They didn't seem to reflect the information requested by the client agency. They did highlight their campus planning experience which is relevant.

Johnson Roberts – They are doing specifications in-house and although that person listed projects it was not indicated they actually did the project listed in resume. A member noted that it would have been nice if they showed the experience in section #10, in the resumes also to make a stronger application. A couple of members noted that section #9 showed some fire department experience and section #10 highlighted master planning and fire rescue facility experience.

Kaestle Boos – A couple of members thought the diversity statement was weak and questioned the M/WBE percentages; can they be met with civil, specs and cost. They did talk about adaptive reuse and master planning.

The Robinson Green Beretta – They did have a fire training consultant included in their application, but it was boiler plate information. The resumes for the PIC and Project Manager showed a lot of projects and some that could be considered close but did not see master planning experience for them.

After a discussion the Board voted to select the following three (3) unranked finalists be interviewed for this project on August 5, 2020:

Dore & Whittier
Kaestle Boos
The Robinson Green Beretta

On a motion by Virginia Greiman to select the above unranked firms to be interviewed for the DFS project on August 5, 2020, seconded by Elise Woodward. Motion was approved unanimously.

D. Board Business

- Criteria and Analytics Sub-Committee Update – Martha Blakey Smith

The sub-committee has not met since the last meeting and there has been no change.

- Autocene Sub-Committee – Elise Woodward

The sub-committee has not met and there has been no change since last meeting.

Jessica noted that the forms on our website need to be updated. Bill is going to review the website so all forms and language will reflect what it is in Autocene.

Bill will set up the two sub-committee meetings sometime next month.

- Reviewing #20-09 for Diversity Statement

Rebecca reminded the members to pay close attention to the Diversity Statement and how well applicants are responding to it and give your opinion on how it is being responded to and if it needs any tweaks to it.

- Special Employees

Bill will contact legal and it will be tabled for the next meeting

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of July 8, 2020 by Gregory Brown, seconded by David Chappell. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, July 22, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shivers

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 996TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY JULY 22, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 994th, June 24, 2020 meeting by David Chappell, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith.

Motion was approved unanimously.

A motion to approve the minutes of the 995th, July 8, 2020 meeting by David Chappell, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. VISITORS:

Jessica Stebbins	HDR, Inc.
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Gail Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Kevin Webb	STV, Inc.
William Epp	JACA Architects, Inc.
Arianna Griffin	Array Architects
Thomas Iskra	BVH
Alexandra Patterson	Shepley Bulfinch
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet
John Zychowicz	Liro
Alex Dorn	William Pevear
Susie Festel	JACA Architects, Inc.
Christina Silvestro	Liro
Aarathi Nirmalan	Cannon Design
Charles Kelsey	DCAMM
Sara Ruggiero	
Liz Minnis	DCAMM
Brian McKenna	Cannon Design
Robin Greenleaf	Architectural Engineers
Irene Kang	
Kevin Murrett	Arch Res
Amy Winter	DCAMM
Robert Rink	STV, Inc.
Molly Moore	MDS-Boston
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Steve Montibello	Cosentini
Rebecca Maloney	Arup
Antonio Leite	DCAMM
Sam Galvin	Array Architects
Jared Oakley	Arch Res
Dena Zyroff	Isgenuity
Jen Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Robin Whitman	DCAMM
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Price Jepsen	STV, Inc.
Arlita McNamee	Arch Res
Ellen Whittemore	DCAMM

William Pevear	William Pevear
John Nunnari	Architects Org.
Scott Mandeville	Moody Nolan
Michael Niehaus	Array Architects
Brian Novelline	Liro

4. NEW BUSINESS:**A. DSB List #20-09, Study, Planning, Design & Construction of Healthcare/Residential Care Environment Facilities, Multiple Locations, Fee: \$3,000,000 (House Doctor), 27 Applicants**

Review of the twenty-seven (27) applications resulted in determination that three (3) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

AECOM had no MBE firm nominated. On a motion to disqualify AECOM by Daniel Carson, seconded by David Chappell. Motion was unanimously approved to disqualify AECOM.

E/F/H was missing Sections #11 to #16; Application was not signed. On a motion to disqualify E/F/H Architects by David Chappell, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was unanimously approved to disqualify E/F/H Architects.

JACA Architects did not submit a Section #9. On a motion to disqualify JACA Architects by Daniel Carson, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was unanimously approved to disqualify JACA Architects.

Ellen Whittemore, Project Manager from DCAMM was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. This is a very important project for DCAMM especially during the COVID 19 crisis. These hospitals deal with residential, health, mental health, corrections and substance abuse. They are looking for a range of consultants that can do strategic and master planning to boiler replacements. Another important factor they would like the Board to consider as part of selection is the diversity statement that firms submitted as part of the project criteria.

Below is a summary of some of the members comments for each applicant:

Array Architects had a complete team and showed some experience in healthcare. In Section #10 they did not take the opportunity to respond directly to the items requested in the advertisement and provided more boiler plate information. They did take advantage of supplying more than one firm in some disciplines in order to engage the M/WBE stated in the diversity statement.

CannonDesign provided alternate disciplines and how they would be covered in-house as well. They had good individual qualifications for this project. Some members commented that they are a very strong firm and appreciated how they set up their resumes; it was easy to evaluate them. Section #10 was very responsive and relevant.

CHA Architecture is undertaking a lot of roles and did not consider having alternate disciplines or sub-consultants. It will be difficult for them to meet the M/WBE requirements. In some cases, there was limited healthcare experience although the project manager did show experience in the healthcare area. The agency found that this application was not as well put together as some of the other applications.

DiGiorgio Associates had so many in-house personnel and it would be difficult to meet the M/WBE requirements. The in-house staff resumes are generic and do not reflect the specific work individuals did on projects. In Section #10 they did answer the evaluation questions and gave some examples of their work. Most of their work is out-of-state but could bring a different perspective to this project.

EYP Architecture resume of the PIC showed higher education experience but did not list much relevant experience for this project. Other resumes especially the healthcare planner listed projects but did not show their experience. Section 8a was okay and they talked about new construction shown in 8a and renovations in existing facilities.

Gensler showed extensive healthcare experience in their resumes, but more detail would have been appreciated. They have a very strong proposal and it was reflected in the comments from the user agency. Section #10 was also very strong and concrete examples were shown.

HDR Architecture resume for the PIC shows relevant experience in healthcare. Section #10 was very strong and demonstrated experience in new and renovated facilities.

HED Architecture team of consultants had strong experience in healthcare. They had a good Section #10 and highlighted relevant experience in new and renovated facilities.

ICON Architecture resume for PIC experience showed higher education and no healthcare experience. The team had relevant experience with healthcare. Section #8 did not show relevant experience for this project. Section #10 seemed to have generic boilerplate information. This was not one of the stronger applications.

Isgenuity had a strong application showing a range of experience in new and renovated projects. They had a good Section #8a and responded to the criteria for Section #10.

Lavallee Brensinger Architects showed strong relevant project experience. Their team also noted a range of healthcare experience. Section #8 and Section #10 were very good, showing a breadth of experience for this healthcare project.

Leslie Saul & Associates and their team did not show a lot of healthcare experience. They did not respond well to Section #10 and did not include a diversity statement showing how the team would meet the M/WBE requirements for this project.

Linea 5, Inc showed relevant project experience. The resumes of the PIC and Project Manager provided healthcare experience. They had a good Section #8 but Section #10 did not answer all the evaluation questions requested in the advertisement.

LWDA and their team had strong relevant experience in healthcare. Section #8 highlighted project experience and addressed all aspects of this project. Section #10 was good but a little bit generic and did not respond directly to a couple of the evaluation questions.

Margulies Perruzzi demonstrated strong relevant project experience in healthcare. The sub-consultants were also very familiar with healthcare projects. Their Section #8 and Section #10 were good. This was another strong application.

Moody Nolan and their team showed relevant project experience throughout their application. The Project Manager in Boston did not show healthcare experience. They needed to show how they will work with out-of-state personnel on projects. Section #10 was not that strong.

Shepley Bulfinch had a very strong application and showed strong relevant project experience in healthcare. The PIC and Project Manager showed pertinent healthcare experience in their resumes. Section #10 was good and addressed all the evaluation questions.

SmithGroup showed strong relevant healthcare experience. The resumes, Section #8 and Section #10 were strong and demonstrated the breadth of healthcare experience. This was a good proposal.

SMRT and their sub-consultants showed strong relevant experience in healthcare. The PIC and Project Manager resumes include project experience for this project. They provided a good Section #8 and Section #10 and answered all the evaluation criteria questions.

Stantec and its design team showed relevant experience in healthcare projects. They addressed all the evaluation criteria in Section #8 and Section #10. This was another strong application.

Studio G Architects showed experience with behavioral health, corrections and residential treatment projects but no healthcare experience. Their team of consultants showed similar relevant project experience. Section #8 and #10 highlighted some healthcare projects but more specific project examples would have been helpful.

STV, Inc. and their design team showed relevant project experience for this project. They answered all the evaluation criteria questions in Section #8 and #10.

The Robinson Green Beretta demonstrated relevant project experience. The Project Manager did not list any relevant experience for this project. They showed healthcare projects in Section #8 and answered all the evaluation criteria questions in Section #10.

William Pevear Architects is a small firm but have the relevant healthcare experience for this project. The PIC listed healthcare experience in the resume. Section #8 was good and showed examples of projects. Section #10 demonstrated relevant project experience in healthcare facilities and answered the evaluation questions in the advertisement.

After a discussion the Board voted to select the following six (6) unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

CannonDesign
Gensler
Margulies Perruzzi
Shepley Bulfinch
SmithGroup
Stantec

On a motion by Martha Blakey Smith to select the above unranked firms for the House Doctor project at Healthcare/Residential Care Environment Facilities in multiple locations, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was unanimously approved.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:21 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of July 22, 2020 by Kenneth Wexler, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, August 5, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shivers

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 997TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY AUGUST 5, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

A motion to approve the minutes of the 996th, July 22, 2020 meeting by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved unanimously.

3. **VISITORS:**

Jason Harris	Designs
Luke McCoy	KBA Architects
Scott Schilt	DCAMM
Antonio Leite	DCAMM
Todd Costa	KBA Architects
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore & Whittier
Elayne Campos	DCAMM
Robert Manns	MWS Architects
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Scott Dzik	RGB
David Pereira	GGD
Michael McKeon	KBA Architects
Sheila Remondi	DFS/DCAMM
Steven Ventresca	Nitsch Engineering
Peter Ostroskey	DFS/DCAMM
Glen Gollrad	Dore & Whittier
Donald Walter	Dore & Whittier
Alan Brown	Dore & Whittier
Larry Trim	KBA Architects
Brian Solywoda	KBA Architects
Nick Ferzacca	ARC Engineers
Roger LeBoeuf	ELA Engineers
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. INTERVIEW: DSB List #20-08,** DFS2002, Southeast Fire Academy Master Plan and Certified Study, Bridgewater, Estimated Construction Cost: \$7,708,000 (Phase I project); Fee for Master Plan and Study: \$250,000; Fee for Schematic Design/Certified Study: To Be Negotiated; Final Design: To Be Negotiated.

On Wednesday July 8, 2020, the Designer Selection Board conducted a preliminary review of the original six (6) submissions for the above-referenced project. After considerable discussion, the Board selected the following three (3) unranked applicants for interviews as they were determined to exhibit the necessary qualifications to perform the requested services:

Dore + Whittier
Kaestle Boos
The Robinson Green Beretta

All three finalists displayed considerable skills and similar experiences with this type of project. Dore & Whittier and Kaestle Boos incorporated most of DCAMMs priorities in their presentations. The Robinson Green Beretta experience was good but less extensive than Dore & Whittier and Kaestle Boos.

In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49, the Board voted to select the ranked firms in the following order:

Dore + Whittier
260 Merrimac Street
Building #7, 2nd Floor
Newburyport, MA 01950
(21 points)

Kaestle Boos Associates, Inc.
16 Chestnut Street, Suite 301
Foxborough, MA 02035
(19 points)

The Robinson Green Beretta Corporation
50 Holden Street
Providence, RI 02908
(8 points)

The immediate services authorized are schematic plans and outline specifications, certified building study, and master planning services. It is intended that the continued services for design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications and administration of construction contract will be required of the selected Design Team following completion of the certified study and notification of the Board in accordance with M.G.L. c. 7C.

B. BOARD BUSINESS:

Autocene: – Rebecca would like to have an idea of when Autocene will be going live, as well as the plan for transitioning from Boardvantage to Autocene. Will more than one platform be active initially? She recommends several sessions be scheduled with Autocene to instruct the board to utilize the functionality without difficulty. Given the transition period it would be helpful to have a project with limited applications as the first and not be inundated with applications for the first time using the Autocene process.

Bill commented on these items below:

The DSB will be keeping Boardvantage until Autocene completes this functionality and it can replace it with Autocene sometime in March/April. The Autocene Sub-Committee will be meeting on August 12, 2020 to discuss DSB tasks with Autocene.

Bill mentioned that the DSB will be relying on the design community to test the application process in Autocene. The DSB has two projects that are due on September 2, 2020 and firms will be applying through Autocene and will also be able to apply to the DSB electronically. All designers and sub-consultants must be registered and ready to use Autocene by September 30, 2020 as noted on the DSB website and in the advertisements.

If Board members have any comments, please submit them to the DSB Staff to be included in the training for the Board on using Autocene.

Remote Meetings: Dan Carson inquired about keeping meetings remote. The answer is that the DSB will be keeping the meetings remote and will not be returning to the in-person forum in the foreseeable future.

MBE/WBE Update: DCAMM will attend a meeting in September/October to discuss the M/WBE requirements with the Board

Massachusetts Convention Center Authority (MCCA) Exemption: The DSB is waiting for more information from MCCA and will upload it into the Boardbook to be discussed at the August 19, 2020 or September meeting.

DSB tasks to be discussed at future meetings: Planning for tasks and dates that lead up to the unveiling of Autocene and the steps needed to engage the Board in training. The Autocene Sub-Committee will discuss and bring it to the full Board.

Add to August 19, 2020 meeting: At the next meeting the Board will review and finalize the Indemnification for Board Members before it is added to the handout for new members.

Criteria and Analytic Sub-committee: There is no meeting set at this time for the Criteria and Analytic Sub-committee – Bill will set up a time when DCAMM can attend this meeting and will keep the Board updated.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:17 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of August 5, 2020 by Gregory Brown, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved unanimously.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, August 19, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Sherr

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 998TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY AUGUST 19, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Gregory E. Brown, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 997th, August 5, 2020 meeting by Gregory Brown, seconded by David Chappell. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Joseph McGowan	Essex County Sheriff's Department
Kevin Webb	STV, Inc.
Christyn Binder	Arora Engineers
Marion Roosa	Habeeb Architects
Renee LaPlante	SMRT, Inc.
Jen Shelby	ARC Engineers
Dan Mee	Klopfer Martin
Abbie Goodman	Engineering Center
P Merrill	RFS Engineering
Pamela Perini	
Caitlin Daniels	CBI Consulting LLC
Ann Keane	Civitects
Harold Levkowicz	HDR, Inc.
Jim Falvey	Arora Engineers
Tamara Macuch	Habeeb Architects
Jepsen Price	STV, Inc.
Liz Minnis	DCAMM
Robin Greenleaf	ARC Engineers
Chad Reilly	HDR, Inc.
Emma Rocha	CBI Consulting
Chris Nordberg	STV, Inc.
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Scott Ennis	Worcester County Sheriff's Office

4. NEW BUSINESS:

A. DSB List #20-10, WCS02020HD, Study & Design of General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, Worcester County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), West Boylston, House Doctor, Fee: \$500,000, 10 Applicants

Scott Ennis from Worcester County Sheriff's Office was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. The immediate services authorized are certifiable building study, schematic plans and outline specifications, design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications and administration of construction contract.

The ten applications were reviewed by the Board and were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project. The following are general comments made by the Board:

Caolo & Bieniek Associates, Inc. did not show much correctional experience. The client agency commented a lack of correctional experience. The Section #10 had good information but did not address or show any experience in the correctional field.

CBI Consulting, LLC didn't address correctional work. The nominated mechanical and electrical engineers did show correctional experience. They were responsive to the criteria evaluation.

Civitects Architecture is a small firm that has increased interest in good client relations and delivery. They do have experience with Worcester County. A couple of the members thought that Section #10 was "boiler plate" and light in correctional facilities experience.

CSS Architects, Inc. listed projects that seem to be less current. The mechanical firm had the most experience for this type of project.

DHK Architects nominated a security consultant, which was not requested in the advertisement, but is a plus with this type of project. They do have experience with various types of detention facilities. It would have been helpful if some of this work showed up in their resumes. Section #10 was difficult to read.

Edward Rowse Architects, Inc. does specialize in correctional work, but mechanical and electrical did not show much experience in this field. Section #10 did seem "boiler plate" and some of the work was out of date and overall could have showed a better representation of projects.

Habeeb & Associates Architects did show projects that were occupied or not. They did receive a positive evaluation which mentioned the structural engineer nominated for this correctional project. The mechanical and electrical were light on their experience with more public safety work noted. Section #10 covered most of their completed work even though they were not correctional facilities, but public safety work dealing with some of the same issues. They showed collaboration with their consultant team. They did not show relevant correctional experience.

HDR Architecture, PC did show a good representation of correctional experience along with their sub-consultants. In Section #10 they showed who is going to work on the project, tied in nicely with the resumes experience.

SMRT Architects & Engineers had extensive correctional facility experience. The client has worked with this firm and never had an issue with them getting to projects and noted they have always been responsive. Section #10 was very strong and was very specific with their availability and expertise.

STV, Inc. received an excellent performance evaluation. Their sub-consultants have relevant experience with correctional work. This proposal was very well presented. Section #10 was well done and one of the strongest ones the Board has seen.

In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49, the Board voted to select the unranked firms in the following order:

Civitects Architecture
66 Troy Street
4th Floor
Fall River, MA 02720

HDR Architecture, P.C.
99 High Street
Suite 2300
Boston, MA 02110

SMRT Architects and Engineers
200 Brickstone Square, Suite 303
Andover MA 01810

STV, Inc.
One Financial Center, 3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02111

A motion was made by Virginia Greiman to send the above unranked firms to the Worcester County Sheriff's Department for this House Doctor project, seconded by Gregory Brown. Motion was approved.

B. DSB List #20-11, ECSD2020HD, Study & Design of General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, Essex County Sheriff's Office (ECSO), Middleton & Lawrence, House Doctor, Fee: \$500,000, 8 Applicants

Joseph McGowan from the Essex County Sheriff's Office was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. The immediate services authorized are certifiable building study, schematic plans and outline specifications, design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications and administration of construction contract.

The eight applicants were reviewed by the Board and were all responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project. Most of these firms mimic the previous project deliberated for the Worcester County Sheriff's Department. The following are general comments by the Board:

CBI Consulting, LLC did not have quite the level of qualifications as the rest of applicants.

CSS Architects, Inc. noted less current correctional experience.

DHK Architects did nominated an independent security consultant, not requested in the advertisement. They have a strong application.

Edward Rowse Architects, Inc. has correctional experience and a good body of work. As noted previously the mechanical and electrical do not have the experience in correctional facilities.

Habeeb & Associates Architects have an excellent evaluation. They have shown good correctional experience. This is a good application.

HDR Architecture, PC has two good evaluations from MCI Framingham. They provided good qualifications and expertise including that of their sub-consultants. In general, they have a good solid Section #10.

SMRT Architects & Engineers has a good body of correctional experience as noted in the Worcester County Sheriff's Department. They also nominated a security consultant.

STV, Inc. has a good evaluation. This is a good application. In Section #10, they submitted a matrix of relevant experience, some in Massachusetts and the other half from across the country. It would have been helpful if another column had been added to show the team and relate how that expertise could be transferred directly to the group working on Essex County Sheriff's Office. They need to focus on the listed team and how they will work together on this project.

In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49, the Board voted to select the following unranked firms for the Essex County Sheriff's Office House Doctor project:

DHK Architects
54 Canal Street
Suite 200
Boston, MA 02114

HDR Architecture, P.C.
99 High Street
Suite 2300
Boston, MA 02110

SMRT Architects and Engineers
200 Brickstone Square, Suite 303
Andover MA 01810

STV, Inc.
One Financial Center, 3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02111

Motion was approved by Virginia Greiman to send the above unranked firms to the Essex County Sheriff's Office for this House Doctor project, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved.

C. BOARD BUSINESS:

Autocene: – The sub-committee met on August 12, 2020. Discussion included online search repository and how the DSB Staff will access certain documents and interface with state archivist.

Bill will send out screen shots if anyone requests them. Another sub-committee meeting will be scheduled the first week of September to discuss all the categories.

Evaluations that are seen with applications were entered under the old system and imported into Autocene. Autocene will have information sessions on how DCAMM and other agencies will import into Autocene.

“How should the firms display their local office vs. headquarters office into Autocene for search purposes?” was discussed. This should be decided by the full board as to use of local office or Massachusetts office. This will be tabled for one of the next meetings

There is an application deadline on September 2, 2020 and it will be a busy next couple of weeks for the application component. There is an outstanding issue with the application program vs. In-design or Word but Autocene has done a great job with this. Also some firms can also use Adobe Acrobat. There will be feedback to the functionality of this and changes can be updated as firms start to apply.

Criteria and Analytic Sub-committee: There is no meeting set at this time for the Criteria and Analytic Sub-committee – Bill will set up a time when DCAMM can attend this meeting and will keep the Board updated.

Miscellaneous – Helpful Hints to Sub-Consultants

Janice requested that the meeting minutes capture comments from the Board regarding how subconsultants can improve their sections of the application for the next project deliberation.

5. MOTION TO ADJOURN: The Board adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of August 19, 2020 by Gregory Brown, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

6. NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY, September 2, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shivers

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 999TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 7, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 998th August 19, 2020 meeting by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Daniel Carson. Ilyas Bhatti abstained. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Janelli Aguilar	Smith Group
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Celia Civello	Edgewood Design
Dan Arons	Perkins Eastman
Jessica Knapp	DiMella Shaffer
Caroline Fitzgerald	RMF
Dan Mee	Klopfermartin
Jen Shelby	ARC Engineers
Abbie Goodman	The Engineering Center
Lindsey Luker	Gensler
Morgan Devlin	LLB Architects
Pamela Perini	Pamela Perini
Ann Keane	Civitects
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Lateffa Curry	SLAM Collaborative
Shannon Nehiley	Kliment Halsband
Melanie Maddox	Smith Group
Kathleen Porter	LBPA
Christopher Donato	Massachusetts Convention Center Authority
Keri Pappalardo	LBPA
Scott Mandeville	Moody Nolan
Jeffrey DeVeau	STV, Inc.
Gregory Brown	Retired Member
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Henry Keane	Antioch School
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects

4. NEW BUSINESS:

A. New Member:

The Board welcomed Ilyas Bhatti, Engineer replacing Gregory Brown.

B. Exemption for the Massachusetts Convention Center Authority (MCCA)

Christopher Donato, Brendan Flynn, John Donahue and Tara Coughlin all from Massachusetts Convention Center were present to discuss the exemption for the MCCA.

Chris noted that he added language regarding the Autocene program to the MCCA procedures. A member suggested not to include specific language and weblinks towards Autocene in the MCCA regulations. From a technology standpoint weblinks change all the time and it was suggested to only mention to use the form(s) online.

A discussion about the MCCA six-member panel. Some of the members asked how a tie vote is broken. The Executive Director would be able to vote and break the tie. The Board suggested there should be a policy on how to deal with tie breaker votes in the procedures.

Another member asked how long design teams are kept in the pool and the length of their contracts. The typical contract is a 3-year base agreement with 2 option years at the discretion of the MCCA. They do not want to overextend a firm when they have alternate firms to utilize. They try to determine which firm(s) are the best fit for projects available.

One member mentioned how the good faith waiver is used for MBE/WBE goals under 12B. The MCCA successfully tracks how they utilize the MBE/WBE firms. They did a workshop for minority firms on how they can get work through the MCCA. These firms were able to network and exchange information for teaming on future projects.

It was recommended to MCCA to select a larger, more diverse pool of firms for House Doctor projects instead of using the same firms over again.

A member wanted to thank the MCCA for all their help with COVID and using their facility as a temporary hospital. It is a great facility.

A suggestion was made by the Chair to the MCCA that if at any time during the 2-year exemption period they want to come back to the board for assistance with any issues that may arise, the DSB staff will make time and add to the agenda.

In accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 7C, §46, the Board voted unanimously on October 7, 2020 to grant the Massachusetts Convention Center Authority a two-year exemption expiring on July 9, 2022.

The MCCA will keep the DSB advised as to any further changes in panel membership, and any modifications to procedures, within the coming 2-year period.

On a motion to approve the two-year exemption for the Massachusetts Convention Center Authority by Elise Woodward, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved.

C. BOARD BUSINESS:

Autocene: – The Sub-committee met on September 29, 2020.

It was an informative presentation from Vikram and his team at Autocene. Vikram reviewed the system naming and appearance and various elements of Autocene, how it will look and be used. He noted that the data can be filtered, including diversity, location, services offered, etc.

Sub-consultant categories must be established and in order to do that we need to provide a list of sub-consultants that firms can choose from. We reviewed a DCAMM list, ACEC list, SDO list, and federal list. It was agreed to utilize the federal list and refine it as needed.

There was a discussion on Certification and how licensing will show in Autocene for firms and individuals. Autocene is working on an automated report system which may be used as an Annual Report.

Other issues that were touched on were training with DCAMM for the 3rd week in September. There was user participation during this sub-committee meeting which was helpful, and people were able to say specifically what was working well for them and what adjustments would be helpful in Autocene.

The evaluation factor was still outstanding and needs to be completed. There are things to still be completed on linking Autocene to the public notice procedures, the SDO database, the DSB training and the transition out of Boardvantage into Autocene.

Bill gave a brief update on the DSB applications received –approximately half the applications in Autocene and half through the DSB for the Military House Doctor and Higher Ed House Doctor projects. He discussed the evaluation and reference system which is being updated for the firms and will be incorporated into the firm's applications. All the DSB members should be registered in Autocene. At this point members will have full access to the system but cannot make any markups on the applications at this time. The Board must use Boardvantage in order to review and markup the applications. It is a work in progress transitioning from Boardvantage to Autocene.

PAGE 3 MINUTES OF THE 999TH MEETING – WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 7, 2020

Bill needs help with finalizing the categories for sub-consultants. Elise suggested that if the DSB uses a federal list, could an "other" category be added so that firms can create a new category in the federal list that other firms could also choose that category? Bill stated that we could do this and even have a sub-category as well. Bill said that we need MBTA, Massport and other agencies' participation in adding to this list. Rebecca asked if we could re-visit this in 2 years to review this list and update as needed? Rebecca suggested we (1) use the federal list (2) add "other" category (3) data analysis and re-visit 2 years and modify to meet all criteria. Dave did state that Licensed Site Professional is missing from this list. Bill will get more input from others before coming back to the Board.

D. FAREWELL to Gregory Brown

The Board said goodbye to Greg after serving six years on the DSB. Greg was presented with a Governor's Citation and a small donation was made to charity of his choice, Edward W. Brooke III Educational Foundation.

E. BOARD BUSINESS CONTINUED:

Autocene Sub-Committee – Sub-consultant categories using the federal list - Add to the list and vet with DCAMM, other agencies, sub-committee members, bring to the full Board for adjustments. Bill will give Claire the "items" to be posted in the Boardbook.

The actual transition for the Board members using Autocene versus Boardbook is about 3-4 months out. Elise suggested that every Board member have a login and "test drive" the site to make any comments and suggestions at the next meeting. Rebecca would like to have an Autocene tutorial at some point within the next 3-4 months. Jessica asked if there is a better way to name the projects in Autocene. Bill will research and get back to the Board.

Jessica will send a project spreadsheet to Roberto to fill out for the House Doctor projects being reviewed at the next couple of meetings. Claire will post in the Boardbook.

Rebecca wants an item added to future agendas – Next Meetings and Adjournments

Rebecca requested that Claire send out an email to the members regarding attendance at meetings. Claire will send out emails the Wednesday before a meeting and members will answer on that Thursday with a commitment to that meeting.

The Board will be reviewing 22 applications on October 21, 2020 for the Energy House Doctor and 60 applications for Higher Ed House Doctor in November. Rebecca suggested that the members start reviewing these applications. A question was asked about how long it will take to review 60 applications in one meeting. Elise suggested that we use a general question such as, should this application be on the short list or what is the reason to engage this firm. This might help us shrink the list. Rebecca wants to give some thought and report back at the next meeting with any comments.

5. MOTION TO ADJOURN: The Board adjourned at 10:56 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of October 21, 2020 by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Jessica Tsymbal. Motion was approved.

6. NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire H. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Sheser

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1000TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 21, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 999th October 7, 2020 meeting by Janice Bergeron, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Jennifer McHale	STV, Inc.
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Miles McDonald	BVH
Sara Ruggiero	STV, Inc.
Lindsay Accardi	SmithGroup
Kevin Webb	STV, Inc.
Betsy Isenstein	DCAMM
Caroline Fitzgerald	RMF
Tom Iskra	BVH
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet
Brooke Wilson	CHA Companies
Kelly Stinnett	ARUP
Nick Brooks	Dream Collaborative
Daniela Hernandez Bellos	DCAMM
Aarathi Nirmalan	Cannon Design
Donald Walter	Dore & Whittier
Andrea Baker	Cannon Design
Kayla Meggy	STV, Inc.
Michael Solomon	WSP
Chris Nordberg	STV, Inc.
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Carley Oliveto	CES Engineers
Stephen White	DCAMM
Janelli Aguilar	SmithGroup
Lara Neubauer	Dream Collaborative
Michael Camoscio	STV, Inc.
Jessica Brown	EDM
Erin O'Keefe	BR+A
Jay Toutant	Cannon Design
Jen Shelby	ARC Engineers
Abbie Goodman	The Engineering Center
Scott Petit	WSP
Pamela Merrill	RFS Engineering
Pamela Perini	Pamela Perini
Tracy Marquis	Marquis Architecture
Joe Fazio	DCAMM
Erica Jackson	FAA, Inc.
Mittch DeWein	CHA – Clough & Harbour

Paul Tsang	Jacobs
Allison Puzycki	CES Engineers
Scott Mandeville	Moody Nolan
Kirk Deininger	Autocene
Robert Hicks	Stantec
Mike Comtois	WSP
Jeffrey DeVeau	STV, Inc.
Katie Donlon	Gensler
Rebecca Berry	FAA, Inc.
Vikram Jalalpuram	Autocene

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. DSB List #20-13, DCPENERGY20, C.25A Energy, Water, Climate & Resilience Projects, DCAMM, Statewide,**
 Fee: \$2,500,000 (House Doctor), 22 Applicants

Betsy Isenstein, DCAMM Director of Energy and Stephen White, DCAMM Support Specialist were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

Review of the twenty-two (22) applications resulted in determination that two (2) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

CMTA did not meet the Massachusetts Ownership Requirements. On a motion to disqualify CMTA by Ilyas Bhatti, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Jessica Tsymbal abstained. Motion was approved.

Weston & Sampson had no MBE – MBE was met by non-requested consultant. On a motion to disqualify Weston & Sampson by Janice Bergeron, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Jessica Tsymbal abstained. Motion was approved.

The following applications were reviewed by the Board and were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project. The following are general comments made by the Board:

Arup - This firm does have the experience but did not tailor their experience in the resume and criteria that was advertised in this RFP.

B2Q Associates – They did a good job with their resumes and showed the related individuals with their experience in a graphic way. It was very well done.

BR+A Consulting Engineers, LLC – Overall, they showed high level consultants and expertise. They exceeded their diversity percentages. Every aspect of this application was relative and very specific to this project.

Buro Happold Consulting Engineers, Inc.- The diversity statement was quite general. The MEP was focused to small renovations and not applicable to DCAMM intentions. Although it was nicely formatted and easy to read, it was generally boiler plate and not tailored to the RFP.

BVH Integrated Services, PC – The diversity statement was good and the answers to the criteria had good examples of their work. The resumes were very descriptive.

CannonBoston, Inc. – The diversity statement had a nice representation of MBE and WBE but listed as alternate firms. More detail on how the MBE/WBE firms would be working on the project would have been helpful. All the in-house consultants that were used for different disciplines had a separate experience sheet.

CDM Smith, Inc. – They have a lot of experience with water and wastewater but did not show projects that are in accordance with the criteria within the RFP. The diversity statement was not strong.

CHA – Clough Harbour Associates – This was a complete proposal and easy to review. The relationships with the “alternates” were nicely identified.

Consulting Engineering Services – The resumes were somewhat boiler plate. The PIC and PM didn't show much experience with the criteria in the RFP. The experience they provided did not match with what was listed in the advertisement.

Hesnor Engineering Associates, PLLC – It was mentioned this is a smaller firm compared to others, but a house doctor project may benefit from a smaller firm. They will have to rely on their sub-consultants to do some of their work. It was a good proposal.

Jacobs Consultants, Inc. – Most of the experience shown was out of state except for 3 projects in Massachusetts. They have excellent experience with larger scale projects but not sure if they are a good fit for this project with DCAMM. It was not clearly indicated how they will use their resources for this project.

Pristine Engineers, Inc. – The experience was light compared to the other firms. They did have good review scores and it is a good firm.

Richard D. Kimball/NV5 – Their most recent project descriptions were completed in 2016 and more current work in energy experience would have been helpful. This was not a strong proposal compared to some of the other firm proposals. It was unclear whether this from a lack of experience or a lack of effort.

Rist Frost Shumway Engineering, PC – Their overall scores were good. The graphics in section 10 did not clearly support the points that they were describing. They showed general experience instead of specific for this type of project. They lacked detail in the elements of the submission and relationship with their sub-consultants.

RMF Engineering, Inc. – This is a relatively big firm with a small presence in Massachusetts. Tailored resumes with specific experience requested. This is a good submittal. Even though they are a small firm they can be assigned appropriate projects.

SmithGroup – They provided a very responsive application and identified examples of savings with their experience and therefore the relevance to this particular RFP. They seem to be a good fit for this project. The responses to the criteria were unique and interesting.

Stantec Architecture & Engineering – Even though they are a big firm, the proposal was relevant. They are a top line firm with the resources needed for this project.

STV, Inc. – The diversity statement was good and showed great team experience. The overall presentation was good.

VAV International, Inc. – This firm fits the niche of a small firm. A member noted that they did not respond to all the criteria and the application was incomplete.

WSP USA Buildings, Inc. – The diversity statement showed good representation.

After a brief discussion, the Board voted to select the following six unranked firms for the DCAMM Energy House Doctor project:

B2Q Associates
BR+A Consulting Engineers, LLC
BVH Integrated Services, PC
CHA – Clough Harbour Associates
SmithGroup
STV, Inc.

On a motion to approve the above selection for the DCAMM Energy House Doctor by Janice Bergeron, seconded by Elise Woodward. Virginia Grieman and Jessica Tsymbol abstained. Motion was approved.

B. BOARD BUSINESS:

How to prepare for the upcoming House Doctor project with 60 Applications – All members will review all 60 applications and the Board will review 30 applications at the November 4, 2020 meeting and the other 30 applications will be reviewed at the November 18, 2020. There will be a vote to select six unranked firms for this project after the final review at the November 18, 2020 meeting. On a motion to split the 60 applications into two meetings by Elise Woodward, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved. Bill will notify the agency of this vote.

Discussion on Liz Minnis letter to the Board – Leniency on applications

Liz Minnis is very excited about Autocene and knows there may be glitches in the new system; therefore, she would like to advocate for leniency to allow firms to be considered for the next few submissions instead of disqualifying for certain reasons. The Board agreed that it would be unable to overlook a missing statutory requirement that the request for leniency was understood and would be considered on a case to case basis.

Unusual Project Criteria

Rebecca recommended that if the Board encounters an unusual project like the DCAMM Energy project that the DSB Staff highlight as unusual, the agency project manager should be invited to the Board to discuss the project a meeting before the review meeting. There were nine evaluation criteria and the Board did not know which were most important with a broad variety mentioned.

Comments from Bill

Rebecca requested Claire to post these comments on the Boardbook for Board review for discussion at next meeting

Chair/Vice Chair Elect Discussion and vote on November 4, 2020

Rebecca's tenure as Chair will expire in December. Alan would become Chair and the Board would have to elect a Vice Chair.

Full Board Meeting on October 28, 2020 to discuss Autocene Sub-Committee Items

A Board meeting is scheduled for Wednesday October 28, 2020 at 9:00 am to focus on Autocene items. There may be certain issues that the full Board needs to vote. Items will be posted to the Boardbook for this discussion.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:36 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of October 21, 2020 by Ilyas Bhatti, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire H. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shuler

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1001TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 28, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. **ROLL CALL:**

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Kenneth Wexler General Contractor

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1000th October 21, 2020 meeting by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved.

3. **VISITORS:**

Vikram Jalalpuram	Autocene
Kirk Deininger	Autocene
Penelope Foussekis	Autocene
Antonio Leite	DCAMM
John Nunnari	BSA
Abbie Goodman	The Engineering Center
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Autocene Discussion

Pending Input:

- **Autocene report:** Gain comments on content and appearance of mockup provided. How would this be included in search fields?

Vikram posted a mock-up report (elevated speech) for review by the members. The evaluations and references are in the system and the prime firms can upload 3 references and/or 3 evaluations for this elevated speech. It was suggested to remove, city, state, zip and FEIN from this report. Perhaps they could include their top 3 pictures and include the name of the project and enough space to provide a one-line explanation of each and also include the firm's (typology) expertise, but since this is a searchable field it will need to be discussed further. Marty suggested that we keep with the federal list; firms will be searching before reading this elevator speech. Another suggestion was that the logo takes up space and can be moved to the side. This report needs to be kept to one page. A couple of members said that they would go directly to the firm's website for more information about their firm. Bill commented that if a firm hides their information this report would be helpful. This will be revisited at another meeting.

- **Application Review Form in Autocene:** Fully implemented currently with Vikram and Penny making some coding changes to make the reports flow better when a printable version is shared.

Penny and Vikram are working on changes and formatting of the agency review form so that it is more readable for members.

It was mentioned that when agencies are reviewing the applications, the Board would like to have them provide a scale (more qualified, qualified, less qualified) or maybe show (more responsive, responsive, less responsive). This will be taken up with the sub-committee and brought back to the full Board for a vote.

- **Team Lead Issue around licensing:** This was done for the purpose of the application. Team Lead needs to be defined to eliminate confusion. Should the Team Lead should mean the responsible professional not the contact person within the firm? The name and license number of the person required for the discipline requested is provided elsewhere in résumés.
- The Team lead should be the licensed individual who is taking responsibility for the project. The Team Lead should be re-named if there is any confusion.

- It was also mentioned that the office that was responsible for the work and the headquarters office. The office doing the work should be clearly identified along with the headquarter office. If a firm feels that the headquarters office is an out-of-state firm and that they can be searched through the office doing the work. This will need more discussion through the sub-committee and come back to the full board for a vote.

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:36 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of October 21, 2020 by Ilyas Bhatti, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rubina Shiner

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1002TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 4, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect (left at 10:10am)
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Virginia Greiman	Public Member
------------------	---------------

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1001th October 28, 2020 meeting by Kenneth Wexler, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

MaKayla Allen	Nitsch
Walter Timility	Mass Senate
Jean Carroon	Goody Clancy
Catherine Hunt	Ellenzweig
Fiske Crowell	Sasaki
Abbie Goodman	The Engineering Center
Brenda Phan	Goody Clancy
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Harold Levkowicz	HDR
Alexis Burck	SmithGroup
Rep Finn's Staff	MA House
Kristi Dowd	Stantec
Monica Meyerhoff	Rickes Associates
John Garcia	Linea 5
Elizabeth Minnis	DCAMM
Gordon Wrin	Mass.gov
Brian McKenna	Cannon Design
Irene Kang	Mass.gov
Andrea Baker	Cannon Design
Molly Moore	MDS
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G
Eva Crowley	Rickes Associates
Hannah Cane	Overunder
Mary Martin	Dyer Brown
Tracey O'Connor	SMMA
Matthew Cotton	SmithGroup
Madeline Howard	Elkus-Manfredi
Dan Arons	Perkins Eastman
Ganesh Ramachandran	DCAMM
Owen Salerno	DiMella Shaffer
Lindsey Luker	Gensler
Kelly Bliss	EYP
Danielle Santos	LBPA
Caitlin Daniels	CBI Consulting
Ann Keane	Civitects
Andrea Tarpley	EYP
Shannon Nehiley	Kliment-Halsband
Melanie Maddox	SmithGroup
Kathleen Porter	LBPA
Robert Hicks	Stantec

John Nunnari	Architects Org
Jessica Bell	FM Architecture
Monique Jankowski	Leslie Saul
Lateffa Curry	SLAM
Ella Halpine	Perry Dean
Joel Pettigrew	Shepley Bulfinch
Dominick Roveto	HDR
Miles McDonald	BVH
Justie Kubo	ICON
Liza Bouton	HMFH
Natalie Sawyer	Mass.gov
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore & Whittier
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architecture
Lindsay Sabadosa	Lindsay Sabadosa
Thomas Iskra	BVH
Sarah Viafora	Sasaki
Joel Goodmonson	ARC
Kelly Stinnett	Arup
Katie Verra	MA Senate
Tracey Anderson	DCAMM
Celeste Soares	T2 Architecture
Anthony Preston	Mass.gov
Joan Eagleson	LBPA
Daniela Hernandez Belloso	Mass.gov
Robin Greenberg	Perkins Eastman
Rebecca Maloney	RFS Engineering
Aarathi Nirmalan	Cannon Design
Robin Greenleaf	ARC
Beth Eromin	DCAMM
George Takoudes	Goody Clancy
Sarah Felton	DCAMM
David Hoglund	Perkins Eastman
Katherine Murphy	Katherine Murphy
Janelli Aguilar	SmithGroup
Lara Neubauer	DREAM Collaborative
Jessica Brown	EDM
Danielle Santos	Danielle Santos
Leslie Saul	Leslie Saul
Alexandra Dorn	William Pevear
Annie Langlois	Sasaki
Melisa Kuronen	Ellenzweig
Paul Davey	Sasaki
Jennifer Shelby	ARC
Dan Mee	Klopfermartin
Robin Whitman	DCAMM
Valerie Puchades	Gund
Ika Chang	Ika Chang
Pamela Merrill	RFS Engineering
Pamela Perini, PSP	Pamela Perini
Tracy Marquis	Marquis Architecture
Joe Fazio	Mass.gov
Nick Koulbanis	SMMA
Jenny Burton	Mass.gov
Kara McLellan	Utile
Nandini Jain	Perry Dean
Vincent Fieg	DREAM Collaborative
Chad Reilly	HDR
Cheryl Lussier Poppe	Mass.gov
Jessica Knapp	DiMella Shaffer
Jess Charlap	Perkins Eastman
Rebecca Berry	FAA Inc.
Alison Faecher	SmithGroup
Paul Moran	Mass.gov
Philippa Gonatas	Goody Clancy
James Nadeau	Arup

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Request for Emergency Selection: DSB List #20-19, #HLY2102, Soldiers' Home Holyoke Long-Term Care Facility and Campus Framework

In accordance with the 811 CMR 3.03 DCAMM requested that the Designer Selection Board select 3 or more finalists from firms with active DSB master files who have previously applied for projects of similar nature. The Board reviewed applications from similar projects (Prime only - resumes, project experience and section #10) for the following firms. Below are comments from the Board:

Cannon (finalist from Soldiers' Home Chelsea) – Some of the diversity consultants are listed as alternates. Cannon has a strong in-house healthcare planner. They are detailed on their approach and in-house capabilities were impressive.

Gensler (finalist from Healthcare House Doctor) – A strong proposal and the Board appreciated seeing the evidence of design. One member was concerned about the lack of VA experience which is a critical criterion.

Lavallee Brensinger (finalist from Soldiers' Home Chelsea) – Much of their veteran's work has been done with another firm. This is a collaboration with SFCS and is unclear if they can still have this collaboration going forward with this project. They seemed to have a long-term relationship and have done healthcare projects together. A matrix was submitted showing graphically how they would share responsibility for the tasks needed.

Margulies Peruzzi (withdrew from consideration) (finalist from Healthcare House Doctor)
Shepley Bulfinch (withdrew from consideration) (finalist from Healthcare House Doctor)

Payette (finalist from Healthcare House Doctor) – The firm has relevant projects of which they highlight the rapid planning study. The PIC seems well versed in Veterans Affairs projects. This is a very strong proposal and team. It was noted that they have a project listed in terms of budget in the same range.

Perkins Eastman (finalist from Soldiers' Home Chelsea) – This was a very strong proposal. The principal is in Pittsburgh and the Board was not sure if that would be an issue, which could be confirmed if selected for interview.

SmithGroup (finalist from Healthcare House Doctor) – This firm is very versed in healthcare and has healthcare experience nationally. It was noted that one of the key team members updated the VA standards. It was unclear whether this team has the experience for Holyoke.

Stantec (finalist from Healthcare House Doctor) – The firm does not have experience with VA but the two persons listed do have experience but are not registered in Massachusetts.

All of these candidates are very strong and are all capable to perform this emergency project.

The Board requested DCAMM to have the following items addressed during the interview process:

- Show the relationship between the in-house and out-sourced roles and how they will work together
- A very strong indication on how they are fulfilling the MBE and WBE participation especially if it is a shared responsibility.
- What is the range of project budgets of their experience (lower and upper limit), size and budget
- Evidence of demonstrated experience that the firm can meet the schedule.
- Evidence of successful project delivery
- Knowledge of the procedures of the VA
- Collaborating firms: detail their relationship and how the work will be shared

Ganesh Ramachandran, DCAMM Sr. Project Manager along with other DCAMM representatives and state officials explained the project emergency at the Soldiers Home Holyoke. The Board voted to exercise its authority to approve the emergency selection for the Soldiers' Home in Holyoke and selected the following (3) three firms to be interviewed by the Division of Capital Asset Management & Maintenance:

Payette
Perkins Eastman
SmithGroup

On a motion to select the above firms for the emergency project at Soldiers' Home Holyoke by Janice Bergeron, seconded by David Chappell. Motion was approved.

The Board requested that DCAMM report on the sub-consultants teams,, the question proposed to each interviewee, presentation from the firm, and general synopsis of the firm's response to the questions proposed to them. Please let Bill know the interview date and schedule a short meeting of the Board once information is received.

B. DSB List #20-12, DCPDHE20, Study, Planning, Design & Construction for Higher Education Facilities, Statewide, House Doctor, Fee: \$3,000,000, 60 Applicants

Sarah Felton, DCAMM Project Manager was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. DCAMM requested the Board select 12 firms for this project.

Review of the first twenty-two (22) of the sixty (60) applications resulted in determination that two (2) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

Dumont Janks, LLC did not meet the Massachusetts Ownership Requirements. On a motion to disqualify Dumont Janks, LLC by Elise Woodward, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

EYP Architecture did not meet the Massachusetts Ownership Requirements. On a motion to disqualify EYP Architecture by Elise Woodward, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

The following applications were reviewed by the Board and were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below are comments from the Board:

Elise acknowledged that she has worked with many architects and engineers in these proposals in her professional life and that this situation exists for many of the Board members. This would not be considered a conflict of interest.

A member asked if DCAMM had a goal as to large firms vs. small firms. DCAMM does not have a goal. The scale of these projects is mostly renovation work but may include small additions.

AECOM USA of Massachusetts – They have relevant experience but should have been more specific to the criteria questions. The PIC was not on some of the featured projects mentioned in the application.

Ann Beha Architects – They had excellent references. Their Team composition and diversity were strong. More specific detail would have strengthened the proposal.

Bargmann Hendrie Archetype – They had a team with good diversity. For their relevant projects they were relying on the part of their sub-consultants. The resumes showed lists and should have been written to show detailed expertise with a few selected projects.

Beyer Blinder Belle – This is a New York based firm with a local office. They have very strong evaluations and the proposed team includes Massachusetts firms. The diversity statement was quite good. A member questioned if this is a good fit for this house doctor project.

Cambridge Seven – They have good DCAMM experience and strong evaluations. They provided a clear diversity statement. It was a solid application.

Cannon Boston – A couple of members thought it was unclear how much partnership would be shared with the diverse team. Other members thought their diversity statement was good. This was a well-prepared proposal, successful in the new format.

CBI Consulting – They seem to focus on building envelope projects, which is well suited for house doctor type work. The evaluations were good. This was a good application.

Civitects – They had great recommendations with specific comments. Their work listed is similar to this type of house doctor contract. They had a decent Section #10. This is a strong application.

CSS Architects, Inc. – Resumes were helpful and very detailed. Section #10 could have been developed better to be easily navigated to the responses.

Design Lab Architects – This was a nicely prepared proposal. They did a nice job describing the various components of the response, their philosophy and action they have taken; this was very effective.

DiMella Shaffer Associates – They did good job presenting their resumes. They showed strong design. One member thought the resumes lacked detail. Their supplemental response was good.

Dore & Whittier Architects – The references were very strong. The diversity statement was thoughtful and complete. The resumes did not show much experience, more boiler plate, but detail was shown in the experience section.

DREAM Collaborative – They have very good references. The resumes are well laid out and descriptive. They showed relevant experience with the work they would be performing. Their team is very fluent in higher education and did a wonderful job responding to the criteria.

Dyer Brown Architects – They have good references and significant higher education experience.

Edgewood Design Architecture – Small firm based in Weymouth with excellent references and experience on each of the team members. Supplemental responses could have been more tailored to the evaluation criteria. This seems like a firm trying to grow and expand and could benefit with assistance to make a better application.

Edm Services – The references were very good. This is a western Massachusetts firm. They have a lot of strong experience with higher education.

Edward Rowse – They did a good job with the application but were a little light on their resumes. They have more experience with K-12 than higher education experience.

Elkus Manfredi Architects – This is a well assembled proposal. The supplemental material was a little boiler plate.

Ellenzweig – This was an excellent proposal showing great experience in labs. It is well developed with a detailed supplemental response section to the evaluation criteria.

Fennick McCredie Architecture – This was another well-developed proposal showing specific knowledge with response to the evaluation criteria.

The remainder of the 40 applications will be reviewed at the next scheduled meeting.

C. Transition for Chair/Vice Chair will be discussed at the next meeting

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of November 4, 2020 by Kenneth Wexler, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shaver

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1003RD MEETING, WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 18, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor (left at 10:50am)
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chairman	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1002th November 4, 2020 meeting Janice Bergeron, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Abbie Goodman	The Engineering Center
Jeffrey DeGregorio	Payette
Maira Breen	Payette
Kevin Chrobak	Juster Pope Frazier
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Brenda Phan	Goody Clancy
Jennifer Shelby	ARC Engineers
James Nadeau	ARUP
Will Ragano	Johnson-Roberts
Robin Greenleaf	ARC Engineers
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore and Whittier
Courtney Wilson	LWA Architects
Lara Neubauer	DREAM Collaborative
Miles McDonald	BVH
Ned Collier	ICON
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Nandini Jain	Perry Dean
Valerie Purchades	Gund Partnership
Jacqueline Scott	Jacqueline Scott
Ella Halpine	Perry Dean
Dominick Roveto	HDR, Inc.
Lateffa Curry	SLAM Collaborative
Rebecca Maloney	RFS Engineering
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Paul Davey	Sasaki
Jessica Brown	EDM
Hannah Cane	Overunder
Kara Gruss	TSKP
Timothy Nolan	FM Architecture
Monique Jankowski	Leslie Saul
Eva Crowley	Rickes Associates
Tracey O'Connor	SMMA
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architects
Shannon Nehiley	Kliment Halsband
Caitlin Daniels	CBI Consulting
Jennifer Cheek	ARUP
Ann Keane	Civitects
Aarathi Nirmalan	CannonDesign
Monica Meyerhoff	Rickes Associates
Susan Elmore	Cambridge Seven

Andrea Baker	CannonDesign
Kathleen Porter	LBPA
Rebecca Berry	FAA Inc.
Mark Pasnik	Overunder
Melissa Kuronen	Ellenzweig
Lindsey Luker	Gensler
Joel Pettigrew	Shepley Bulfinch
Joel Goodmonson	ARC Engineers
Chad Reilly	HDR, Inc.
Alan Fried	HDR, Inc.
Dan Mee	Klopfermartin
Nicholas Koulbanis	SMMA
Vincent Fieg	DREAM Collaborative
Mary Blatz	ICON
Kate Murphy	Goody Clancy
Mary Martin	Dyer Brown
Kelly Bliss	EYP
Celeste Soare	Turowski2 Architecture
John Garcia	Linea 5
Dan Arons	Perkins Eastman
Kara McLellan	Utile Design
Catherine Hunt	Ellenzweig
Robert Hicks	Stantec
Elayne Campos	DCAMM
Sarah Felton	DCAMM

A. DSB List #20-12, DCPDHE20, Study, Planning, Design & Construction for Higher Education Facilities, Statewide, House Doctor, Fee: \$3,000,000, 60 Applicants

Sarah Felton, DCAMM Project Manager was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

It was brought to the attention of the Board to review the ownership of EYP Architecture again and the vote remains the same as the initial review on November 4, 2020.

EYP Architecture did not meet the Massachusetts Ownership Requirements. On a motion to disqualify EYP Architecture by Elise Woodward, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

The Board reviewed the remaining thirty-eight (38) of the sixty (60) applications.

The following applications were reviewed by the Board and were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below are comments from the Board:

Fennick McCredie Architecture – This firm showed significant experience in higher education and had a strong diversity statement.

Gensler – This firm would serve the agency well and put together a very good proposal.

Goody Clancy & Associates – This was a strong application with positive evaluations. Their diversity statement was very thoughtful, and they showed a good amount of DCAMM work. They would be well-suited for this project.

Gorman Richardson (GRLA) – They did not have a lot of higher ed projects. Their evaluation section was not as strong as some of the other applicants and they were not completely detailed and comprehensive in their responses.

Gund Partnership – It was noted that some of the highlighted projects are over five years old. Higher ed did not seem to be the type of work for the PIC and PM. This proposal is a little light on experience compared to other applicants.

HDR Architecture – Their diversity statement was strong. The resumes were done well and was overall a good application.

HGA Architects & Engineers – The diversity consultants that were listed showed a previous collaboration with HGA. Their relevant projects were designed focused. This was a good application.

ICON Architecture – They provided good client references, good qualifications and experience with higher ed. Their response to the 4th criteria question regarding the energy efficiency and climate resiliency experience was strong.

Johnson Roberts Associates – This is strong firm and submitted a good application. They showed house doctor experience and design excellence. However, their diversity statement was general, and the energy efficiency and climate resiliency experience were not specifically addressed.

Jones Architecture Inc – This was a solid application. The diversity statement showed that they achieved the diversity goals which is one of the concerns with house doctor projects and cited how they meet and exceed these goals. The resumes of prime and subconsultants were solid and they addressed the evaluation criteria. They also included a matrix which was a nice presentation of cost and change orders.

Juster Pope Frazier – They provided good references. The resume of the specification consultant does not represent that they do specifications. Their response to the evaluation criteria was not as strong as it could have been. They are a 6-person firm located in Northampton.

Kliment Halsband Architects – They are a small firm located in Northampton. Their main office is in New York City and it does not show it on the application. The evaluation criteria were lacking information compared to other firms. Their experience is light on higher ed experience.

Kuhn Riddle Architects – They are located in Amherst. This is a solid application and reflects on their higher ed qualifications. They addressed all the aspects of the evaluation criteria.

Lavallee Brensinger Architects – This was a mixed application; some responses were stronger than their other responses.

Leers Weinzapfel Associates – They had good public agency evaluation comments. Projects were listed in the resume and not a lot of narrative on what the projects were. They got more specific in their project description and did show good experience with the projects they have completed. The supplemental response was nicely done and showed their design capabilities and long-term results of their work, as well as the sustainability, leadership and diversity. They showed a lot of larger projects, not comparable to what is referred to in the project criteria.

Leslie Saul & Associates – Their diverse statement was positive. This is a small firm and would be a good fit for this house doctor project. The application was responsive and well put together.

Linea 5, Inc. – They should have shown more concrete examples in their resumes based on health care and not higher education; some consultants did have higher education experience.

LLB Architects – This firm is located in Worcester. They provided relevant experience and listed a very good case study in response to one of the evaluation criteria questions. This is a solid application.

MDS/Miller Dyer Spears – They provided solid evaluations. It was a good presentation of past MBE/WBE participation in the diversity statement showing large renovation and new construction but not a lot of house doctor project diversity.

Mount Vernon Group – They show more experience with K-12 than higher education experience. Their team approach was good but no diversity and did not follow the evaluation criteria.

NADAAA Design, Inc. – Their evaluations were great. They lacked detail in their resumes, and it seemed like larger projects and not a lot on house doctor projects. The evaluation criteria were generic, and no diversity statement was included.

Oudens Ello Architecture – There was not a lot of higher education experience. It showed good experience but focused on museum and libraries. They did provide a good diversity statement and supplemental material including specifics with their Chapter 149 experience.

Overunder – They are a small firm located in Boston. They have a good diverse team. Although they included strong evaluations, they lacked in higher education experience.

Payette Associates – They provided good evaluations. It was a solid application with some higher education experience.

Perkins Eastman – They had good references. The projects presented were very large. They did respond to the evaluation criteria quite well and showed strategies for renovations in occupied spaces. One concern is that they might find it difficult to meet their diversity goals.

Perry Dean Rogers – This was a strong application. Their resumes were good and included a team experience matrix which was good and showed how the team worked together on different projects. Overall a solid proposal.

Pfeuffer Richardson Architects – They have a good diverse team and excellent references. The team showed good higher education qualifications. Their resumes were excellent.

Sasaki Architects – They showed good amount of diversity on their team. The PIC and PM show a lot of experience on higher education projects. This was a strong proposal.

Shepley Bulfinch Richardson & Abbott – This was a good application and strong proposal. One of the members thought the sustainability question was one of the best presented. They submitted a strong section #5 for the evaluation criteria.

SMMA – Another strong firm with experience in higher education.

Stantec – They had very diverse team with a lot of higher education experience. Their diversity focus statement lacked information. The evaluation section was not as strong as the other applications but liked the table they put together about higher education experience with team members and facilities. With a large firm like this is important to look at the experience of the individuals listed on their team; it was helpful to have the organizational chart included.

Studio Enee – They noted in the evaluation criteria their relationship with a sub-consultant and good relevant experience with some of their projects although with another architectural firm. They put together a solid application and showed their strengths to shore up some of their weaknesses. They are familiar with house doctor projects and is overall a good application.

The Galante Architecture – Their resumes are not that strong, and the sub-consultants were not as strong as others submitted. They did not specifically respond to the evaluation criteria.

The SLAM Collaborative – It was nice to see how they showed outcomes and relevance in their project experience. Supplemental information relied more on the sub-consultant's experience. This was a good application.

TSKP Studio – They are lighter on higher educational experience than some of the other firms. They might struggle to meet the diversity goals.

Turowski2 Architecture – This is a small firm located in Marion. They included two very good evaluations. Their resumes could have been stronger in their presentation but have the higher educational experience. They did a good job with the evaluation criteria section.

Utile, Inc. – strong higher educational background with a variety of small and large projects, including house doctor projects. The response to the evaluation criteria was quite well done and speaks to the type of work required for this project.

William Pevear Architects – This is small firm. They have a diverse team, but not a lot of higher educational experience.

At the request of DCAMM, the Board selected twelve (12) finalists instead of the six (6) finalists that were requested in the public notice.

The Board had a brief discussion and voted to select the following twelve (12) unranked finalists for the Higher Educational House Doctor project:

Cannon Boston/CannonDesign
DiMella Shaffer Associates, Inc.
Ellenzweig
Fennick McCredie Architecture
Finegold Alexander Architects, Inc.
HDR Architecture, P.C.
Jones Architecture, Inc.
Kuhn Riddle Architects
Perry Dean Rogers & Partners, Architects, Inc.
Pfeuffer Richardson Architects PC
Studio Enee, Inc.
Turowski2 Architecture, Inc.

A motion was made by David Chappell to approve the above Higher Educational House Doctor list to be sent to DCAMM, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved.

B. Chair and Vice Chair

The Board discussed the election for Chair and Vice Chair and nominated Alan Ricks for Chair and Elise Woodward for Vice-Chair. The Board voted to elect Alan Ricks, Chair and Elise Woodward as Vice-Chair.

A motion was made to elect Alan Ricks as Chair and Elise Woodward as Vice-Chair by Martha Blakey, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

The Chair/Vice Chair will take over position January 2021.

C. Future Meetings

December 2, 2020 meeting – DSB #20-15, DCAMM Arch House Doctor – 33 Applicants
December 16, 2020 meeting – DSB #20-16, DCAMM MEP House Doctor – 22 Applicants

D. Progress Update on Autocene and Board Business

Bill discussed the progress with Autocene. There are a few sessions scheduled for November 20th and 23rd with ACEC/AIA. There is another diversity Zoom meeting in January 2021 with chat rooms set up for firms to attend. He would like the Board to finalize an information sheet for handouts to this event in January. We are working on finalizing the documents to upload. Municipalities need to be trained in the new system for evaluations. Claire and Roberto are working on getting them uploaded into Autocene. He will be scheduling another Autocene sub-committee to help finalize the documents.

Rebecca suggested that Bill and Elise schedule the sub-committee meeting to finalize the top 3-4 Autocene issues. Bill will schedule a sub-committee meeting the week before the December 16, 2020 meeting and invite the full Board to attend the morning of December 9, 2020. Rebecca asked when Boardvantage will be transitioned to Autocene; Bill said that Autocene will come up with a viable solution within the next month or two.

The Board wants DCAMM to send the information on the team for Payette selected for the Emergency Selection for the Soldiers' Home in Holyoke to be reviewed at one of the next meetings.

4. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of November 18, 2020 by Elise Woodward, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved.

5. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Sherr

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1004TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 2, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chair	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbol, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor (left at 10:50am)
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1003rd November 18, 2020 meeting Virginia Greiman, seconded by Alan Ricks. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Allen Wiggin	DCAMM
Paul Ford	DCAMM
Jack Keleher	DCAMM
Beth Baldwin	DCAMM
Kathleen Porter	LBPA
Yugon Kim	TSKP
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Keith Campbell	Next Phase Studio
Courtney Wilson	LWA Architects
Miles McDonald	BVH
Tom Tsaros	Tom Tsaros
Morgan Devlin	LLB Architects
Deborah Yelle	Kleinfelder
Ned Collier	ICON Architecture
Catherine Hunt	Ellenzweig
Chad Reilly	HDR, Inc.
Mary Martin	Dyer Brown
Justine Kubo	ICON Architecture
Susan Elmore	Cambridge Seven
Kara Gruss	TSKP
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Crystale Wozniak	Kleinfelder
Chelsea Gazaille	Cambridge Seven
Allison Puzycki	CES Engineering
Jessica Brown	EDM
Jennifer Shelby	ARC Engineers
Simone Brogini	Kleinfelder
Janelli Aguilar	SmithGroup
Sharon Gray	SchwartzSilver
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore & Whittier
Brian Hunter	Dinisco
Gail Sullivan	Studio G Architects
John Nunnari	Architects Org
Robin Greenleaf	ARC Engineers
Alissa Marciano	LWA Architects
Mark Galvin	CDM Smith
Melanie Maddox	SmithGroup
Harold Levkowicz	HDR
Melissa Kuronen	Ellenzweig

Kate Beckman	SGH
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architecture
Cheryl Buttler	F-T
Diana Nicklaus	Saam Architecture
Joel Goodmonson	ARC Engineers
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects

A. DSB List #20-15, DCPSPT-ARCH20, Study and Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, DCAMM, Statewide, House Doctor, Fee: \$2,500,000, 33 Applicants

Jack Keleher, Allen Wiggin and John Ford all representing DCAMM were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

Review of the thirty-three (33) applications resulted in determination that two (2) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

Beasley Chin Hunderman had no MBE and no WBE firm nominated as requested in the advertisement. On a motion to disqualify Beasley Chin Hunderman by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

Edward Rowse Architects had no MBE firm nominated as requested in the advertisement. On a motion to disqualify Edward Rowse Architects by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

The following applications were reviewed by the Board and were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below are comments from the Board:

Bargmann Hendrie + Archetype – This is a well written proposal with a strong team. The resumes and Section #5 could have benefited by adding more in-depth information.

CambridgeSeven – They provided a good diversity statement. They might struggle with MBE/WBE depending on the projects assigned. They provided relevant resumes and seem to be able to handle small projects. The plus to this proposal was that they mentioned how they would manage around Covid and included a helpful graphic.

CBI Consulting LLC – They had a solid application with good client references.

CSS Architects, Inc. – They seem to be well qualified, but Section #5 could have showed more detail to the project.

Dietz and Company Architects – They provided relevant experience in their resumes. The specification consultant should have added specs in their resumes but had a strong application.

Dore + Whittier Architects, Inc. – The resumes were solid but with minimal details. This firm showed strengths, but Section #5 was lacking information.

Dyer Brown and Associates – Their Section #5 could have been submitted with more detail. Their diversity statement was interesting and showed more than “boiler plate” content. They showed more private than public work.

Edgewood Design + Architecture – This was a confusing application. The PIC and PM had strong resumes but showed work at previous firms and/or in collaboration with another firm. In the experience section none of the projects were included that were noted in their resumes. The PM had a lot of private work and firm experience showed one project that was public.

EDM Services, Inc. – EDM is using Shekar & Associates as an associate MEP firm to provide more diversity. It was appreciated that the PIC and PM resumes showed fewer projects and offered more information instead of a long list. Section #5 developed a matrix with project timelines; this was a good presentation of their project experience. It was a solid proposal.

Ellenzweig – They had a series of strong evaluations and a very strong proposal showing detail in the experience section. They provided a good diversity statement. This is a capable firm delivering high quality projects.

Fennick McCredie Architecture – PIC listed projects with no description and PM listed a little more detail but overall could have provided more information. They did provide examples in their project experience but would have liked to see more current work.

Finegold Alexander Architects – They provided good client references and strong agency evaluations. Provided a good representation of a wide variety of projects. Section #5 seemed to be one of the strongest of all the applicants.

HDR Architecture – They provided excellent agency evaluations. Provided a strong diversity statement and resumes. This was a very strong proposal.

ICON Architecture, Inc. – They have a strong diversity statement and provided good evaluations.

Jones Architecture, Inc. – In general, this was a strong proposal. They provided a strong diverse team.

Kleinfelder – They provided a strong diverse team and have a good track record with DCAMM.

Kuhn Riddle Architects – They showed a good amount of diversity and provided relevant projects in their project criteria.

Lavallee Brensinger Architects – The resumes were informative, and they provided a good consultant matrix of responsibilities. They should have emphasized their firm's internal diversity and commitment.

Leers Weinzapfel Associates – The architect is a WBE but only one MBE is on the team. They provided good references and agency evaluations. The resumes could have been more specific showing how they would meet the needs for smaller projects.

LLB Architects – They have relevant experience and are well qualified. They provided good evaluations.

MDS – Miller Dyer Spears – They provided good references and agency evaluations. Their section #5 was solid and comprehensive.

Overunder – This was an interesting proposal trying to break in to do DCAMM projects. They put together a solid team of sub-consultants with good experience. They had a well-crafted Section #5 making a case for a firm that does not have a long list of prior house doctor work. This was a thoughtful application.

Pfeuffer Richardson Architects – Their references are good, and resumes showed good public work weighted towards higher education. They provided a good Section #5.

Rode Architects – The MBE and WBE goals may be challenged. They showed projects but did not indicate a lot of detail around the projects. Does not have a lot of public work and Section #5 was "boiler plate" information.

Saam Architecture – They did a nice job on Section #4 and showed one of the stronger Section #5's. They showed a good range of projects.

Schwartz Silver Architects – They did not have a lot of information in their resumes towards the relevancy of this house doctor project. They did highlight good projects limited to private work.

The S/L/A/M Collaborative – They have good client references. The specification consultant's resume does not mention specification work.

SmithGroup – The MBE and WBE may be challenged to meet their goals. Their emphasis is healthcare projects.

Studio G Architects – They have a collaboration with Studio Enee and did a nice job at articulating the roles in Section #5.

Taylor & Burns – They could have given more detail in the resumes. The specification consultant does not even reflect it in their title so confused as to who will prepare the specifications. Really good response regarding the cost control diagram and a good discussion in the process design approach.

TSKP Studio – Their resumes were good, and projects listed were appropriate for house doctor projects. Their response to the project criteria was good. They submitted a very good matrix on their bidding record and change order. They provided excellent client references.

The Board had a brief discussion and voted to select the following five (5) unranked finalists for the DCAMM Architectural House Doctor project:

Dietz and Company Architects, Inc.
Ellenzweig
HDR Architecture, P.C.
ICON Architecture
Studio G Architects

A motion was made by Virginia Greiman to approve the above DCAMM Architectural House Doctor list to be sent to DCAMM, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

- B. Discussion: VJ Associates has pleaded guilty in federal court for overbilling clients in New York and Massachusetts. The DSB cannot ban them from applying unless it has been officially notified by Massachusetts. If a firm submits an application with VJ Associates on the team the Board will flag it and discuss at meeting.

C. Autocene and Board Business

Agency Review – There was a lengthy discussion on how the agency should review the firms in order to assist the Board with the assessment of the applicants. Rebecca is concerned that agencies may not be willing to articulate the firms that they prefer when in a public meeting. It was discussed to have a better indicator in the agency's interest in the firm as part of their review comments. Some examples could be used - recommend, highly recommend, never worked with this firm or check boxes – recommend, highly recommend, never worked with and never worked with but impressed with proposal. No agency should be ranking firms. The agency review's format needs to be tweaked (the two columns); Alan will help with this issue if needed. A consistent review format for all agencies is needed. This will be discussed and voted on at one of the DSB regular meetings.

Autocene Application Form – There have been firms that entered over 5 projects instead of the 5 recommended projects. The instructions need to be clear to only put in 5 projects. The Board does not want firms to design their own application; they want firms to keep to the same format as requested in Autocene.

Rebecca thinks that Autocene is functioning very well and the setup of the application has improved and made reviewing better.

Autocene Voting – Autocene has a system in place and will be presented to the Autocene Sub-Committee meeting and later discussed at a regular DSB meeting.

Rebecca had requested the matrix information that the Board received on projects showing when each firm was selected and appointed for projects before Autocene. The information was located in the former DSB database and will eventually be included in Autocene.

Board attendance at meetings - Rebecca requested from the Board to let Claire know the Wednesday before a meeting if they will attend or not attend a meeting.

Agency Reviews - Rebecca requested that the Board receive the agency project reviews the Friday before a meeting. Claire does notify the agencies and will confirm that she receives them to send out to the Board the Friday before a meeting.

The next Autocene Sub-Committee Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday December 9, 2020 at 9:00 am. – Claire will send out an Autocene Sub-Committee agenda, provided by Bill and those items will be discussed and voted at the full Board meeting on December 16, 2020.

4. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of December 2, 2020 by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

5. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire H. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shuler

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1005TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 16, 2020 AT 8:40 A.M, VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Sherer, P.E., Chairwoman	Registered Engineer
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chair	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect (left at 9:45 a.m.)
Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor
----------------	--------------------

Present for the DSB staff, Bill Perkins, Executive Director, Claire G. Hester, Program Coordinator III and Roberto Melendez, Program Coordinator I.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1004th December 2, 2020 meeting Virginia Greiman, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Allen Wiggin	DCAMM
Paul Ford	DCAMM
Robin Greenleaf	Architectural Engineers
Susan Wisler	Architectural Engineers
Sharmila Bail	Shekar
Cheryl Buttler	Fitzmeyer & Tocci
Miles McDonald	BVH
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Michael Coppola	SmithGroup
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Jacquie Hughes	BER Engineering
Jay Toutant	CannonDesign
Jennifer Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Todd Chase	Liro
Kim Sousa	BVH
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore & Whittier
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants
Christina Silvestro	Liro
Kristina Kashanek	Kristina Kashanek
Joel Goodmonson	Architectural Engineers
Tori Ellis	Tori Ellis
Abdullah Khaliqi	Fitzmeyer & Tocci
Tom Iskra	BVH
Kevin Webb	STV, Inc.
Fasha Onorato	RW Sullivan
Tom Tsaros	Fitzmeyer & Tocci
Lindsay Accardi	Lindsay Accardi
Steven Karan	BER Engineering
Ron Willey	Liro
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Carley Oliveto	CES Engineering
Jessica Bell	FM Architecture
Beth Baldwin	DCAMM
Aarathi Nirmalan	CannonDesign
Brian Novelline	Liro

A. DSB List #20-16, DCPSPT-MEP20, Study and Design for Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, DCAMM House Doctor, Statewide, Fee: \$2,500,000, 22 Applicants

Allen Wiggin and John Ford both representing DCAMM were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following twenty-two (22) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below is a brief summary from the members:

Architectural Engineers, Inc. – They have a very strong diversity team. Their specialty is within small projects and looks like what DCAMM is looking for. This is a well put together proposal and they have focused on bringing in new firms.

B2Q Associates, Inc. – This application showed excellent references and all the resumes and matrix showing the participation of DCAMM projects were very helpful.

BLW Engineering, Inc. – The PIC and PM do not seem to have much experience listed in resumes. They did perform work with their sub-consultants on prior projects. They might have a hard time meeting the MBE and WBE goals since they have listed themselves to perform some of the MEP work.

Building Engineering Resources, Inc. – They have a good diversity representation but are doing most of the MEP work in-house and might have difficulty meeting the MBE and WBE goals. They have a lot of experience like what DCAMM is looking for and highlighted their internal diversity as well as their team diversity.

BVH Integrated Services, P.C. – Their in-house civil engineer resume focuses on project manager experience and not civil engineering. They had a good diversity statement and section #5 was strong and comprehensive. The references submitted were solid.

CannonDesign – The Board liked how they presented their resumes with the matrix, but there was no other explanation what the participants do. They have done work for DCAMM in the past and are a good firm.

CDM Massachusetts, Inc. – They showed extensive prior work and work with their sub-consultants. The resumes showed detail on a few projects articulating the relevance of their work. Section #5 was mostly boiler plate information.

Consulting Engineering Services, LLC – The project listing could have showed more detail. Section #5 seemed to be boiler plate and not very responsive to the evaluation criteria.

Cosentini Associates, Inc. – They provided strong evaluations and references. The resumes showed little detail but did mention relevant DCAMM projects in Section #4. This was a difficult proposal to review because of its organization.

DiGiorgio Associates, Inc – The resumes were informative and described what each one of the team members did in their projects. It might be difficult to meet the MBE and WBE goals.

EDM Services, Inc. – They provided very good references. They clearly described their teaming strategy in Section #5.

Fitzmeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc. – This showed excellent experience on DCAMM projects and plumbing and electrical in-house. This was a good proposal but missed an opportunity in Section #5 and did not specifically answer evaluation criteria questions.

Hesnor Engineering Associates, PLLC – The resumes were good. Their Section #5 was solid in providing good information and good examples. The diversity statement was good.

Norian/Siani Engineering, Inc. – They seem to be light on the diversity participation. The resumes lacked examples of projects that DCAMM is looking for.

Pristine Engineers, Inc. – This was a good application and the resumes were well written. They provided a good response to Section #5. This is a very diverse team.

R.W. Sullivan Engineering – The resumes lacked a little detail, but personnel are qualified for this project. They have solid experience with DCAMM projects. Their Section #5 was not one of the strongest and did not answer some of the evaluation criteria.

Richard D. Kimball Co/NV5 – They still have money left over to use with DCAMM for a prior contract. Section #5 was not that comprehensive.

Rist-Frost-Shumway Engineering, P.C. – They have done a lot of work in Massachusetts but show their office in Laconia, NH. They provided a good Section #5.

Shekar & Associates, Inc. – This was a good proposal with solid experience. Section #5 provided good detail and a strong concluding statement.

SmithGroup – This was a strong proposal but seem to be large healthcare projects with no direct alignment to DCAMM's criteria. Their diversity statement was well considered and quite genuine.

STV, Inc. – They had good evaluations. This was a strong application and good diversity statement including an internal diversity statement. They did a good job with illustrating their relationship with their sub-consultants.

VAV International, Inc. – They are a small MBE firm. Section #5 response was strong.

The Board had a brief discussion and voted to select the following five (5) unranked finalists for the DCAMM Architectural House Doctor project after a tiebreaker between Pristine Engineers, Inc. and STV, Inc.:

Architectural Engineers, Inc.
Fitzmeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc.
Hesnor Engineering Associates PLLC
Pristine Engineers, Inc.
VAV International, Inc.

A motion was made by Janice Bergeron to approve the above DCAMM MEP House Doctor list to be sent to DCAMM, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Jessica Tsymbal abstained. Motion was approved.

B. Autocene and Board Business

An Autocene Sub-Committee will be scheduled sometime in January/February 2021.

Bill spoke to some of the new functions for Autocene including using it as a diversity tool. Autocene had to add additional functionalities and went above and beyond what was initially anticipated. Autocene is willing to write off over 600 hours to help implement these functionalities. The DSB must justify these costs to DCAMM in order to get licenses paid. We hope to have 40 hrs. a month approved for ongoing Autocene help with these functionalities, for instance voting and categories, etc. There are some enhancements that the Board will get for free such as the Boardbook for members in Autocene, once DHCD is on board. Bill talked to DCAMM last week which responded that the licensing will not be a problem (70% of what is asked for) and is waiting to hear back hopefully in a couple of weeks for the other implementations. Autocene is still working on this. The DSB does have a budget but Autocene is supported by DCAMM. The entire DSB Budget is controlled by DCAMM. The Board functions transparently and would like to see the budgetary report for Autocene. An executive summary of the budget will be put together for the Board (bi-annually). Bill would like the members to meet with DCAMM or draft a letter to let them know the importance of Autocene to support an increase in the Autocene budget.

An Annual Report has been prepared every year by Claire and sent to DCAMM. A question was raised as to who evaluates the Executive Director and staff. The Board would like a process in place for a Board self-evaluation, review of Executive Director and staff.

Rebecca would like to have an Autocene Training setup for the members. Bill had stated that he is having an Autocene training for the design community January 7, 2021 with breakout sessions taking place. After a discussion, Claire will set up a formal training for Autocene on March 17, 2021 (Autocene only for this meeting).

The Board had further discussion regarding the firms changing the order of the application and ease of reviewing sections. The Board prefers that firms not change the order of sections in the applications and there should be clear instructions.

The next meeting is on January 6, 2021 with 14 applications for the Mass Military Division House Doctor. On January 20, 2021, two projects with 18 applications for DCR and 10 applications for a charter school project with a total of 28 applications to be reviewed.

Once the Autocene Sub-Committee minutes are approved we can come back to the Board if a vote is needed.

The Board thanked Rebecca for serving as Chair of the Board. She did a great job and will continue to serve as a member of the Board until her term expires.

4. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of December 16, 2020 by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

5. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2021 at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: A. Richman