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 Autocene

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:**

<mark>**WEDNESDAY, June 10, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM**</mark>

Submitted by: _Claire G. Hester_

Approved by: _Rebecca Sherer_