

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