

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1033RD MEETING, WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 16, 2022 AT 8:35 a.m., VIA ZOOM.

1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Khalil Mogassabi, AIA	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA, Chair	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer (left at 10:30 a.m.)
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David Capaldo	General Contractor
Kathleen B. Colwell	Public Member
Janice Bergeron	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA,	Registered Architect
David A. Chappell, P.E., V-Chair	Registered Engineer
Maureen Sakakeeny, P.E.	Registered Engineer

Present for the DSB staff, 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 1032nd February 2, 2022 meeting was made by Janice Bergeron, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Fabrizio Caruso	DCAMM
Stephen O'Connor	DCAMM
Pat Temple	QPDO
Janet Saglio	Boston Collegiate Charter School
Jenna Ogundipe	Boston Collegiate Charter School
Jim Kolb	OPM/STV
Mark Loring	Brooke Charter School
Robin Greenleaf	IMEG Corp
Lauren Hickey	FAA, Inc.
Miles McDonald	BVH
Brittany Mather	Arrowstreet
Darlene Meacham	Tighe & Bond
Pawel Honc	Amenta Emma
Caitlin Daniels	Socotec
Tori Ellis	Tori Ellis
Gabrielle Cole	B2Q Associates
Jessica Brown	EDM
Jacquie Hughes	BER Engineering
Arleen Guyan	C.A. Crowley Engineering
Sharmila Bail	Shekar
Patty Bilotto	VanZelm
Maria Loitz	BVH
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Regan Shield-Ives	FAA, Inc.
Marion Roosa	SGH
Janet Nolan	Gale Associates
Aarathia Nirmalan	CannonDesign
Jennifer Shelby	IMEG Corp
Kelsey Lyons	R.W. Sullivan
Kathie Chainey	Arrowstreet
Kristina Kashanek	Kristina Kashanek
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Helena Currie	WSP USA
Kate Zagarenski	STV, Inc.
Pamela Merrill	RFS Engineering
Rebecca Maloney	RFS Engineering
Ganesh Ramachandran	DCAMM
Carol Burns	Taylor & Burns
Nicole Ownes	Amenta Emma
Bill Donald	VanZelm
Brian Neely	Gale Associates
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. DSB List #21-35, DSBP-13, Study and Design of Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing and Fire Protection Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, DCAMM, Statewide, Available Aggregate Amount: \$18,000,000, Estimated Construction Cost: Varies Per Project, Not to Exceed \$10,000,000, Maximum Fee Per Contract, based on the scope of work and services authorized, shall not exceed: \$3,000,000, 22 Applicants

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

The following twenty-two (22) firms met the requirements in this advertisement:

Affiliated Engineers, Inc. – Section #5 was generic and not specific to the project criteria. This was not a strong proposal.

AI Engineers – This was a good proposal. They provided relevant project experience.

Akal Engineering, Inc. – This was another good proposal with relevant project experience.

Architectural Engineers, Inc. – This was a strong proposal. They have relevant project experience. Section #5 provided a good diversity statement.

B2Q Associates, Inc. – This was a good proposal with a strong team. They provided specific project experience. Their references were excellent.

BLW Engineers, Inc. – This was not a strong application. It would have been helpful if they submitted project graphics and more details of relevant experience.

Building Engineering Resources, Inc. – This was a good application. They provided relevant experience. Section #5 had a strong diversity statement. They had excellent references.

BVH Integrated Services, P.C. – This was another good application. They had a strong diversity focus statement in Section #5.

C.A. Crowley Engineering, Inc. – This was a strong proposal. They demonstrated good relevant experience for this project.

Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP – This was a good proposal. They had good references and relevant project experience. It would have been helpful if they provided more information on how they would use the diverse team for this project.

Consulting Engineering Services, LLC – This was a good application. They demonstrated relevant project experience. Section #5 included a strong diversity statement.

EDM Architecture & Engineering, P.C. – This was a good proposal. It would have been helpful to see more detail added to the application.

Fitzmeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc. – This was another strong proposal. They included relevant project experience. They provided a strong sustainability section.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc. – This was a good application. They demonstrated relevant project experience. Section #5 was very good.

R.W. Sullivan Engineering – This was a good application with impressive client references. They provided relevant project experience and a good Section #5 with thoughtful suggestions.

Richard D. Kimball Co. DBA NV5 – This was another good application. They provided relevant project experience and past collaboration with their sub-consultants.

Rist-Frost-Shumway Engineering, P.C. – This was a good proposal. They demonstrated relevant project experience.

Shekar & Associates, Inc. – This was a strong proposal and diverse team. They provided relevant project experience.

STV, Inc. – This was another good application. They had a strong Section #5 with a good diversity statement.

Van Zelm Heywood & Shadford, Inc. – This was a good application. They had good client references and demonstrated relevant project experience.

Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc. – This was a good application. They had relevant project experience.

WSP USA – This was another strong application. They provided good references and relevant project experience. Section #5 was well written, complete and addressed the project criteria in the advertisement.

B. Public Comments

No public comment

C. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted for the following six (6) unranked finalists for this House Doctor project. There was a tiebreaker between: BVH Integrated Services, P.C., C. A. Crowley Engineering, Inc, Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP and Fitzmeyer & Tocci Associates:

Architectural Engineers, Inc.
B2Q Associates, Inc.
C.A. Crowley Engineering, Inc.
Shekar & Associates, Inc.
STV, Inc.
WSP USA

Motion was made by David Capaldo to select the unranked finalists mentioned above for the DCAMM House Doctor project, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved.

The immediate services authorized are certifiable building study, schematic plans and specifications, design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications and administration of construction contract.

D. DSB List #21-37, DSBP-12, Building Enclosure Commissioning Services, DCAMM, Statewide, Available Aggregate Amount: \$12,000,000, Estimated Construction Cost: Varies Per Project, Typically Less Than \$50,000,000, Maximum Fee Per Contract, based on the scope of work and services authorized, shall not exceed: \$2,000,000, 4 Applicants

Stephen O'Connor, DCAMM Project Manager was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following four (4) firms met the requirements in this advertisement:

CannonDesign - This was a good application with relevant project experience.

Gale Associates, Inc. – This was a good application with relevant project experience.

Socotec AE Consulting LLC - This was a good application with relevant project experience.

WSP USA - This was a good application with relevant project experience.

E. Public Comments

No public comment

F. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted for the following four (4) unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

CannonDesign
Gale Associates, Inc.
Socotec AE Consulting, LLC
WSP USA

Motion was made by Khalil Mogassabi to select the unranked finalists mentioned above for the DCAMM House Doctor project, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved.

The immediate services authorized is an independent third-party oversight.

G. DSB List #22-01, Brooke 2021-02, Expansion of East Boston and Mattapan Campuses, Brooke Charter Schools, East Boston and Mattapan, Conceptual Estimated Construction Cost: \$9.7 Million, Fee for Schematic Design/Study/Final Design: To Be Negotiated for each building, 3 Applicants

Pat Temple from QPDCO, Mark Loring from Brooke Charter School and Jim Kolb, OPM/STV were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following three (3) firms met the requirements in this advertisement:

Amenta Emma Architects – This was a good application. They have relevant and specific project experience. They addressed the project criteria listed in Section #5.

Arrowstreet – It was noted that Section 4b, the sub-consultant firm experience was not included in the application, however the information was stated in Section 3 of the resumes for each sub-consultant. Janice Bergeron motioned to disqualify Arrowstreet for not including Section 4b in their application, seconded by Daniel Carson. There was a vote of 3 to disqualify and 4 not to disqualify Arrowstreet. Arrowstreet will be considered for this project. They have strong relevant project experience. This was a strong application.

Jones Architecture, Inc. – This was a strong proposal. They demonstrated relevant project experience.

H. Public Comments

No public comment

I. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted for the following three (3) finalists in ranking order for Brooke Charter School project:

Arrowstreet (12 points)
Jones Architecture, Inc. (10 points)
Amenta Emma Architects (8 points)

Motion was made by Martha Blakey Smith to select the ranked finalists mentioned above for the Brooke Charter School project, seconded by Kathleen Colwell. Motion was approved. Janice Bergeron and David Capaldo abstained.

The immediate services authorized are schematic plans and outline specifications. It is intended that the design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications and administration of construction contract be required of the selected Designer's team and notification of the Board in accordance with M.G.L. c. 7C.

J. DSB List #22-02, BCCS 2021-2, 21 Mayhew Renovation Project, Dorchester, Boston Collegiate Charter School, Estimated Construction Cost: \$725,000, Fee for Final Design: To Be Negotiated, 2 Applicants

Pat Temple from QPDCO, Jenna Ogundipe and Janet Saglio both from Boston Collegiate Charter School were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following two (2) firms met the requirements in this advertisement:

MDS/Miller Dyer Spears – This was a good proposal. They have demonstrated relevant project experience and previous work with Boston Collegiate Charter School. They provided good client references.

Michael Lindstrom Associates dba STUDIOMLA Architects – This was a good proposal. They have provided relevant project experience.

K. Public Comments

No public comment

L. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted for the following two finalists in ranking order for Boston Collegiate Charter School project:

Michael Lindstrom Associates dba STUDIOMLA Architects (11 points)
MDS/Miller Dyer Spears (10 points)

Motion was made by David Capaldo to select the ranked finalists mentioned above for the Boston Collegiate Charter School project, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

The immediate services authorized are schematic plans and outline specifications. It is intended the design development plans and specifications, construction plans and specifications, and administration of construction contract be required of the selected Designer's team and notification of the Board in accordance with M.G.L. c. 7C.

M. Board Business

Add to March 2, 2022 Agenda

- Discussion on Diversity Focus Statement with representatives from DCAMM
- Preliminary discussion on new Board procedures for reviewing applications to be finalized on March 16, 2022

5. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of February 16, 2022 by Janice Bergeron, seconded by David Capaldo. Motion was approved.

6. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2022 at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: Glise F. Arruda