

## DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

### MINUTES OF THE 1039<sup>TH</sup> MEETING, WEDNESDAY MAY 11, 2022 AT 8:35 a.m., VIA ZOOM.

#### 1. ROLL CALL:

The Designer Selection Board Meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m.

##### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Khalil Mogassabi, AIA	Registered Architect
Alan Ricks, AIA,	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA, Chair	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E., V-Chair	Registered Engineer
Maureen Sakakeeny, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David Capaldo	General Contractor
Janice Bergeron	Public Member (left at 10:18 a.m)
Kathleen B. Colwell	Public Member (left at 10:18 a.m)

##### MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

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 1037<sup>th</sup> April 13, 2022 meeting was made by Martha Blakey Smith, seconded by Maureen Sakakeeny. Motion was approved.

A motion to approve the minutes of the 1038<sup>th</sup> April 27, 2022 meeting was made by Alan Ricks, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved. David Chappell abstained.

#### 3. VISITORS:

Miles McDonald	BVH
John Tomaz	CSS Architects
Lauren Hickey	FAA, Inc.
Iris Davis	CSS Architects
Benjamin Salzberg	Mass Military Division
Debra Avery	STCC
Andrea Nathanson	STCC
Tom Therrien	STCC
Ashley Horan	TSKP
Matthew Donnelly	Anser Advisory
Bob DeLagrange	Hoff Architects
Jason Penney	Office of Court Management
Jennifer Shelby	IMEG Corp
Jessica Brown	EDM
Kenna Therrien	Gienapp Architects
Chad Reilly	HDR
Karen Reichenbacher	STV
Tom Iskra	BVH
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants
Brian Hunter	DiNisco
Kate Zagarenski	STV
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Chris Nordberg	STV
Mike Sears	RDK/NV5
Arleen Guyan	C.A. Crowley Engineering
Robin Greenberg	Perkins Eastman
Marisa Breece Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Frank Greene	STV
Sara Ruggiero	STV
Grace Lee	HDR

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Extension of Design Services for CSS Architects, Inc.  
DSB List #18-07, Item #1, Mass State Project #31  
Mass Military Division (MMD)  
3 Applicants**

Ben Salzberg from MMD and John Tomaz from CSS Architects were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

**B. Public Comments**

No public comment

**C. Project Voting and Ranking**

The Board voted to approve the extension of design services for \$121,000 to CSS Architects, Inc. The reimbursables are not subject to the DSB approval. MMD must return to DCAMM for authorization for project over their contract limit. On a motion to approve the Extension of Design Services to CSS Architects, Inc. for \$121,000 and for MMD to return to DCAMM for approval to increase construction cost by Martha Blakey Smith, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Khalil Mogassabi abstained.

**D. DSB List #22-08, STCC2022-23, Study & Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, Springfield Technical College (STCC), Springfield, (House Doctor – 2 contracts), Available Aggregate Amount: \$1,500,000, ECC: Varies Per Project, Not to Exceed authority delegated pursuant to M.G.L. c7C §5, for an individual project, FEE: \$750,000, 7 Applicants**

Deb Avery, Tom Therrien and Andrea Nathanson all from Springfield Technical Community College were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following seven (7) firms met the requirements in this advertisement:

Amenta Emma Architects – This was a good proposal. They have relevant project experience.

Caolo and Bieniek Associates, Inc. – This was a good application. They have excellent references and relevant project experience working with higher education facilities.

Dietz and Company Architects, Inc. – This was an excellent proposal. They have strong relevant project experience especially working with Springfield Technical Community College.

DiNisco Design – This was a good proposal. They provided other strong community college project experience. They have submitted good evaluations.

Foster Architecture PLLC – This was a 3-person firm based in Vermont. The key personnel had previous experience at STCC with a former firm. Section #5 was not as strong as other firms.

Kuhn Riddle Architects – This was a good application. They have relevant project experience with higher educational facilities.

Pfeufer Richardson Architects, PC – This was another strong application. They provided excellent references and showed qualified personnel. They have relevant project experience working with higher educational facilities. Their Section #5 was excellent.

**E. Public Comments**

No public comments

**F. Project Voting and Ranking**

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this project. After a brief discussion the Board voted to select the following unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

Dietz and Company Architects, Inc.  
Pfeufer Richardson Architects, PC.

Motion was made by Ilyas Bhatti to select the two (2) unranked finalists for the Springfield Technical Community College House Doctor project, seconded by Kathleen Colwell. Motion was approved.

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

**G. DSB List #22-11, STCC2022-24, Study & Design for Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing & Land/Site Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, Springfield Community College (STCC), Springfield (House Doctor – 3 contracts), Available Aggregate Amount: \$2,250,000, ECC: Varies Per Project, Not to Exceed authority delegated pursuant to M.G.L. c7C §5, for an individual project, FEE: \$750,000, 8 Applicants**

Deb Avery, Tom Therrien and Andrea Nathanson all from Springfield Technical Community College were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following eight (8) firms met the requirements in this advertisement:

Architectural Engineers, Inc./ now IMEG – This was a responsive application. They have relevant project experience for this project and is familiar with working at STCC. They have good references.

BVH Integrated Services, PC – This was an excellent proposal. They are very familiar with working with STCC.

EDM Architecture & Engineering, PC – This was a good application. They are also very familiar working with STCC. They provided a strong Section #5.

Fitzemeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc. – This was a good application. They have relevant project experience working with educational facilities.

Hesnor Engineering Associates, PLLC – They have been a subconsultant on the robotics lab at STCC. This was a good application.

R.W. Sullivan Engineering – This was a strong proposal. They have relevant project experience working with STCC.

Richard D. Kimball/NV5 – This was another good proposal. They have relevant project experience working with STCC.

VAV International, Inc. – This was a good application. They have relevant project experience working with STCC. They were responsive to all the project criteria.

**H. Public Comments**

No public comment

**I. Project Voting and Ranking**

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this project. After a brief discussion the Board voted to select the following unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

BVH Integrated Services, PC  
Fitzemeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc.  
R.W. Sullivan Engineering

Motion was made by Martha Blakey Smith to select the three (3) unranked finalists for the Springfield Technical Community College House Doctor project, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved.

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

**J. DSB List #22-13, DSBP-20, Study & Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, Various Court Facilities, Statewide, Office of Court Management, Facilities Management & Capital Planning (OCM) (House Doctor – 8 contracts), Available Aggregate Amount: \$12,000,000, ECC: Varies Per Project, Not to Exceed authority delegated pursuant to M.G.L. c7C §5, for an individual project, FEE: \$1,500,000, 9 Applicants**

Jason Penney from Office of Court Management was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following nine (9) firms met the requirements in this advertisement:

Beasley Chin & Hunderman, PC (dba WJE Engineers & Architects) – This was not a strong application. They did not respond well to the project criteria. The Board encouraged them to contact the DSB for assistance with the application process.

CSS Architects – This was a good proposal with a strong team. They have relevant project experience. They were very responsive to the diversity focus statement.

DHK Architects – This was a good proposal. They have relevant project experience with court facilities.

Dietz and Company Architects, Inc. – This was another good application with specific response to the project criteria. They have relevant project experience.

EDM Architecture & Engineering, PC – This was a good proposal. They have relevant project experience.

Gienapp Architects – This proposal was fair. Their response to the project criteria could have been stronger with more specificity.

HDR Architecture, PC – This was an excellent proposal. They have relevant project experience.

Rowse Architects, Inc. – This was a good application. They have relevant project experience even though most of the court experience is in Rhode Island. They provided a good team of consultants with relevant court experience. They provided a good Section #5.

STV, Inc. – This was another good application. They provided an excellent diversity focus statement and did show their track record. In Section #5 they did address their local presence.

**K. Public Comments**

No public comment

**L. Project Voting and Ranking**

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this project. After a brief discussion the Board voted to select the following unranked finalists for this House Doctor project:

- CSS Architects
- DHK Architects
- Dietz and Company Architects, Inc.
- EDM Architecture & Engineering, PC
- Gienapp Architects
- HDR Architecture, PC
- Rowse Architects, Inc.
- STV, Inc.

Motion was made by Maureen Sakakeeny to select the unranked finalists for the Office of Court Management House Doctor project, seconded by Khalil Mogassabi. Motion was approved.

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

**M. Board Business:**

None

**5. MOTION TO ADJOURN: The Board adjourned at 10:50 a.m.**

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of May 11, 2022 by Ilyas Bhatti, seconded by David Capaldo. Motion was approved.

**6. NEXT MEETING:**

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2022 at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM**

Submitted by:     *Claire G. Hester*    

Approved by:     *Glise J. Arruda*