

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.
Pfeufer 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