

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1004TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 2, 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
Alan Ricks, AIA, Vice Chair	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Elise F. Woodward, AIA	Registered Architect
Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor (left at 10:50am)
Janice M. Bergeron	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 1003rd November 18, 2020 meeting Virginia Greiman, seconded by Alan Ricks. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Allen Wiggin	DCAMM
Paul Ford	DCAMM
Jack Keleher	DCAMM
Beth Baldwin	DCAMM
Kathleen Porter	LBPA
Yugon Kim	TSKP
Laurene Demoy	Studio G Architects
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Keith Campbell	Next Phase Studio
Courtney Wilson	LWA Architects
Miles McDonald	BVH
Tom Tsaros	Tom Tsaros
Morgan Devlin	LLB Architects
Deborah Yelle	Kleinfelder
Ned Collier	ICON Architecture
Catherine Hunt	Ellenzweig
Chad Reilly	HDR, Inc.
Mary Martin	Dyer Brown
Justine Kubo	ICON Architecture
Susan Elmore	Cambridge Seven
Kara Gruss	TSKP
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Crystale Wozniak	Kleinfelder
Chelsea Gazaille	Cambridge Seven
Allison Puzycki	CES Engineering
Jessica Brown	EDM
Jennifer Shelby	ARC Engineers
Simone Brogini	Kleinfelder
Janelli Aguilar	SmithGroup
Sharon Gray	SchwartzSilver
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore & Whittier
Brian Hunter	Dinisco
Gail Sullivan	Studio G Architects
John Nunnari	Architects Org
Robin Greenleaf	ARC Engineers
Alissa Marciano	LWA Architects
Mark Galvin	CDM Smith
Melanie Maddox	SmithGroup
Harold Levkowicz	HDR
Melissa Kuronen	Ellenzweig

Kate Beckman	SGH
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architecture
Cheryl Buttler	F-T
Diana Nicklaus	Saam Architecture
Joel Goodmonson	ARC Engineers
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects

A. DSB List #20-15, DCPSPT-ARCH20, Study and Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades, DCAMM, Statewide, House Doctor, Fee: \$2,500,000, 33 Applicants

Jack Keleher, Allen Wiggin and John Ford all representing DCAMM were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

Review of the thirty-three (33) applications resulted in determination that two (2) of the applicants had failed to meet the following requirements and could not be considered for this project:

Beasley Chin Hunderman had no MBE and no WBE firm nominated as requested in the advertisement. On a motion to disqualify Beasley Chin Hunderman by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

Edward Rowse Architects had no MBE firm nominated as requested in the advertisement. On a motion to disqualify Edward Rowse Architects by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

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:

Bargmann Hendrie + Archetype – This is a well written proposal with a strong team. The resumes and Section #5 could have benefited by adding more in-depth information.

CambridgeSeven – They provided a good diversity statement. They might struggle with MBE/WBE depending on the projects assigned. They provided relevant resumes and seem to be able to handle small projects. The plus to this proposal was that they mentioned how they would manage around Covid and included a helpful graphic.

CBI Consulting LLC – They had a solid application with good client references.

CSS Architects, Inc. – They seem to be well qualified, but Section #5 could have showed more detail to the project.

Dietz and Company Architects – They provided relevant experience in their resumes. The specification consultant should have added specs in their resumes but had a strong application.

Dore + Whittier Architects, Inc. – The resumes were solid but with minimal details. This firm showed strengths, but Section #5 was lacking information.

Dyer Brown and Associates – Their Section #5 could have been submitted with more detail. Their diversity statement was interesting and showed more than “boiler plate” content. They showed more private than public work.

Edgewood Design + Architecture – This was a confusing application. The PIC and PM had strong resumes but showed work at previous firms and/or in collaboration with another firm. In the experience section none of the projects were included that were noted in their resumes. The PM had a lot of private work and firm experience showed one project that was public.

EDM Services, Inc. – EDM is using Shekar & Associates as an associate MEP firm to provide more diversity. It was appreciated that the PIC and PM resumes showed fewer projects and offered more information instead of a long list. Section #5 developed a matrix with project timelines; this was a good presentation of their project experience. It was a solid proposal.

Ellenzweig – They had a series of strong evaluations and a very strong proposal showing detail in the experience section. They provided a good diversity statement. This is a capable firm delivering high quality projects.

Fennick McCredie Architecture – PIC listed projects with no description and PM listed a little more detail but overall could have provided more information. They did provide examples in their project experience but would have liked to see more current work.

Finegold Alexander Architects – They provided good client references and strong agency evaluations. Provided a good representation of a wide variety of projects. Section #5 seemed to be one of the strongest of all the applicants.

HDR Architecture – They provided excellent agency evaluations. Provided a strong diversity statement and resumes. This was a very strong proposal.

ICON Architecture, Inc. – They have a strong diversity statement and provided good evaluations.

Jones Architecture, Inc. – In general, this was a strong proposal. They provided a strong diverse team.

Kleinfelder – They provided a strong diverse team and have a good track record with DCAMM.

Kuhn Riddle Architects – They showed a good amount of diversity and provided relevant projects in their project criteria.

Lavallee Brensinger Architects – The resumes were informative, and they provided a good consultant matrix of responsibilities. They should have emphasized their firm's internal diversity and commitment.

Leers Weinzapfel Associates – The architect is a WBE but only one MBE is on the team. They provided good references and agency evaluations. The resumes could have been more specific showing how they would meet the needs for smaller projects.

LLB Architects – They have relevant experience and are well qualified. They provided good evaluations.

MDS – Miller Dyer Spears – They provided good references and agency evaluations. Their section #5 was solid and comprehensive.

Overunder – This was an interesting proposal trying to break in to do DCAMM projects. They put together a solid team of sub-consultants with good experience. They had a well-crafted Section #5 making a case for a firm that does not have a long list of prior house doctor work. This was a thoughtful application.

Pfeufer Richardson Architects – Their references are good, and resumes showed good public work weighted towards higher education. They provided a good Section #5.

Rode Architects – The MBE and WBE goals may be challenged. They showed projects but did not indicate a lot of detail around the projects. Does not have a lot of public work and Section #5 was "boiler plate" information.

Saam Architecture – They did a nice job on Section #4 and showed one of the stronger Section #5's. They showed a good range of projects.

Schwartz Silver Architects – They did not have a lot of information in their resumes towards the relevancy of this house doctor project. They did highlight good projects limited to private work.

The S/L/A/M Collaborative – They have good client references. The specification consultant's resume does not mention specification work.

SmithGroup – The MBE and WBE may be challenged to meet their goals. Their emphasis is healthcare projects.

Studio G Architects – They have a collaboration with Studio Enee and did a nice job at articulating the roles in Section #5.

Taylor & Burns – They could have given more detail in the resumes. The specification consultant does not even reflect it in their title so confused as to who will prepare the specifications. Really good response regarding the cost control diagram and a good discussion in the process design approach.

TSKP Studio – Their resumes were good, and projects listed were appropriate for house doctor projects. Their response to the project criteria was good. They submitted a very good matrix on their bidding record and change order. They provided excellent client references.

The Board had a brief discussion and voted to select the following five (5) unranked finalists for the DCAMM Architectural House Doctor project:

Dietz and Company Architects, Inc.
Ellenzweig
HDR Architecture, P.C.
ICON Architecture
Studio G Architects

A motion was made by Virginia Greiman to approve the above DCAMM Architectural House Doctor list to be sent to DCAMM, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

- B. Discussion: VJ Associates has pleaded guilty in federal court for overbilling clients in New York and Massachusetts. The DSB cannot ban them from applying unless it has been officially notified by Massachusetts. If a firm submits an application with VJ Associates on the team the Board will flag it and discuss at meeting.

C. Autocene and Board Business

Agency Review – There was a lengthy discussion on how the agency should review the firms in order to assist the Board with the assessment of the applicants. Rebecca is concerned that agencies may not be willing to articulate the firms that they prefer when in a public meeting. It was discussed to have a better indicator in the agency's interest in the firm as part of their review comments. Some examples could be used - recommend, highly recommend, never worked with this firm or check boxes – recommend, highly recommend, never worked with and never worked with but impressed with proposal. No agency should be ranking firms. The agency review's format needs to be tweaked (the two columns); Alan will help with this issue if needed. A consistent review format for all agencies is needed. This will be discussed and voted on at one of the DSB regular meetings.

Autocene Application Form – There have been firms that entered over 5 projects instead of the 5 recommended projects. The instructions need to be clear to only put in 5 projects. The Board does not want firms to design their own application; they want firms to keep to the same format as requested in Autocene.

Rebecca thinks that Autocene is functioning very well and the setup of the application has improved and made reviewing better.

Autocene Voting – Autocene has a system in place and will be presented to the Autocene Sub-Committee meeting and later discussed at a regular DSB meeting.

Rebecca had requested the matrix information that the Board received on projects showing when each firm was selected and appointed for projects before Autocene. The information was located in the former DSB database and will eventually be included in Autocene.

Board attendance at meetings - Rebecca requested from the Board to let Claire know the Wednesday before a meeting if they will attend or not attend a meeting.

Agency Reviews - Rebecca requested that the Board receive the agency project reviews the Friday before a meeting. Claire does notify the agencies and will confirm that she receives them to send out to the Board the Friday before a meeting.

The next Autocene Sub-Committee Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday December 9, 2020 at 9:00 am. – Claire will send out an Autocene Sub-Committee agenda, provided by Bill and those items will be discussed and voted at the full Board meeting on December 16, 2020.

4. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of December 2, 2020 by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

5. **NEXT MEETING:**

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2020, at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire H. Hester

Approved by: Rebecca Shuler