

## DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1007<sup>TH</sup> MEETING, WEDNESDAY JANUARY 20, 2021 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:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Chair	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA, Vice-Chair	Registered Architect
Martha Blakey Smith, AIA	Registered Architect
Elise F. Woodward, AIA, Vice-Chair	Registered Architect
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Rebecca Sherer, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice M. Bergeron	Public Member
Virginia Greiman	Public Member

#### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jessica Tsymbal, AIA, LEED AP	Registered Architect
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor

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 1006<sup>th</sup> January 6, 2021 meeting Virginia Greiman, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

### 3. VISITORS:

Sayem Khan	Sayem Khan
Elizabeth Minnis	DCAMM
Stephen Furtado, Jr.	Global Learning Charter Public School
Stephen Furtado, Sr.	Global Learning Charter Public School
Robin Pfetsch	DCR
Stephanie Livolsi	Dore and Whittier
Molly Moore	MDS/Miller Dyer Spears
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants
Steven Habeeb	Habeeb Architects
Mark Galvin	CDM Smith
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Patrick Grime	JMBA Architects
Jennifer Bentley	BH Plus
Miles McDonald	BVH
Paola Munoz	FM Architecture
Kim Sousa	I Make Your Marketing
Jessica Bell	FM Architecture
Katherine McDonald	Arrowstreet
Molly Conner	JMBA Architects
Tamara Macuch	Habeeb Architects
Laurence Spang	Arrowstreet
Lauren Carter	LDA Architects
Amir Kripper	Kripper Studio
Mary McKenna	MMA Architects
Sara Garber	Arrowstreet
Brian Hunter	DiNisco
Nadia Zimo	DREAM Collaborative
Randall Luther	TSKP
Morgan Devlin	LLB Architects
Katie Ferrier	Arrowstreet
Marion Roosa	Habeeb Architects
Diana Ostberg	Saam Architects
Kathleen Chainey	Arrowstreet
Susan Cook	NV5
Emily Grandstaff	Arrowstreet
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architects
Ashley Solomon	Dietz Architects
Celeste Soares	T2 Architecture

Jennifer Shelby	ARC Engineers
Stephen Setterluns	BPLUSA
Will Ragano	Johnson Roberts
Jessica Brown	EDM

- A. Notes of gratitude** – Alan gave a shout out to DCAMM, BSA, ACEC and BOS NOMA for organizing the “get to know you” event that took place on January 7, 2021.
- B. DSB List #20-17, DCR20A/E07, Study & Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, Statewide, DCR, Fee: \$750,000 (House Doctor – 6 contracts), 18 Applicants**

There were some general comments to help firms improve their applications. When submitting resumes, please use a more detailed list of relevant experience describing the scope, scale and the role an individual played in working on a project; this will help the Board better understand the relationship. In the experience section, it would help to give more depth to the projects listed and keep the interest with examples not just a list. Section #5 is the opportunity for a firm to stand out and show why a firm should rise to the top; this is a chance to show why your firm would be a good candidate for the project. DCAMM has added a diversity statement as a standard evaluation criteria and it should show how this enables your firm to provide better services and how you think about developing your team to diversify the field working on state projects and bring new perspectives, insights and values. When a firm is the Prime providing sub-consultant roles, please describe your approach in the resume, experience and Section #5. Do not reorder the sections of the applications; this makes it very confusing to review. For out-of-state firms, you should give more clarity on who will be the team members and be able to service a project in Massachusetts when they are located in another state. It was also noted that on a few of the applications the design architect on project was not credited; this should be noted that they had a collaborating role in the project. These are all areas of opportunities of improvement to help a firm stand out with a robust application.

The following eighteen (18) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below is a brief summary from the members:

Bargmann Hendrie + Archetype – This firm had a good supplemental response in Section #5 and clearly the team has extensive DCR experience.

Beacon Architectural Associates – The resumes were missing the point that DCR requested in the advertisement. Section #5 showed a good matrix and clear examples of work that was performed.

Clark & Green, Inc. – This firm is based in western part of the state. They have good diversity and experience working with DCR. It was challenging to read because of the re-order of sections but had good content. Some of the resumes were general. This firm seems to be very competent, but Section #5 was limited, and the diversity statement was not strong.

DHK Architects, Inc. – This firm showed strong diversity credentials. They showed impressive historic preservation projects and relevant project experience. The Section #5 was excellently presented. The specification is being done in-house and should have been referenced in the resume.

Dietz & Company Architects – This firm is in the western part of the state. The principal and project manager didn't seem to have the relevant experience in the area as described for DCR. Their Section #5 could have had a little more narrative to strengthen their proposal.

Dore + Whittier Architects – This firm did not have a lot of recreational experience. This is a large firm and they did address some of the smaller projects that they have worked on. They did a solid job on the diversity statement and reached out to new firms to be part of their team.

EDM Services, Inc. – This firm is in western part of the state. They have provided good references. It would have been useful if they showed how they would use their alternate consultants.

Fennick McCredie Architecture – This team has a lot of experience. The resumes for the PIC and PM were solid and they had a host of good project case studies in Section #4 and #5 that were well represented and nice design work. Some of the experiences are not as applicable to the project criteria. This is a large firm and the projects may not be relevant to what DCR is seeking.

JM Booth & Associates – They have relevant project experience with DCR. They are in New Bedford. They have a diverse team of consultants but did not submit a diversity statement. This is a well-qualified firm but needs to work on providing a better application with the resumes and Section #5 and answer the questions directly from the application evaluation.

Johnson Roberts Associates – They have relevant project experience with DCR. They have put together a strong application but Section #5 narrative could have been stronger. Robin Pfetsch did mention that they never receive additional services requests from them; they go out of their way to do the work and stick to budgets.

Kripper Architecture Studio – This is a new firm to the DSB. They seem to focus on housing in Boston rather than parks and recreation. Most of their DCR experience is represented in the sub-consultant team; maybe hoping to expand in the DCR realm. Section #5 would have been a great opportunity for them to bring something fresh to add value to the project.

LDA Architecture & Interiors – This application is very good and has a good representation of DCR work. They currently have a \$600,000 balance left on their current contract. This is a large firm and a 2<sup>nd</sup> contract would not overload them.

Maryann Thompson Architects – This is an excellent firm. They have relevant project experience with DCR. They have reached the limit on their current house doctor project. The entire team is very familiar with DCR.

Rode Architects – They provided nice design projects but not relevant to DCR projects. Section #5 could have had more narrative information showing how they would work with DCR.

Schwartz Silver Architects – They have a strong diverse team. They are a larger firm and lack park and recreation project experience. They did a good job in Section #4 showing some relevant work. The in-house specification writer is detailed in the resume of the PIC.

Stephen Kelleher Architects – This is a small firm and the diversity statement does not show a lot of strengths. They have relevant DCR experience. They have an expired house doctor contract. This is another case of adding more relevant information in Section #5.

Turowski2 Architecture, Inc. – This is a strong application and the response to the criteria was good. Section #5 had a strong response to the evaluation questions.

Westfaulkner – This is a small firm with higher education experience. They assembled a team of consultants to cover the DCR recreations experience. This is a new firm to the DSB. They have a strong diversity statement and a strong proposal.

Robin Pfetsch from DCR was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. She stated that it would be advantageous to select a firm from the western part of the state as well as the Cape Cod area. The Board had a brief discussion and voted to select the following six (6) unranked finalists for the DCR House Doctor project:

Bargmann Hendrie + Archetype  
DHK Architects, Inc.  
JM Booth & Associates  
Johnson Roberts Associates  
Maryann Thompson Architects  
Turowski2 Architecture, Inc.

A motion was made by Elise Woodward to approve the above DCR House Doctor list to be sent to DCR, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved.

**C. DSB List #20-18, CP-DS-2020-001, GLCPS Convent Renovation Project, Global Learning Charter Public School, ECC: \$6,095,781-\$6,580,134, Fee: To Be Negotiated - 10 Applicants**

The following ten (10) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project. MBE and WBE were not required but were encouraged for this project.

Below is a brief summary from the members:

Arrowstreet – They have relevant charter school experience. They have similar experience in converting a convent into a school. This is an excellent proposal and consistent throughout.

Flansburgh Architects – This is a strong firm and has great experience with K-12 with excellent references. In Section #5 they took the opportunity to provide design ideas.

Habeeb & Associates Architects – They have strong relevant experience with charter school projects. Their response to sustainability was very good.

Jones Architecture, Inc. – They provided good references and evaluations. Their expertise seems to be in higher education. They listed a charter school but were not the prime firm working on the project. The Section #5 was good.

LLB Architects – They have relevant experience with charter school projects and K-12 experience. This is a good application.

MDS/Miller Dyer Spears – This was a very good application with relevant experience and good focus on projects. They have also dealt with convent renovations.

Olinger Architects – They do not have any charter school experience. This is a new firm providing charter school experience with their sub-consultants. They provided limited graphics and should have provided more narrative on how they would perform on this project.

SAAM Architects – They have a lack of charter school experience but do have relevant educational experience. They did seek to show the relevance to this project and included the same MEP consultant who is currently working at this charter school.

TSKP Studio – This firm is in Connecticut with no Massachusetts connection. They do have relevant experience in K-12 education in Connecticut. They provided a thoughtful and informative Section #5.

Turowski2 Architecture – They gave great references. They have relevant experience with K-12 and charter school projects. They have strong sub-consultants including the MEP that has experience with this charter school. This was a nice proposal, and if selected for an interview, their challenge would be to convince the client that they are not stuck with the ideas that they have presented thus far and to keep current and look forward with different ideas.

Stephen Furtado, Sr. and Stephen Furtado, Jr. both representing Global Learning Charter Public School were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board. The Board had a brief discussion and voted to select the following three (3) unranked finalists to be interviewed on February 3, 2021 for the Global Learning Charter Public School:

Arrowstreet  
Habeeb & Associates Architects  
MDS/Miller Dyer Spears

A motion was made by Elise Woodward to approve the above list to be interviewed for the Global Learning Charter Public School, seconded by Virginia Greiman. Motion was approved.

- D. **Public Comments** – There would be a window of time during which we would invite public to comment. This would be moderated on Zoom by Bill and the public would send a chat message to Bill and he would elevate them to comment and limit them to one minute.

Some of the concerns by the members:

- This would go much smoother when we go back to in-person meetings and not on Zoom.
- Public comment could be done offline by sending a letter or contacting the Chair. This seems like it would cause more problems by allowing public comment.
- Is there a limit to the comments; there could be 25+ people that want to comment. This could end up being a very long meeting.
- It is very interesting and helpful for the public to have a voice during a public meeting. The Chair would be able to disallow any derogatory or judgmental comments about a firm. The Chair must moderate the public comments.
- It is important to recognize that a Board or Committee need not have any response to any public comment nor does a Board or Committee need to answer any question that is raised by any public comment.
- For the first trial of public comments we will put 15 mins with one minute per person on the agenda and revisit again and make sure that it is productive.
- Will the comments be allowed before the review or after review of applications?
- There will be two test drives, one meeting to do before review and the other test to do after review (before vote). This will be tested at the meeting of the Westfield State University House Doctor reviews.

- E. **Informational Interview Discussion** – This will be discussed as Board Business at a future meeting.

- F. **Farewell to Virginia Greiman**

The Board thanked Ginny for the many years that she has served as a public member to the DSB. Ginny was presented with a citation from the Governor and a donation was made in her name to the New England Center Home for Veterans. A photo book from DCAMM will be sent to Ginny with some quotes from the Board.

4. **MOTION TO ADJOURN:** The Board adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of January 20, 2021 by Virginia Greiman, seconded by Janice Bergeron. Motion was approved.

5. **NEXT MEETING:**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2021 at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM**

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: A. Richer