

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1020TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY JULY 21, 2021 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:

Elise F. Woodward, AIA, Vice-Chair	Registered Architect
Khalil Mogassabi, AIA	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
Rebecca Sherer, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Janice Bergeron	Public Member (left at 9:15 a.m.)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Chair	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 1019th July 7, 2021 meeting was made by Ilyas Bhatti, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

David Zenk	Gund Partnership
Christine Verbitzki	Gund Partnership
Valerie Puchades	Gund Partnership
Howard LaRosee	MassArt
Will Ragano	Johnson Roberts
John Garcia	Linea 5
Kim Sousa	I Make Your Marketing
Betsy Lawson	CDW Consultants
Miles McDonald	BVH
Chip Sloan	William Sloan
Emily Hartmann	Gensler
Ashley Horan	TSKP
Nadia Zimo	Dream Collaborative
Molly Moore	MDS/Miller Dyer Spears
Martin Vickey	C.A. Crowley Engineering
Donna Hulub	NV5
Carol Burns	Taylor & Burns
Kara Gruss	TSKP
Lauren Hickey	Finegold Alexander
Brian Hunter	DiNisco
Joel Goodmonson	ARC Engineers
Mike Sears	NV5
Brianna Sullivan	William Sloan
Gilio Stantec	Stantec
Arleen Guyan	C.A. Crowley Engineering
Jennifer Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Carley Oliveto	CES Engineers
Jovani Caraballo	Jovani Caraballo
Sharon Gray	Schwartz Silver
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Stephanie Beals	TSKP
Robert Hicks	Stantec
Vincent Fieg	Dream Collaborative
Sharmila Bail	Shekar
Morgan Devlin	LLB
Lara Neubauer	Dream Collaborative
Caitlin Daniels	CBI Consulting

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Informational Interview with Gund Partnership

Representing Gund Partnership were David Zenk and Christine Veritzki to discuss their firms' qualifications and project experience with the Board.

B. DSB List #21-14, #551 MCA 00-1, Study & Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, Massachusetts College of Art (MassArt), Fee: \$750,000 (House Doctor) – 3 contracts, 23 Applicants

Howard LaRosee from Massachusetts College of Art was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

Gensler did not meet the Massachusetts ownership requirement. On a motion to disqualify Gensler to be considered for this MassArt project by Rebecca Sherer, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Khalil Mogassabi opposed to disqualify. Motion was approved.

The following twenty-two (22) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below is a brief summary of discussion:

William Sloan Associates – They showed that every team member was participating, and the prime was not relying on subconsultants for all the experience. This is a well-integrated team with extensive relevant experience. They have a good relationship with MassArt. This was a very good application.

Utile, Inc. – One of their subconsultants has good experience with MassArt. They provided a good Section #5 with relevant experience requested in the advertisement.

Taylor & Burns, Inc. – They provided a strong diverse team. One of their consultants has experience at MassArt. This was an excellent application.

Stantec Architecture & Engineering – This firm also has experience working at MassArt. They provided the relevant experience as requested in the advertisement. This was an excellent application.

Schwartz Silver Architects – They provided a good Section #5 with relevant experience and focused on design excellence. They provided a good diversity statement. This was a good application.

Pfeufer Richardson Architects, P.C. – They provided excellent references. They have a good Section #5. This was another strong application.

NADAAA Design, Inc. – They provided a good team with relevant experience for this house doctor project.

MDS/Miller Dyer Spears – This firm has completed a few studies at MassArt and has relevant experience for this project. They provided a good diversity statement and Section #5.

Margulies Perruzzi Architects, Inc. – This team has experience working with MassArt. They submitted a good Section #5. This is another good application.

LLB Architects – This firm provided good client references. They have relevant experience for this house doctor project and submitted a good Section #5. This was a good application.

Linea 5, Inc. – This was another good application. They provided relevant experience with a range of projects of different sizes.

Johnson Roberts Associates – They demonstrated successful relevant projects. This is a good application.

Howeler Yoon Architecture – This firm did not respond well to the criteria for this house doctor project. They did provide relevant experience and they do nice work.

Finegold Alexander Architects, Inc. – This firm provided a good diversity statement and an excellent Section #5. They provided relevant experience for this house doctor project. This was another good application.

DREAM Collaborative – This is another competitive application and the firm has relevant experience. They provided a good diversity statement and Section #5.

DiNisco Design – This is another good application. They have relevant house doctor experience and provided a good Section #5.

Dietz & Company Architects, Inc. – This firm completed work with MassArt. They provided relevant house doctor experience and a thorough response to the criteria in Section #5. This is another good application.

DHK Architects - This firm has worked with MassArt. They provided a good Section #5 and showed relevant project experience for this house doctor project.

CSS Architects – This firm showed relevant house doctor experience and submitted a good Section #5. This was another good application.

CBI Consulting, LLC – They provided a good Section #5 and have the relevant project experience.

Bargmann Hendrie + Archetype – This was a good application with relevant project experience. They provided a good Section #5 in response to the project criteria.

Amenta Emma Architects – They responded well to the criteria in Section #5 and provided relevant project experience. This is another strong application.

C. Public Comments

No public comment

D. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this “House Doctor” project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted to select the following three (3) unranked firms:

Finegold Alexander Architects, Inc.
MDS/Miller Dyer Spears, Inc.
William Sloan Associates

Motion was made by Rebecca Sherer to select the three (3) unranked finalists mentioned above for the Massachusetts College of Art Architectural “House Doctor” project, seconded by Daniel Carson. Motion was approved.

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

The Maximum Fee per Contract, based on the scope of work and services authorized, shall not exceed \$750,000.

E. DSB List #21-15, #51 MCA 00-2, Study & Design for Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing and Fire Protection Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, Massachusetts College of Art (MassArt), Fee: \$750,000 (House Doctor) 3 contracts, 9 Applicants

Howard LaRosee from Massachusetts College of Art was present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following nine (9) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below is a brief summary of discussion:

VAV International, Inc. – This team has experience with MassArt. They provided an excellent application.

Shekar & Associates, Inc. – This firm provided excellent client references. They provided relevant house doctor experience and a good Section #5. This is a good application.

Richard D. Kimball/NV5 – This was a very good application with relevant experience and good detail in Section #5.

Fitzmeyer & Tocci Associates, Inc. – This firm provided good references and submitted relevant project experience. This was a solid application.

Consulting Engineering Services, LLC – This was a strong proposal with relevant project experience. They provided a good Section #5.

C.A. Crowley Engineering, Inc. – This was another strong application with relevant house doctor experience. They provided good client references. They responded well to Section #5.

BLW Engineers, Inc. – They provided relevant house doctor project experience. This was another solid application.

B2Q Associates, Inc. – They provided good client references. The diversity statement and Section #5 was excellent and very informative. This was another strong application.

Architectural Engineers, Inc. – This was an excellent application. They submitted good evaluations and client references. Their Section #5 was good with relevant project house doctor experience.

F. Public Comments

No public comment

G. Project Voting and Ranking

The following firms displayed considerable skills and similar experiences for this "House Doctor" project. In accordance with the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 7C, Section 49 the Board voted to select the following three (3) unranked firms:

Architectural Engineers, Inc.
C.A. Crowley Engineering, Inc.
Shekar & Associates, Inc.

There was a tiebreaker between B2Q (5 points), C.A. Crowley Engineering (8 points) and Shekar & Associates, Inc. (8 points)

Motion was made by Martha Blakey Smith to select the three (3) unranked finalists mentioned above for the Massachusetts College of Art Mechanical "House Doctor" project, seconded by Rebecca Sherer. Motion was approved.

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

The Maximum Fee per Contract, based on the scope of work and services authorized, shall not exceed \$750,000.

H. Board Business

No Board business was discussed.

5. MOTION TO ADJOURN: The Board adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of July 21, 2021 by Ilyas Bhatti, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. Motion was approved.

6. NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2021 at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: A. Rick