

DESIGNER SELECTION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE 1018TH MEETING, WEDNESDAY JUNE 23, 2021 AT 8:30 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
Daniel M. Carson, P.E.	Registered Engineer
David A. Chappell, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Ilyas Bhatti, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Rebecca Sherer, P.E.	Registered Engineer
Kenneth Wexler	General Contractor

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alan Ricks, AIA, Chair	Registered Architect
Janice 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 1017th June 9, 2021 meeting was made by Ilyas Bhatti, seconded by David Chappell. Motion was approved.

3. VISITORS:

Andraya Lombardi	Anser Advisory/Roxbury Community College
Pamela Lomax	Roxbury Community College
Jonathan Salvon	Kuhn Riddle
Charles Roberts	Kuhn Riddle
Aelan Tierney	Kuhn Riddle
Caroline Fitzgerald	RMF
Ashley Horan	TSKP
Alisa Kahn	Studio MLA
Martin Vickey	Crowley Engineering
Kristina Kashanek	Jones Architects
Justine Kubo	ICON
Sara Ross	Dyer Brown
Kathleen Bradley Colwell	Kathleen Bradley Colwell
Kevin Webb	STV, Inc.
Donna Hulub	RDK/NV5
Jenn Weiss Donovan	Anser Advisory/Roxbury Community College
Carol Burns	Taylor Burns
Susan Wisler	Architectural Engineers
John Garcia	Linea 5
Mary Martin	Dyer Brown
Brian Hunter	DiNisco
Ned Collier	ICON
Nicole Owens	Amenta Emma
Arleen Guyan	Crowley Engineers
Nancy Banks	B2Q Associates
Gabrielle Cole	B2Q Associates
Karen Reichenbacher	STV, Inc.
Kayla Meggy	STV, Inc.
Pamela Merrill	RFS
Marisa Sullivan	Studio G Architects
Lara Neubauer	DREAM Collaborative
Nadia Zimo	DREAM Collaborative
Jennifer Shelby	Architectural Engineers
Rebecca Maloney	RFS
Allison Puzycki	CES Engineering
Jennifer Cardettino	Linea 5
Nick Brooks	DREAM Collaborative

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Board Business

The Board welcomed the newest architect member Khalil Mogassabi who replaced Jessica Tsymbal.

Elise requested the following be posted to the Boardbook and be added to the Board Business for July 7, 2021:

- Introduction to the Board
- Discussion on disqualifications of applications

If there are any items that members would like to be discussed at one of the meetings, please contact Alan or Elise.

B. Informational Interview with Kuhn Riddle Architects

Representing Kuhn Riddle were Aelan Tierney, Jonathan Salvon and Charles Roberts to discuss their firms' qualifications and project experience with the Board.

C. DSB List #21-11, #RCC2021-01ARC, Study & Design for General Building Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, 1234 Columbus Avenue, Roxbury Community College, Fee: \$750,000 (House Doctor) – 4 contracts, 13 Applicants

Pamela Lomax from Roxbury Community College and Andraya Lombardi from Anser Advisory representing Roxbury Community College were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following thirteen (13) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below is a brief summary of discussion:

Amenta Emma Architects – This was an excellent application and they responded well to the criteria for selection.

CBI Consulting LLC – The prime team has higher education experience with specific project examples. They provided good references. Overall this was a great application.

DHK Architects – This firm does not have a lot of higher education experience. Their engineering subconsultant RDK/NV5 has experience requested in the advertisement.

DiNisco Design – They provided good references and submitted a range of projects as requested in the advertisement. Section #5 was well done. This was a good application in responding to the criteria.

DREAM Collaborative – This is a good firm, but the higher education experience was smaller compared to other firms. Their sub-consultants had strong higher education experience.

Dyer Brown & Associates, Inc. – This is a good firm with relative experience in higher education. They have provided good references. Section #5 was good with a strong diversity statement.

ICON Architecture – They are very familiar with Roxbury Community and have relative experience in higher education. This was strong application.

Johnson Roberts Associates – They showed strong experience throughout their application.

Jones Architecture, Inc. – They have a current contract with Roxbury Community College. They provided good qualifications and Section #5 was well written. This was an excellent application.

Linea 5, Inc. – Their resumes were general and not project specific. Section #5 was not integrated.

Michael Lindstrom Associates Architects – Studio MLA – This was a good application and provided a good diverse team. Section #5 was strong.

Pfeufer Richardson Architects, P.C. – This is a strong application and Section #5 showed relative expertise. They have higher education experience.

STV, Inc. – This is a strong application and a complete Section #5. They acknowledged they are big firm and showed how they would cope with smaller projects. Their sub-consultants are good.

D. Public Comments

No public comment

E. 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 four (4) unranked firms:

DiNisco Design
Dyer Brown & Associates, Inc.
ICON Architecture
Jones Architecture, Inc.

Motion was made by Kenneth Wexler to select the four (4) unranked finalists mentioned above for the Roxbury Community College Architectural “House Doctor” project, seconded by Martha Blakey Smith. 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.

F. DSB List #21-12, #RCC2021-01ARC, Study & Design for Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing and Fire Protection Renovations, Repairs & Upgrades, 1234 Columbus Avenue, Roxbury Community College, Fee: \$750,000 (House Doctor) – 4 contracts, 13 Applicants

Pamela Lomax from Roxbury Community College and Andraya Lombardi from Anser Advisory representing Roxbury Community College were present to explain the project and answer questions from the Board.

The following thirteen (13) applications reviewed by the Board were responsive to the criteria in the advertisement for this project.

Below is a brief summary of discussion:

Architectural Engineers, Inc. – They provided good references and evaluations. Section #5 was well organized. This was a strong application.

B2Q Associates, Inc. – This was a good application with relevant experience and a great team of sub-consultants.

BLW Engineers, Inc. – The diversity statement was complete but just listed their credentials and was not strong.

C.A. Crowley Engineering, Inc. – This was a strong application. Section #5 showed good examples with graphics.

Consulting Engineering Services, Inc. – This was a good application with a strong team.

Fitzemeyer and Tocci Associates, Inc. - This was an excellent application. They are a well-rounded firm with relevant higher education experience.

Garcia Galuska DeSousa, Inc. – This was an excellent application. The team has good credentials with a wide variety of experience. They had an excellent response to the criteria in Section #5.

Richard D. Kimball/NV5 – They have relevant higher education experience. This was a good application.

Rist-Frost-Shumway Engineering, P.C. – This was a strong firm and good application. They provided relevant higher education experience.

Stantec Architecture & Engineering, P.C. – They are a multi-disciplinary firm with experience at Roxbury Community College. Section #5 was not as strong as some of the other applications.

STV, Inc. – Section #5 was well presented. This was another good application.

VAV International, Inc. – They are a small to mid-size firm with relevant project experience. This was a good application.

Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc. – This firm has good experience but did not focus on higher education experience in their application.

G. Public Comments

No public comment

H. 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 four (4) unranked firms:

Architectural Engineers, Inc.
Fitzmeyer and Tocci Associates, Inc.
Richard D. Kimball/NV5
VAV International, Inc.

Motion was made by Martha Blakey Smith to select the four (4) unranked finalists mentioned above for the Roxbury Community College MEP “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.

5. MOTION TO ADJOURN: The Board adjourned at 11:12 a.m.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting of June 23, 2021 by Kenneth Wexler, seconded by Ilyas Bhatti. Motion was approved.

6. NEXT MEETING:

WEDNESDAY, JULY 7, 2021 at 8:30 a.m. via ZOOM

Submitted by: Claire G. Hester

Approved by: A. Richer