



CITY OF SALEM DESIGNER SELECTION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES DRAFT

Held: Thursday, February 27, 2019 at 10:00 AM at City Hall Annex.

Attendance: Jenna Ide (JI), Mike Lutrzykowski (ML), Kathy Winn (KW). Guest - Tom Watkins (TW)

On Call Architectural Services for Various Projects, #19-26-240

- **Minutes**

- The Committee reviewed and approved the minutes from 1/17, 1/24, and 1/31 2019. They approved the minutes with minor corrections.
- The Committee reviewed the draft rankings and evaluation recommendation, and approved the evaluation memo, with minor corrections, see attached.
- The Committee agreed to recommend the top 6:

Name	Final Rank
Flow Design Inc.	Did not meet minimum criteria.
DREAM Collaborative LLC	5
Beacon Architectural Associates	7
Clark H. Brewer, Architect	9
DiGiorgio Associates Inc.	8
Winter Street Architects, Inc.	6
BLW Engineers, Inc.	2
Russo Barr Associates, Inc.	4
CBI Consulting, LLC	1
Gray Architects, Inc.	3
Energy Engineering & Design, Inc.	Did not meet minimum criteria.

○



CITY OF SALEM DESIGNER SELECTION COMMITTEE

- JI stated she would circulate to the Mayor and if approved, provide to TW.

- **Adjourn 10:45**

Minutes prepared by JI

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-2028 through 2-2033.



Date: March 5, 2019

To: Mayor Kimberley Driscoll

From: Designer Selection Committee

- Jenna Ide, Director of Capital Projects & Municipal Operations
- Michael Lutrzykowski (Delegated by Tom St. Pierre)
- Kathy Winn (Delegated by Tom Daniel)

cc: Tom Watkins

Re: Recommendation of Selection of Designers for On-Call Architectural Services for Various Projects
RFQ #19-26-240

On November 28, 2018 the City of Salem posted a Request for Qualifications for a designer for the above referenced project. The RFQ is for On-Call architects which would be used for projects under the legal thresholds (currently \$30,000 design and \$300,000 construction cost), for third party review of other projects, or to provide initial studies or investigative analyses of issues found in City buildings. The Contract term is for 1 year with a 2-year option to renew, and there is no limit to the total number of contracts issued or to the total value of work in aggregate over the term of the contract. The City of Salem received eleven proposals on January 4, 2019¹ The following designers submitted proposals by the date and time required. Attachment 1 is a matrix providing more details on the firms, such as location, subconsultants, etc.

Name	Abbreviation	Final Rank
Flow Design Inc.	Flow Design	Did not meet minimum criteria.
DREAM Collaborative LLC	DREAM	5
Beacon Architectural Associates	Beacon	7
Clark H. Brewer, Architect	Brewer	9
DiGiorgio Associates Inc.	DiGiorgio	8
Winter Street Architects, Inc.	Winter St.	6
BLW Engineers, Inc.	BLW	2
Russo Barr Associates, Inc.	Russo Barr	4
CBI Consulting, LLC	CBI	1
Gray Architects, Inc.	Gray	3
Energy Engineering & Design, Inc.	EE&D	Did not meet minimum criteria.

The Designer Selection Committee ranked the proposals as shown above. The Committee recommends requesting price proposals and proceeding with negotiations with the top six firms as ranked (see bolded firms).

¹ Two addenda were issued on December 6 and 13, 2018.

A summary of each of the firms is provided below.

Recommended:

1. **CBI** – CBI scored well in experience, references, and depth of team. They have a large firm with many disciplines that could provide a variety of services. They have done a number of schools and a larger number of public projects in Massachusetts. They wrote a good proposal, that provided a thoughtful approach. They have accessibility, acoustical, and other specific skills that might be beneficial to the team.
2. **BLW** – BLW is a mechanical firm with a strong background in high efficiency, school, and public projects. They could be a good firm for when we have projects that are primarily mechanical or electrical. They had good references. They did not have as much depth of experience in other areas requested but not required (Criteria 3), however they will be good for MEP projects.
3. **Gray** – Gray is a small and local architectural firm that has worked for Salem previously. They have good envelope, public, historic, and some school experience. They do not have a large capacity but do have good subconsultants and work nearby so they can be brought in quickly. They provided a thoughtful approach. They have excellent references.
4. **Russo Barr**- Russo Barr specializes in envelopes and roofing. They provide excellent services for this type of work and have worked on several public projects and have historic experience. They responded to the RFQ thoroughly. They have excellent references. They brought in appropriate subconsultants.
5. **DREAM** – DREAM is a Boston based MBE firm that has excellent references. They have good public outreach, school, and architectural experience. They have excellent subconsultants. They thoroughly responded to the RFQ and detailed their approach to services.
6. **Winter St.** – Winter St. is a firm that has good public and architectural experience and internal references. Their MEP received great references They have experience with the City of Salem. Winter St. did not respond to the clarification questions so it is recommended they submit the information needed prior to executing a contract.

Not recommended:

7. **Beacon** – Beacon has average relevant experience and good. References were mixed, some good and some average. Their project approach was average and they did not go into depth as to their particular experience for Criteria 3, and their relevant experience did not have as much depth as other firms.
8. **DiGiorgio** – DiGiorgio did not demonstrate the level of experience in public projects and understanding of the work scope (Criteria 1 & 2). There was difficulty getting references. DiGiorgio did not respond to questions but did not formally withdraw.
9. **Brewer** – Brewer is a one-person firm that is on the South Shore. The Committee did not feel they had the capacity to work for this contract (Criteria 2) and did not have significant public experience. Some references were good, some did not come in. Brewer was responsive to the proposal; however, it was confusing to read and find information.

Process:

The City of Salem held six meetings of the Designer Selection Committee (DSC) in January and February.² Members of that Committee included: Jenna Ide, Tom St. Pierre (who delegated to Mike Lutrzykowski) and Tom Daniel (who delegated to Kathy Winn). The Committee was assisted by Tom Watkins, the Purchasing Agent, and Ryan Monks, Facility Director of the Schools³. Tom Watkins assisted in ensuring the process followed the law, and Ryan Monks provided input on the school related responses, as the majority of work is likely to be in schools. Both assisted in references but did not rate the Proposers or vote. On January 17, 2019, the Committee went over the process and discussed the overall steps. The Committee discussed the applicants and whether or not they met the minimum criteria as outlined in the RFQ and outlined in the matrix

The Committee determined that each proposal meet the legal minimum criteria established by the State and City under M.G.L. Chapter 7c and City ordinances. The Committee also reviewed the minimum criteria established by the City. The Committee determined that it was not required by the RFQ that the primary proposer be an architect, but the primary proposer was required to be licensed as well as the primary contacts of any of the engineering and architectural firms that were part of the teams. In the RFQ, the City requested that Proposers also have a minimum amount of experience (10 years architecture and 3 years public, Mass, and Schools), and have all the required disciplines in their team (prime or subs – architecture, MEP, structural, and cost estimator). More information on the minimum requirements and whether they were met is in Attachment 1.

The Committee determined that not all designers appeared to meet the minimum criteria in the RFQ. The Committee voted on 1/17/19 that Flow Design and EE&D did not meet the minimum criteria. Flow Design Inc. did not meet the minimum requirements for architectural experience and did not demonstrate the required amount of public experience. They also did not list a cost estimator. EE&D did not have a licensed engineer and did not list the required subconsultants. The Committee unanimously voted that Flow Design and EE&D did not meet the minimum criteria and would not review those proposals further.

In the meetings on January 24 and 31st the Committee established who would be calling references and what clarification questions they had. On 1/31/19, Jenna Ide sent each remaining proposer the same questions in order to clarify experience, financial strength, experience with subconsultants, quality of submittals, and approach to project. All proposers except two, DiGiorgio and Winter St., responded to the questions by the deadline of February 7, 2019.

The Committee on 2/14 and discussed the responses to the questions, references, and the rating criteria. On 2/19 the Committee provided their initial rankings and discussed their rankings. The Committee discussed the references they received. Jenna Ide took the rankings and averaged them for each proposer. On 2/27/19 the Committee voted on the criteria as shown on the next page. More detailed criteria are shown in the attachments.

² DSC meetings were held on 1/17/19, 1/24/19, 1/31/19, 2/14/19, 2/19/19, 2/27/19. Each was publicly posted within 48 hours.

³ TW and RM did not attend the 2/19 and 2/27 meetings.

The following table provides the average ranking (points) for each proposer, the total points, and final ranking. Criteria are highlight from red to blue as lowest to highest. Points were awarded on a 1-4 scale, with 4 being Highly Advantageous, 3 being Advantageous, 2 being Not Advantageous (Neutral), and 1 being Unacceptable.

Proposer	Min. Criteria Met	Responded to Questions	Number of References Received Prime	Number of References Received Subs (MEP, Structural, & Architect if Applicable)	Criteria 1: Prior Similar Experience and Disciplines (1-4)	Criteria 2: Demonstrated understanding of scope of work and financial and other ability to undertake and complete these types of projects with assigned staff (1-4)	Criteria 3: Quality and Identity of Applications Team (another experienter requested) (1-4)	Criteria 4: References	Total Points out of 16
Ratings:					Average	Average	Average	Average	Average
Beacon	Yes	Yes	2	1	3.07	3.17	2.67	2.83	11.733
BLW	Yes	Yes	2	3	3.5	3.5	3	4	14
Brewer	Yes	Yes	2	1	2.17	2.9	2.07	2.67	9.8
CBI	Yes	Yes	2	Not Needed*	3.67	3.83	4	3.6	15.1
Dream	Yes	Yes	1	1	3.1	3.67	3.5	3.5	13.767
DiGiorgio***	Yes	No			2.73	2.57	2.73	2.5	10.533
Gray	Yes	Yes	2	1**	3.83	3.13	3.33	3.67	13.967
Russo Barr	Yes	Yes	2	Not Needed*	3.33	3.5	3	4	13.833
Winter St.	Yes	No	1	1	3.17	2.5	3.17	3.17	12
EE&D	No								
Flow, Inc.	No								
Average					3.17	3.2	3.05	3.33	12.74811

* MEP is BLW - covered above. Structural In House reference

** See MacRitchie for Brewer

*** Called references, none received back per TW.

In conclusion, the Committee determined that it wanted different skill sets, and that the by providing the top six companies and opportunity to continue negotiations, the City would benefit from a diverse architectural pool. Overall, the recommendation provides a well-rounded set of architects and engineers for the City -- from large (CBI, BLW), to medium (Russo Barr, DREAM) to small (Winter St., Gray), from specialists in envelope or MEP (Russ Barr and BLW) to more general architects (Winter St., DREAM, CBI, Gray), and firms that have worked with Salem many times before (Gray, Russo Barr, Winter St., and BLW) and to firms that have not worked with Salem significantly, and bring new talents and approaches (CBI, DREAM).

If you agree with our recommendation, please sign below, and we will move forward with requesting the companies proposed fees and negotiating contracts.

If you would like to see the recommended Proposals, please let me know.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Approved:

Mayor Driscoll

Date

Attachment 1: List of Firms and Min. Criteria

Attachment 2: Full Evaluation Scoring