



**City of Salem
Designer Selection Committee
Meeting Minutes - DRAFT
May 16, 2019**

A meeting of the Salem Designer Selection Committee was held on May 16, 2019 at 8:30am at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. **Present:** Jenna Ide (JI), Michael Lutrzykowski (MK- Delegated by Tom St. Pierre), Kathleen Winn (KW- Delegated by Tom Daniel). Guest: David Kucharsky (DK)

Interviews were held with each of the short-listed applicants, in the order shown below.

8:30 – Walker

9:30 – Desman

10:30 – DAI

Each interview was 45 minutes, with 30 minutes allotted for a presentation, and 15 minutes for Q&A. After the last interview, the Committee discussed their observations, references, and rankings for each of the criteria.

The Committee had the following consensus concerning the criteria:

For Relevant Project Experience, DAI and their subconsultant clearly demonstrated the most experience with structural, architectural and MEP evaluations as well as having worked on several public facilities in Massachusetts. Walker also demonstrated a high level of experience but the Committee members felt DAI had more capacity to conduct all aspects of their evaluation in house.

For Criteria 2, the Committee found DAI's approach to be the best, with their proposal and interview well organized and detailed. They demonstrated an integrated team that understood the many challenges associated with the operations and maintenance of this type of public facility. Walker was rated high as well, however members felt they did not quite respond to all of the important considerations (as outlined in the RFQ) as thoughtfully, particularly at the interview. Desman rated the lowest, as their approach during the interview was not clearly thought out nor was their team as organized and responsive.

For the third criteria, all of the applicant's references were positive and as such they were ranked equally.

The Committee agreed that DAI was 1st, Walker 2nd, and Desman 3rd.

The table on the following page provides the ranking for each proposer, the total points, and final ranking.

DK stated he would draft the evaluation memo based upon these findings and would circulate to the Committee for final review and approval and then submit it to the Mayor and Tom for approval and award.

	Final Rank	Criteria 1: Quality and Depth of Project Experience (0-3)				Criteria 2: Desirability of Approach to project, demonstrated understanding of scope of work, and proposer's ability to undertake and complete this project in a timely manner and on budget. (0-3)				Criteria 4: Overall Quality of References (0-3)				Total out of 9			Total out of 9
Raters		ML	JJ	KW	Average	ML	JJ	KW	Average	ML	JJ	KW	Average	ML	JJ	KW	Average
Firm																	
Becker	N/A																
Desman	3	1	1.5	1	1.17	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	5	5.5	5	5.167
Gorman Richardson	N/A																
Bayside	N/A																
DiGiorgio	1	3	2.9	3	2.97	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	9	8.9	9	8.967
Walker	2	3	2.5	3	2.83	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	3	3	3	8.5	8	8.5	8.333
Average		2.33	2.3	2.33	2.32	2.17	2.17	2.17	2.17	3	3	3	3	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.489
Rating: Greater than or Equal to 1 --- Non Advantageous																	
Rating: Greater than 1 but less than 2 ---- Advantageous																	
Rating: Greater than 2 and less than or equal to 3 -- Highly Advantageous																	