

# CITY OF SALEM DESIGNER SELECTION COMMITTEE

# MEETING MINUTES FINAL

Held: Thursday, January 17, 2019 at 11:00 AM at City Hall Annex.

Attendance: Jenna Ide (JI), Mike Lutrzykowski (ML), Kathy Winn (KW), Ryan Monks (RM), and Tom Watkins (TM)

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

#### • Discussion of Evaluation Process

Each member discussed their role. JI is chair. ML was delegated by Tom St. Pierre and is a voting member. Kathy Winn was delegated by Tom Daniel and is a voting member. Tom Watkins is the purchasing agent and is assisting in review and ensuring that the DSC proceeds under the law. Ryan Monks represents schools which is the major building stock that the City owns.

JI gave an overview of the process, which was to review the proposals for minimum criteria. Then the Committee might short list. At each stage, each proposer would need to be treated the same. JI stated that we could elect to interview or not. The Committee would evaluate the proposals that met the minimum criteria based upon the criteria in the RFQ, which she handed out. TM explained that there were legal minimum criteria that we could not waive, and then minimum criteria in the RFQ that were at the discretion of the committee whether they could be waived. TM and the Committee agreed that all proposals me the legal minimum criteria.

JI explained that we would need to do references, and that we would write up a recommendation of rankings for the Mayor. If she approved, TM would request price proposals, and start negotiations with the top selected candidates. The City did not state how many we would select. JI explained that since this was on call, we might choose more than one.

#### • Initial Discussion of 11 Proposals Received

The Committee received 11 proposals from the following firms as attached. The Committee discussed the prime and subs, and other information. JI pointed out the DSB form which helped make review easier.

# • Minimum Requirements Review

The Committee reviewed the proposals for the other minimum criteria (outlined on pages xx- xxx of the RFQ) and discussed the proposals in context. ML asked whether they had to have a registered architect or if a registered engineer was enough. TM determined that the RFQ did not clearly state that it had to be an architect as the prime. However, the Committee determined that it was clear and important that all architects and engineers be licensed. It was also important that the Proposer and the subconsultants have the following disciplines (architecture – licensed, MEP – licensed, Structure – licensed, and Cost Estimate – no license applicable). Other disciplines were important, but not required for minimum.

The Committee discussed Flow Design Inc and EE&D. Flow Design Inc. Did not meet the minimum requirements for architecture experience and did not have the required amount of public experience. They did not list a cost estimator. EE&D did not have a licensed engineer and did not list the required subs. The Committee voted that Flow Design and EE&D did not meet the minimum criteria and would not review those proposals further. It was a unanimous vote.



# CITY OF SALEM DESIGNER SELECTION COMMITTEE

#### Next Steps

The Committee decided on the two next meeting dates, 1/24/19 and 1/31/19. At the next meeting the committee would start degerming who would call references and who would call each proposer. The Committee was also asked what types of questions they would have.

## • Adjourn 1PM.

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.