



Tennessee Board of Regents

Office of Facilities Development

Suite 664 at 1415 Murfreesboro Road in Nashville, Tennessee 37217-2833
(615) 366 – 4431 FAX (615) 366 – 3992



Designer Recommendation

Project: D.P. Culp Addition & Renovations
Category: Major
Total Budget: 39,840,000
MACC: 31,361,500
Designer Fee: 2,199,204
SBC Project No: 166/005-01-2014

Construct an addition and renovations to the existing student center.

1. Beeson, Lusk & Street

BLS included Moody Nolan (Nashville office) as their design consultant. All five of the consultant submitted projects were similar in scope, including a new \$118m student center (Ohio Union) for The Ohio State University. The team's portfolio included 23 student centers and two recent projects (both completed 2015) for ETSU. BSL's principal managed both ETSU projects. The team provided the maximum of three projects of similar scope, size or complexity, while working with a CM/GC – and the maximum three projects requiring sequencing of construction in an occupied facility.

2. Thompson & Litton

T&L included VDMO Architects as their design consultant. Eight of the ten submitted projects were similar in scope, including a new \$46m Student Center for Liberty University. T&L's principal managed one of the submitted projects, while VDMO's project manager (team daily activities leader) managed five of their submitted projects. The team provided the maximum of three projects of similar scope, size or complexity, while working with a CM/GC – and the maximum three projects requiring sequencing of construction in an occupied facility.

3. Barber McMurry

Barber McMurry included Ken Ross Architects as their architectural consultant. Five of the ten submitted projects were similar in scope, including a new \$131m Student Union for the University of Tennessee, and the 2008 renovations to D.P. Culp Center. Barber McMurry's project manager (team daily activities leader) managed three of their submitted projects. The team provided the maximum of three projects of similar scope, size or complexity, while working with a CM/GC – and the maximum three projects requiring sequencing of construction in an occupied facility

A total of 9 firms submitted Letters of Interest for the project.

Firm Name	Location
Barber McMurry	Knoxville
Beeson, Lusk & Street	Johnson City
Bullock, Smith & Partners	Knoxville
Johnson Architecture	Knoxville
Lewis Group Architects	Knoxville
Red Chair Architects	Knoxville
Studio Four Design	Knoxville
Thompson & Litton	Bristol, TN
Weeks Ambrose McDonald	Knoxville

Tennessee Board of Regents
East Tennessee State University
D.P. Culp Student Center Renovations & Addition

	Qualifications & Experience						Technical					Q&E+T TOTAL	RANK		
	Evaluator						Evaluator								
	1	2	3	4	5	Median 50	1	2	3	4	5			Median 50	
2	Barber McMurry	41.0	37.0	39.0	40.0	32.0	39.00	38.0	36.0	38.0	39.0	33.0	38.00	77.00	3
8	Beeson, Lusk & Street	41.0	42.0	44.0	43.5	43.0	43.00	39.0	41.0	44.0	43.5	42.0	42.00	85.00	1
1	Bullock, Smith & Partners	38.0	37.0	37.0	45.0	36.0	37.00	36.0	37.0	39.0	43.0	37.0	37.00	74.00	6
5	Johnson Architecture	37.0	39.0	37.0	45.5	38.0	38.00	35.0	37.0	36.0	41.0	37.0	37.00	75.00	5
4	Lewis Group Architects	39.0	40.0	39.0	39.5	40.0	39.50	36.0	39.0	40.0	36.0	37.0	37.00	76.50	4
3	Red Chair Architects	33.0	31.0	38.0	36.5	33.0	33.00	31.0	31.0	37.0	33.5	35.0	33.50	66.50	9
7	Studio Four Design	31.0	34.0	39.0	40.5	38.0	38.00	32.0	33.0	39.0	41.5	36.0	36.00	74.00	6
9	Thompson & Litton	39.0	40.0	43.0	37.5	41.0	40.00	40.0	40.0	41.0	39.5	40.0	40.00	80.00	2
6	Weeks Ambrose McDonald	35.0	33.0	33.0	36.0	31.0	33.00	35.0	35.0	39.0	37.0	31.0	35.00	68.00	8

Median	38.0	37.0	39.0	40.0	38.0	38.0	38.0	36.0	37.0	39.0	39.5	37.0	37.0	75.0	Median
Average	37.1	37.0	38.8	40.4	36.9	37.8	37.8	35.8	36.6	39.2	39.3	36.4	37.3	75.1	Average
High	41.0	42.0	44.0	45.5	43.0	43.0	43.0	40.0	41.0	44.0	43.5	42.0	42.0	85.0	High
Low	31.0	31.0	33.0	36.0	31.0	33.0	33.0	31.0	31.0	36.0	33.5	31.0	33.5	66.5	Low
Difference	10.0	11.0	11.0	9.5	12.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	8.5	18.5	Difference



Tennessee Board of Regents

Office of Facilities Development

Suite 664 at 1415 Murfreesboro Road in Nashville, Tennessee 37217-2833
(615) 366 – 4431 FAX (615) 366 – 3992

2

Designer Recommendations

Project:	TTU Laboratory Science Building and Infrastructure
Category:	Major
Total Budget:	81,750,000
MACC:	69,664,300
Designer Fee:	3,642,980
SBC Project No:	166/011-11-2013

Construct new facility for laboratory sciences, relocating the Chemistry program. Project includes modifications to the utilities facilities to accommodate the new building.

1. Upland Design Group

This firm was selected as the best fit because of their expertise with complex projects and similar experience with TTU's campus architecture and design objectives. The lead firm and their consultants have a proven track record of working together successfully on the TTU Nursing Building project, as well as having thorough knowledge of the campus through design of other TTU projects. The entire design team has experience working together on the projects referenced in the proposal. All of the firms are local to the mid Tennessee region (with the exception of the science and A/V consultants) and will be able to provide a quick response to issues in construction. The lead firm and M/P/E consultant principal's time involvement is significant for this project (highest of all proposals), with the science consultant heavily involved in the programming and schematic design phases.

2. Barber & McMurray

The design firm has a proven track record of completing complex projects on a university campus. The proposal provides a relatively good overlap of proposed team members on the project examples submitted, with the majority of team members having all worked together on the submitted projects. The firm has extensive experience working on research and other highly technical buildings at the University of Tennessee and other universities. The science consultant, the lead firm and M/P/E consultant's principal's time commitments are significant.

3. ESa

The design firm has demonstrated experience with science laboratory facilities. The proposal provides an experienced team that has worked together on some of the projects listed in the proposal. The proposal includes several higher-ed Science and research facilities designed with the proposed team and the science Consultant including Belmont University and several other universities. All team members, except for science and A/V consultants, are local to the mid Tennessee region, and they will be able to provide quick response to the TTU campus. Referenced projects include three buildings with science lab components. Average time commitment by lead team members and consultants averages 25%.

A total of 17 firms submitted Letters of Interest for this project:

Rank	Firm Name	Location
2	Barber & McMurray	Knoxville
9	Bullock, Smith & Partners	Knoxville
7	Cope Associates	Knoxville
11	EOA Architects	Nashville
3	ESa	Nashville
14	Gilbert McLaughlin Casella	Nashville
12	Goodwyn Mills Cawood	Nashville
6	Gresham, Smith and Partners	Nashville
8	HFR Design	Nashville
10	Lewis Group Architects	Knoxville
13	Michael Brady Inc.	Knoxville
4	Moody Nolan	Nashville
5	Santec Architects	Boston
16	Studio Four Design	Knoxville
17	Tuck Hinton Architects	Nashville
1	Upland Design Group	Crossville
14	Weeks Ambrose McDonald	Knoxville

Tennessee Board of Regents

TTU - Science Laboratory

RFQ Score Sheet - Overall Evaluations & Ranking

Qualifications & Experience

Technical

	Evaluator					Median 50	Evaluator					Median 50	Q&E+T TOTAL	RANK	Delta
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5				
	39.00	39.50	28.00	39.00	33.50		39.50	39.50	42.00	38.00	35.50				
Barber McMurry	39.00	39.50	28.00	39.00	33.50	39.00	39.50	42.00	38.00	35.50	39.50	78.50	2	2.5	
Bullock, Smith & Partners	29.00	31.50	28.00	32.00	30.00	30.00	21.00	34.00	35.00	24.00	32.00	62.00	9	19.0	
Cope Arch	29.00	33.50	32.00	38.00	31.75	32.00	27.00	31.50	35.00	30.00	31.50	63.50	7	17.5	
EOA Arch	25.00	28.50	21.00	35.00	26.00	26.00	23.00	32.00	31.00	36.00	31.00	57.00	11	24.0	
ES a	40.00	39.50	31.00	39.00	40.00	39.50	38.00	36.00	38.00	43.50	38.00	77.50	3	3.5	
Gilbert McLaughlin Casella	27.00	30.00	23.00	25.00	19.25	25.00	21.00	28.50	19.00	26.00	26.00	51.00	14	30.0	
Goodwyn Mills Cawood	24.00	27.00	25.00	25.00	29.50	25.00	25.00	30.00	32.00	38.50	30.00	55.00	12	26.0	
Gresham Smith & P	28.00	32.00	39.00	33.00	30.75	32.00	30.00	29.50	34.00	33.00	33.00	65.00	6	16.0	
HFR Design	31.00	29.00	28.00	30.00	26.50	29.00	30.00	33.50	34.00	34.00	34.00	63.00	8	18.0	
Lewis Group Architects	24.00	31.00	30.00	35.00	35.50	31.00	26.00	29.00	33.00	29.00	29.00	60.00	10	21.0	
Michael Brady	20.00	28.50	22.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	23.00	29.50	25.00	29.50	29.50	53.50	13	27.5	
Moody Noland	31.00	25.00	37.00	35.00	35.75	35.00	25.00	32.50	35.00	41.00	35.00	70.00	4	11.0	
Stantec Arch	30.00	34.50	23.00	39.00	26.00	30.00	28.00	36.00	29.00	37.00	36.00	66.00	5	15.0	
Studio Four Design	24.00	29.00	21.00	20.00	21.25	21.25	16.00	27.50	23.00	32.00	24.00	45.25	16	35.8	
Tuck Hinton	25.00	30.00	19.00	15.00	15.75	19.00	31.00	29.50	17.00	19.00	25.00	44.00	17	37.0	
Upland Design Group	39.00	41.00	44.00	45.00	40.00	41.00	40.00	37.00	46.00	40.00	40.00	81.00	1	-	
Weeks Ambrose McDonald	24.00	30.00	24.00	27.00	29.00	27.00	15.00	29.00	30.00	19.00	24.00	51.00	14	30.0	

Median	28.0	30.0	28.0	33.0	29.5	30.0	26.0	31.5	31.0	33.0	33.0	31.5	Median
Average	28.8	31.7	27.9	31.5	29.1	29.8	27.0	32.0	30.9	33.3	32.2	31.6	Average
High	40.0	41.0	44.0	45.0	40.0	41.0	40.0	39.5	46.0	46.0	43.5	40.0	High
Low	20.0	25.0	19.0	15.0	15.8	19.0	15.0	27.5	17.0	24.0	19.0	24.0	Low
Difference	20.0	16.0	25.0	30.0	24.3	22.0	25.0	12.0	29.0	22.0	24.5	16.0	Difference



3

THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE • CHATTANOOGA • MARTIN • MEMPHIS • TULLAHOMA

Office of Capital Projects

Designer Recommendation

January 15, 2016

Project: Boathouse Improvements
UT Knoxville
SBC 540/009-09-2015

Category: Minor

Total Budget: \$3,000,000.00

MACC: \$2,585,000.00

This project will renovate all three floors of the boathouse. Locker rooms, showers, and exercise areas will be enlarged and offices incorporated into the space.

1. Lindsay & Maples, Architects, Inc.

Lindsay & Maples have worked on several renovation projects for UT Knoxville including work with the Athletic Department. The project experience listed include renovations for the baseball stadium and track, and they designed the swim facility. Each of these projects show their capabilities in adhering to the program and budget. The staff proposed are experienced with consultants who have worked on the campus previously. They are located in Knoxville.

2. Brewer Ingram Fuller Architects, Inc.

This firm has worked with the campus on prior projects, and they have provided quality service. Their experience listed includes renovations for an office, theater, and a sanctuary with each having a similar component to this project. Staff proposed are diligent and consultants are experienced and familiar to the campus. They are located in Knoxville.

3. Sanders Pace Architecture

Sanders Pace has experience on working on renovation projects with recent experience on the UT Knoxville campus. Their project experience covers classrooms and adaptive reuse of an existing historical building. The staff proposed are knowledgeable, and the consultants have worked with the campus and Sanders Pace on previous projects. They are located in Knoxville.

A total of 3 firms were solicited for this minor project with 3 submitting qualifications.

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

4

Project: ADA Upgrades – J.R. Fleming Training Facility
Agency: Environment & Conservation
Category: Minor
SBC Number: 402/002-01-2015
Project Approval Date: 12/17/2015
Total Project Budget: \$ 550,000.00
MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 440,00.00
Designer Fee: \$ 42,840.00
Project Description: Correct ADA deficiencies and all related work

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1)	DKRS Architects/Engineers, PLLC - DKRS presented project types and sizes most consistent with the scope and budget of the JR Fleming project. Designer is relatively close to the project site.
2)	M. Shanks Architects - M. Shanks Architects presented projects that had ADA related work as a part of the project scopes. While all projects had ADA components it is unclear as to how much of the Project was represented by the ADA component
3)	Larry Woods & Associates - Larry Woods & Associates' project examples were appropriate but not recent. A more recent project had an ADA component but was not itself an ADA project.

Other Firms Submitted: Cope Associates Inc. Architecture

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

5

Project: Laboratory Renovations – R.S. Gass Laboratory

Agency: General Services

Category: Minor

SBC Number: 406/003-01-2015

Project Approval Date: 01/14/2016

Total Project Budget: \$ 4,268,000.00

MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 2,861,320.00

Designer Fee: \$ 235,902.00

Project Description: Interior upgrades including ADA, LED lighting, interior finishes, and all related work.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1)	<p>Gobbell Hays Partners- The firm demonstrated that their previous project experience aligns with the needs of this project. They demonstrated extensive experience in designing, estimating, scheduling, and coordinating laboratory renovations. Specifically, and in direct correlation to this project, the firm detailed experience completing ADA and laboratory renovations for the State of TN and the Department of Health.</p> <p>The architectural team is comprised of individuals who have many years of experience completing projects successfully with the State of Tennessee that involved ADA upgrades and interior renovations, as well as a proven track record of completing various laboratory renovations. The lab planner and designer on the team has designed and managed projects for the Department of Health previously that included BSL3 laboratory spaces.</p>
2)	<p>HFR Design, Inc. – The firm demonstrated that the experience and qualifications of both the architectural and engineering team align with the needs of this project. The design team will include a combination of professionals who specialize in laboratory design, are familiar with the facility and its security parameters, having previously completed a project within the building.</p> <p>Additionally, the firm demonstrated their previous experience aligns with the needs of the project, and they have presented a project approach that has been vetted and presents a well thought-out approach to deliver a successful project. The firm has experience vast experience completing laboratory renovations.</p>
3)	<p>Johnson + Associates Architects, LLC - The firm demonstrated that their previous project experience aligns with the needs of this project. They are familiar with the area and the site, having previously completed renovations on a portion of the building. They also demonstrated an understanding, based on previous experience, of the careful coordination and sensitivity involved in renovating the spaces within an occupied building that will continue to have functioning laboratory space throughout the course of the project.</p>

Other Firms Submitted: Design House 1411, LLC; Gould Turner Group, P.C.; Moody Nolan, Inc.; Cope Associates, Inc. Architecture; Kline Swinney Associates; Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood, Inc.; M. Shanks Architects; Kennon Calhoun Workshop

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

6

Project: Replace Emergency Power Back-Up Systems Phase 2 – Statewide
Agency: Correction
Category: Minor
SBC Number: 140/001-03-2015
Project Approval Date: 09/10/2015
Total Project Budget: \$ 8,200,000.00
MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 1,575,200.00
Designer Fee: \$ 136,537.00
Project Description: Upgrade the emergency power backup systems at various facilities, including all related work.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1)	Michael Brady Inc. – Firm showcased an understanding of the project and familiarity with both State and TDOC projects. Proposed project team, including consultants are experience on similar projects. Workload appears to be light.
2)	Allen & Hoshall, Inc. – Firm is experienced on projects of this scope, however, project approach is lacking in detail. Firm is experienced on State and TDOC projects. Workload appears to be moderate to heavy.
3)	March Adams & Associates, Inc. – Based on the information submitted, this firm is capable doing work of this scope. Project approach was not strongly presented and experience working at correctional facilities was not reflected in their submittal.

Other Firms Submitted: None

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

7

Project: Wastewater Treatment Plan Expansion – Bledsoe Correctional Facility
Agency: Correction
Category: Standard
SBC Number: 142/013-01-2013
Project Approval Date: 12/17/2015
Total Project Budget: \$ 3,500,000.00
MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 3,500,000.00
Designer Fee: \$ 283,877.00
Project Description: This subproject will concentrate on the review of the current design and will provide additional capacity to address additional flow from a proposed institution expansion along with addressing permitting requirements.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1)	CTI Engineers, Inc. – Firm showcased previous experience and successful work on correctional projects. Provided a well-defined project approach that expressed possible environmental concerns and the ongoing changes at the facility. Workload appears to be light.
1)	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc. – Detailed their experience working on State projects, including those at correctional facilities. Project approach was well defined and addressed possible environmental issues. Workload appears to be light.
2)	GRW Engineers, Inc. – Firm has previous experience at this facility as the designer of record of the original plant. Project approach lacked some details and there is some concern of size of proposed project team. Workload appears to be moderate.

Other Firms Submitted: Goodwyn Mill and Cawood; Griggs and Maloney, Inc

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

8

Project: Cockrill Bend Development – Planning – Cockrill Bend
Agency: General Services
Category: Standard
SBC Number: 529/017-01-2016
Project Approval Date: 01/14/2016
Maximum Liability: \$ 800,000.00
Project Description: Development of programming requirements for the colocation of various agencies' functions and all related work.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1)	Kline Swinney Associates, Inc. – Proposed design team is experienced in master planning and consultants have expertise in fields that will be required on this project. Project approach appears to be thoroughly vetted and they provided case studies to showcase their process.. Work load appears to be light to moderate
2)	TMPartners, PLLC – Proposed project team has relevant project experience and is capable of completing this project. Project approach was well defined and emphasized attention to detail. Workload appears to be moderate.
2)	EOA Architects – Provided a project team with relevant projects experience. Project approach is well defined and builds on existing knowledge and deliverables. Workload appears to be heavy.

Other Firms Submitted: Cope Associates Inc. Architects; Kennon Calhoun Workshop; M. Shanks Architects; Street Dixon Rick Architecture, PLC.