



DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Mid Cumberland Regional Health Office – Energy Improvements

Agency: Health

Category: Minor – Direct Solicitation

SBC Number: 408/002-01-2015

Project Approval Date: 11/12/2015

Total Project Budget: \$ 225,000.00

MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 148,000.00

Designer Fee: \$ 12,775.62

Project Description: Replace boiler with high efficiency equipment. Replace fluorescent lighting with controllable LED lighting and perform existing building commissioning to optimize building control and performance.

RANKING	RECOMMENDATION
1)	I.C. Thomasson Associates, Inc. – Firm’s location is in close proximity to site; previous project experience of firm and proposed project team closely aligns with needs of this project; provided a detailed and specific approach to this project; workload appears to be light.
2)	Power Management Corporation – Firm’s location is in close proximity to project site; presented previous experience on projects of similar scope; proposed project team is small, but has adequate experience; workload appears to be light.
3)	N/A

A total of 4 firms were solicited for this project.

FIRM NAME	LOCATION
I.C. Thomasson Associates, Inc.	Nashville, TN
Power Management Corporation	Nashville, TN
Olert Engineering, Inc.	Nashville, TN
MP&E Engineering	Brentwood, TN

Others Firms Submitting: N/A



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: UoM Land Bridge and Parking Garage
 Category: Major
 Total Budget: 36,600,000
 MACC: 33,500,000
 Designer Fee: 1,839,202
 SBC Project No: 166/007-03-2016

Construct land bridge across Walker Avenue, the Norfolk Southern Railway, and Southern Avenue. Construction parking garage and make site improvements at Alumni Mall and Echles Mall. Demolish Printing Services building on Southern Avenue.

1. Haizlip Studio.

This proposal has a team that includes very good experience of the prime designer with a major existing main campus structure in the past, and also recognized national consultants for the parking garage, land bridge, and pedestrian and transportation interfaces. The bridges, parking garages, and plaza designs presented as the team’s experience are similar in size and scope to the UM project and the designs are congruent to the needs and vision of the campus. The qualifications, experience, approach and understanding of the project were significant reasons why this team was ranked first by a fairly wide margin.

2. ANF architects

This architectural firm and their consultants have good, but more limited experience with similar projects. The team including consultants submitted are qualified for this project. The firm and some of their consultants have experience at this campus. The engineering consultant has relevant related railroad experience. The approach, qualifications and understanding of the project are good.

3. Fleming Architects.

This firm and their consultants are fully qualified and have good experience. Experience presented as related to the campus project includes one similar project involving a bridge, parking garage and railroad. The firm has higher education experience and indicated an understanding of the scope, approach and coordination required of this project.

A total of 10 firms submitted Proposals for this project:

Firm Name	Location
A2H Engineers Architects Planners	Lakeland
ANF Architects	Memphis
Brg3s architects	Memphis
Barge Waggoner Sumner & Cannon, Inc.	Memphis
Evans Taylor Foster Childress Architects	Memphis
Fleming Architects	Memphis
Haizlip Studio, PLLC	Memphis
LRK Inc.	Memphis
O.T. Marshall Architects	Memphis
Tuck-Hinton Architects PLC	Nashville

Tennessee Board of Regents
 The University of Memphis
 Land Bridge & Parking Garage

	Qualifications & Experience							Technical							Q&E+T TOTAL	RANK		
	Evaluator							Evaluator										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			Median	
							50											
A2H	30.0	33.5	32.0	38.0	45.0	25.0	41.0	33.50	44.0	35.5	31.0	35.0	39.0	31.0	42.0	35.50	69.00	5
ANF Architects	31.0	35.5	48.0	37.0	50.0	46.0	37.0	37.00	45.0	34.5	43.0	34.0	41.0	46.0	36.0	41.00	78.00	2
Barge Wagner Summer Cann	33.0	32.5	33.0	38.0	50.0	33.0	42.0	33.00	40.0	35.0	36.0	40.0	44.0	35.0	42.0	40.00	73.00	4
brg3s architects	31.0	30.0	34.0	38.0	48.0	29.0	35.0	34.00	45.0	32.0	29.0	30.0	39.0	32.0	35.0	32.00	66.00	7
Evans Taylor Foster Childre	24.0	32.0	25.0	33.0	45.0	28.0	30.0	30.00	37.0	25.5	19.0	34.0	29.0	28.0	30.0	29.00	59.00	9
Fleming Architects	30.0	33.5	40.0	38.0	50.0	43.0	37.0	38.00	46.0	34.0	34.0	29.0	45.0	42.0	36.0	36.00	74.00	3
Haizlip Studio	35.0	34.0	48.0	42.0	49.0	48.5	38.0	42.00	45.0	34.0	49.0	38.0	44.0	48.0	38.0	44.00	86.00	1
Looney Ricks Kiss	30.0	36.0	34.0	31.0	46.0	42.0	34.0	34.00	42.0	34.5	33.0	28.0	33.0	38.0	34.0	34.00	68.00	6
OT Marshall	26.0	29.0	22.0	26.0	43.0	19.0	26.0	26.00	36.0	25.0	19.0	19.0	35.0	23.0	26.0	25.00	51.00	10
Tuck Hinton Architects	27.0	29.5	29.0	28.0	43.0	35.0	32.0	29.50	38.0	32.0	23.0	22.0	37.0	37.0	31.0	32.00	61.50	8
Median	30.0	33.0	33.5	37.5	47.0	34.0	36.0	33.8	43.0	34.0	32.0	32.0	39.0	36.0	35.5	34.8	68.5	Median
Average	29.7	32.6	34.5	34.9	46.9	34.9	35.2	33.7	41.8	32.2	31.6	30.9	38.6	36.0	35.0	34.9	68.6	Average
High	35.0	36.0	48.0	42.0	50.0	48.5	42.0	42.0	46.0	35.5	49.0	40.0	45.0	48.0	42.0	44.0	86.0	High
Low	24.0	29.0	22.0	26.0	43.0	19.0	26.0	26.0	36.0	25.0	19.0	19.0	29.0	23.0	26.0	25.0	51.0	Low
Difference	11.0	7.0	26.0	16.0	7.0	29.5	16.0	16.0	10.0	10.5	30.0	21.0	16.0	25.0	16.0	19.0	35.0	Difference



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

Office of Capital Projects

Designer Recommendation

May 13, 2016

Project: Tom Black Track Additions
UT Knoxville
SBC 540/009-06-2016

Category: Minor – Direct Solicitation

Total Budget: \$3,000,000

MACC: \$2,546,000

Designer Fee: \$197,950

Project Scope: This project will construct a new Team Building and add a Press Box to the existing bleachers.

- 1. Lindsay & Maples, Architects, Inc.

This firm worked on the previous track project so they are familiar with the existing conditions. They have worked on other facilities with the athletic department including baseball, swimming, and rowing. The team cited are experienced and capable, and they have always provided good service.

- 2. Sparkman & Associates, Inc.

Sparkman is a good firm that has worked with the Knoxville Campus previously. Their cited experience includes work with the athletic department on the tennis facility. The staff and consultants proposed are knowledgeable and able.

- 3. Studio Four Design, Inc.

They have provided relevant project experience including previous work done with the athletic department. They have worked well with the campus, and the proposed staff and consultants are qualified.

A total of 3 firms were solicited for this project with 3 submitting qualifications. Firms that were solicited are as follows:

Firm Name	Location
Lindsay & Maples, Architects, Inc.	Knoxville
Sparkman & Associates, Inc.	Knoxville
Studio Four Design, Inc.	Knoxville

Additional firms that submitted qualifications are as follows:

Firm Name	Location
N/A	