



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 Recommendations

Project: TTU Parking and Transportation
Category: Standard
Total Budget: 14,250,000
MACC: 13,125,000
Designer Fee: 769,717
SBC Project No: 166/011-02-2016

Construct transportation, parking and pedestrian improvements throughout campus including roads, parking lots, sidewalks, lighting, security cameras, emergency phones, storm sewer and landscaping in accordance with Master Plan. This phase will also include programming, a preliminary schematic study, and probable cost for a future parking garage.

1. Lose & Associates

The scope for all five referenced projects was similar to the proposed project, with five surface lots including lighting, safety, storm water, and pedestrian traffic. The lead firm and consultants have extensive experience on this type of project, and worked together as a team on all referenced projects. Services provided include civil and landscape (both in-house), electrical, structural, and transportation. The transportation consultant provided parking and transportation improvement recommendations in the current campus master plan.

2. HFR Design, Inc

This firm has similar experience on two of the referenced projects, one road project, two surface parking lots, and parking garage. Services provided include architectural, civil, structural (all in-house), mechanical, electrical, transportation, and landscape. The transportation consultant provided parking and transportation improvement recommendations in the current campus master plan.

3. TRC Worldwide Engineering

The referenced projects include three parking garages, one surface parking lot, and two road designs. Proposed staff has worked together on all of the referenced project. Services provided included structural (in-house), mechanical, electrical, plumbing (in-house), civil, landscape, transportation, and storm water.

A total of 7 firms submitted Letters of Interest for this project:

Firm Name	Location
Allen & Hoshall, Inc.	Chattanooga
Civil Engineering and Surveying, LLC	Cookeville
Field's Engineering Consultant Services, LLC	Crossville
HFR Design, Inc.	Brentwood
Lose & Associates, Inc.	Nashville
Ross/Fowler, P.C.	Knoxville
TRC Worldwide Engineering	Brentwood



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: MSCC Rutherford County Teaching Facility
Category: Major
Total Budget: 27,190,000
MACC: 23,579,000
Designer Fee: 928,377
SBC Project No: 166/021-01-2016

Construct a third building at the Rutherford County (Smyrna) center. Project to include parking and renovations of existing facilities.

1. TMPartners, PLLC

The proposal demonstrates extensive higher-ed experience - and a thorough understanding of the flexible, general classroom spaces required for this project. Their STAH (Science, Technology and Allied Health) Building on MSCC's Rutherford County campus is an excellent example. It serves the students with STAH specialty labs, but also has general classrooms, faculty offices and with student-oriented spaces like the Lounge and Success Center – it also functions as the Campus Student Center. Also, they propose to use the same in-house and consultant team for this project that was used for the STAH project. Consultants include Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Structural, Civil, Landscaping and a Cost Estimator. The Interior design is in-house. Other higher-ed clients include Middle Tennessee State University (six projects) and Vanderbilt.

2. Johnson Johnson Crabtree Architects, P.C.

The firm has a substantial amount of the experience needed for this project. The Nashville State Community College Academic and Support Building on the main campus – and their new (2012) satellite campus in Clarksville are both good examples of this experience. The proposal also notes projects at Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee State University, the Tennessee College of Applied Technology - Dickson and Vanderbilt. Their consultants included Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Structural, Civil, Landscaping and Interior Design.

3. Tuck-Hinton Architects

The proposal highlights the firm's varied higher-ed experience, with three new and two renovation projects. Renovation is an important part of the proposed project – and THA has provided good examples at Vanderbilt and Lipscomb Universities. They have projects at Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee State University, Vanderbilt, Lipscomb University (six projects), Nashville State Community College and TCAT Murfreesboro at Smyrna (Nissan). Consultants included Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Structural, Civil, Landscaping, Cost Estimating, ADA and A/V (if required).

A total of 12 firms submitted Letters of Interest for this project:

Firm Name	Location
Bauer Askew Architecture	Nashville
Gilbert McLaughlin Casella architects, plc	Nashville
Gould Turner Group	Nashville
Hereford Dooley Architects	Nashville
HFR Design	Brentwood
Johnson Johnson Crabtree Architects, P.C.	Nashville
Kline Swinney Associates	Nashville
Moody Nolan	Nashville
Stanley Beaman & Sears	Atlanta
Street Dixon Rick Architecture, PLC	Nashville
TMPartners, PLLC	Brentwood
Tuck-Hinton Architects	Nashville

Tennessee Board of Regents
Motlow State Community College Rutherford Co. Teaching Facility

	Qualifications & Experience										Technical					Q&E+T TOTAL	Rank	Delta
	Evaluator										Evaluator							
	1	2	3	4	5	Median	1	2	3	4	5	Median						
AB	BC	CD	DE	GH	50	AB	BC	CD	DE	GH	50							
Bauer Askew	41.0	42.0	43.0	42.5	40.5	42.00	37.0	48.0	48.0	41.5	34.5	41.50	83.50	7	8.50			
Gilbert McLaughlin Casella	34.0	34.0	42.0	25.0	38.0	34.00	32.0	27.0	40.0	26.0	38.0	32.00	66.00	12	26.00			
Gould Turner Group	42.0	34.0	42.0	36.0	37.0	37.00	41.0	37.0	46.0	35.5	38.5	38.50	75.50	11	16.50			
Hereford Dooley	39.0	41.0	40.0	26.0	29.5	39.00	36.0	41.0	47.0	32.5	38.5	38.50	77.50	10	14.50			
HFR Design	42.0	39.0	41.0	42.0	34.0	41.00	32.0	41.0	45.0	40.0	36.0	40.00	81.00	8	11.00			
JJCA	46.0	47.0	49.0	44.5	46.0	46.00	44.0	44.0	49.0	42.5	38.0	44.00	90.00	2	2.00			
Kline Swinney	46.0	41.0	40.0	43.5	43.0	43.00	42.0	48.0	44.0	42.0	39.0	42.00	85.00	6	7.00			
Moody Nolan	41.0	36.0	39.0	41.0	41.5	41.00	42.0	41.0	39.0	38.0	36.5	39.00	80.00	9	12.00			
Stanley Beaman & Sears	43.0	49.0	40.0	38.0	43.0	43.00	44.0	43.0	48.0	37.5	37.5	43.00	86.00	4	6.00			
Street Dixon Rick	40.0	49.0	43.0	42.5	43.0	43.00	41.0	45.0	48.0	42.5	36.5	42.50	85.50	5	6.50			
TMPartners	47.0	49.0	44.0	40.0	46.0	46.00	46.0	49.5	50.0	38.5	39.5	46.00	92.00	1	-			
Tuck-Hinton	48.0	49.0	44.0	40.0	43.5	44.00	44.0	47.0	49.0	39.0	39.5	44.00	88.00	3	4.00			

Median	42.0	41.5	42.0	40.5	42.3	42.5	41.5	43.5	47.5	38.8	38.0	41.8	84.3	Median
Average	42.4	42.5	42.3	38.4	40.4	41.6	40.1	42.6	46.1	38.0	37.7	40.9	82.5	Average
High	48.0	49.0	49.0	44.5	46.0	46.0	46.0	49.5	50.0	42.5	39.5	46.0	92.0	High
Low	34.0	34.0	39.0	25.0	29.5	34.0	32.0	27.0	39.0	26.0	34.5	32.0	66.0	Low
Difference	14.0	15.0	10.0	19.5	16.5	12.0	14.0	22.5	11.0	16.5	5.0	14.0	26.0	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

Designer Recommendations

Project: WSCC ADA Updates
 Category: Minor
 Total Budget: 780,000
 MACC: 693,000
 Designer Fee: 64,635
 SBC Project No: 166/023-01-2016

Provide improved ADA accessibility and improvements throughout campus.

1. Shaw & Shanks Architects, PC

Strong proposal with excellent project experience. Four out of the five submitted projects were similar. Three were dedicated ADA compliance projects. The same architectural team worked on all five projects. The same consultants worked on three of the five projects.

2. Community Tectonics Architects, Inc.

Three of the five submitted projects were similar. Two were dedicated ADA projects for RSCC and WSCC. One was a long term contract (20 years) with the USPS for determining - and remediating – ADA accessibility requirements. The architectural and engineering teams are virtually the same for all the submitted projects.

3. Johnson Architecture, Inc.

Two of the five projects were similar. Two were dedicated Codes/ADA projects for ETSU and PSCC. The Principal worked on all five projects, while the Project Manager worked on four. The same mechanical and electrical engineering firms worked on four of the five projects.

A total of 6 firms submitted Letters of Interest for this project:

Firm Name	Location
Benefield Richters Company	Knoxville
Community Tectonics Architects, Inc.	Knoxville
Design Innovation Architects	Knoxville
Johnson Architecture, Inc.	Knoxville
Michael Brady, Inc.	Knoxville
Shaw & Shanks Architects, PC	Johnson City



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE • CHATTANOOGA • MARTIN • MEMPHIS • TULLAHOMA

Office of Capital Projects

Designer Recommendation

To: Peter Heimbach

From: Robbi Stivers *R. Stivers*

Date: September 9, 2016

Project: Elam and Clement Roof Replacement and Masonry Repair
 UT Martin
 SBC 540/011-01-2016

Category: Standard

Total Budget: \$3,960,000

MACC: \$3,530,000

Designer Fee: \$228,891

This project will replace the standing seam metal roof (approx. 79,000 sf) (1985) that covers the main portion of the Elam Center and repair the exterior brick on the Elam Center and Fieldhouse. This project will also complete the replacement of the Clement Hall roof (approx. 20,000 sf).

1. TLM Associates, Inc. Architects + Engineers

TLM's experience and staff submission represents the best fit for this project. They have replaced multiple roofs on the UTM campus including a previous portion of the Clement roof. The staff and consultants provided will be providing all services required for the implementation of this work. They are located in Jackson.

2. Ross Witt, PLLC

Project experience given is similar and relevant to the scope of this project which includes roof and exterior envelope improvements. Staff and consultants listed have worked together previously and are experienced in this type of work. They are located in Bartlett.

3. A2H, Inc.

A2H have worked on a similar project on the Martin campus previously. They have also submitted similar scope and budget work that they have completed for Bethel University and Dyersburg State Community College as well as other work for private clients. Principal and staff proposed are experienced. Consultants proposed are knowledgeable and have worked on UTM campus previously. They are located in Lakeland.

A total of 9 firms submitted qualifications for this project. Other firms submitting are as follows:

- Allen & Hoshall
- Evans Taylor Foster Childress Architects, P.C.
- Lyle Cook Martin Architects
- McGehee Nicholson Burke Architects
- Pickering Firm, Inc.
- UrbanArch architecture

5

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Various Facilities - Sallyports Upgrades Phase III

Agency: Correction

Category: Minor

SBC Number: 140/001-03-2016

Project Approval Date: 09/08/2016

Total Project Budget: \$ 2,500,000.00

MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 2,035,000.00

Designer Fee: \$ 172,589.00

Project Description: Replacement and upgrade of vehicular Sallyports and equipment along with upgrades of pedestrian trap gates, and all required related work.

RANKING	RECOMMENDATION
1)	Johnson + Associates Architects, LLC – Submittal indicated previous experience on projects of similar size and scope; proposed project team is well qualified and included a security consultant; propose approach indicated a solid understanding of project development and included security design needs; workload appears light.
2)	Rufus Johnson Associates of Clarksville, Inc. – Firm has experience on projects of similar size, some within correctional facilities, but appeared to lack sallyport experience; proposed project team is well qualified; proposed project approach was adequate; workload appears light
3)	N/A

Other Firms Submitted: None



DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Statewide – Agency Consultant (Engineering)
Agency: Correction
Category: Standard
SBC Number: 140/001-01-2016
Project Approval Date: 07/14/2016
Maximum Liability: \$ 100,000.00
Project Description: Provide Agency Consultant for Engineering consultant services for various projects.

RANKING	RECOMMENDATION
1)	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc. – Firm has extensive previous project experience with agency and on IDIQ contracts of this type; proposed project team includes all engineering disciplines in-house; project approach indicated a comprehensive understanding of services required for this contract.
2)	Oliver Little Gipson Engineering, Inc – Firm has limited experience on IDIQ contracts and with Correctional facilities; project team is well qualified and includes all engineering disciplines in-house; project approach lacked detail.
3)	N/A

Other Firms Submitted: None

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: William R. Snodgrass Tennessee Tower – Garage Structural Repairs

Agency: General Services

Category: Minor

SBC Number: 529/079-02-2016

Project Approval Date: 09/08/2016

Total Project Budget: \$ 1,410,000.00

MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 1,232,000.00

Designer Fee: \$ 109,096.00

Project Description: Renovations and structural repairs to the existing garage. Project will also include sealing and striping of garage floor and all required related work.

RANKING	RECOMMENDATION
1)	Goodwyn Mills and Cawood – Firm has substantial project experience with projects of similar scope, including for this facility; project team has experience on projects with similar scope; project approach was well defined.
2)	Centric Architecture – Firm and proposed project team have experience on similar scope projects; project approach was well defined
2)	HFR Design, Inc. - Firm is experienced on structural and renovation projects but submittal lacked parking structure examples; project team is well qualified; project approach was adequate.

Other Firms Submitted: None



DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Rachel Jackson State Office Building – Interior Renovations (Planning)

Agency: General Services

Category: Minor

SBC Number: 529/013-02-2016

Project Approval Date: 09/08/2016

Total Project Budget: \$ 11,340,000.00

MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 5,995,000.00

Designer Fee: \$ 330,893.00

Project Description: Interior renovation and mechanical, electrical, and plumbing system upgrades and all required related work.

RANKING	RECOMMENDATION
1)	HFR Design, Inc. – Firm has recent and relevant project experience; firm is familiar with facility as they currently have 2 projects at this location; Proposed project team is well qualified; project approach is very detailed and highlighted the importance of communication
2)	Goodwyn Mills and Cawood, Inc. - Firm is experienced on projects of similar scope; recently completed a project at the facility; project team is qualified; project approach was well thought out
2)	Moody Nolan, Inc. – Firm has recent and relevant project experience on State projects of similar size and scope; proposed project team is qualified; project approach was specific and detailed.

Other Firms Submitted: Centric Architecture; EOA Architects; GHP Environmental + Architecture; Kennon Calhoun Workshop; McFarlin Huitt Panvini, Inc.

9

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Exterior Envelope Repairs – R.Ss Gass State Laboratory

Agency: General Services

Category: Minor

SBC Number: 406/003-02-2016

Project Approval Date: 09/08/2016

Total Project Budget: \$ 1,920,000.00

MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 1,650,000.00

Designer Fee: \$ 142,452.00

Project Description: Building envelope repairs including waterproofing, window repairs, drainage modifications, and all required related work.

RANKING	RECOMMENDATION
1)	Kline Swinney Associates – Submittal showcased that not only firm, but also proposed project team have extensive experience on similar scoped projects; firm has experience on previous project at facility; project approach is well vetted and very detailed.
2)	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc. – Both firm and proposed team have experience on similar projects; firm and proposed team workload appears light and indicated great availability; project approach was somewhat short and generalized.
3)	Gobbell Hays Partners – Firm and proposed project team have experience on similar projects; proposed project approach is systematic and well thought out; some concern over envelope consultant being out of state.

Other Firms Submitted: Johnson + Associates Architects, LLC