



# THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE • CHATTANOOGA • MARTIN • MEMPHIS • TULLAHOMA

## Office of Capital Projects

### Designer Recommendation

March 11, 2016

Project: Upgrade Infrastructure Systems – Phase 1  
UT Space Institute, Tullahoma  
SBC 540/020-02-2015

Category: Minor – Direct Solicitation

Total Budget: \$2,000,000.00

MACC: \$1,760,000.00

Designer Fee: \$151,000.00

This project will make improvements to the Main Academic Building (1964), Propulsion Research Facility (1990), Test Building 8103 (1980), Andy Holt Industry/Student Center (1969), and will provide some campus safety improvements. Main Academic Building improvements include adding an elevator, upgrading auditorium seating, replacing windows, and upgrading classrooms. The other facility upgrades include HVAC replacement, a roof replacement, site improvements, restroom upgrades and building system improvements

#### 1. Cogent Studio, LLC

This firm presented renovation projects whose scopes of work are similar to the roof and window replacements in this one. These projects also represented their ability to work on period structures and the thoughtfulness behind keeping the historical accuracy intact. The proposed staff are experienced and have worked on the projects cited. Although they have not worked on the Space Institute Campus previously they have worked with UT on another campus and provided good service. The proposed staff and consultants are experienced and capable of delivery this project.

#### 2. TWH Architects, Inc.

This firm has shown experience with renovation and adaptive reuse of existing buildings. The components of these projects are similar to the scope and work that will be needed on the UTSI campus. They represented an understanding that comes with handling code issues that present themselves on most renovation projects. Staff and defined consultants have experience working together. They have not previously worked on the Space Institute Campus, but they have worked for UT and previous and current projects.

A total of 3 firms were solicited for this project with 2 submitting qualifications.  
Firms that were solicited are as follows:

Firm Name	Location
Cogent Studio, LLC	Chattanooga
Franklin Associates Architects, Inc.	Chattanooga
TWH Architects, Inc.	Chattanooga

Additional firms that submitted qualifications are as follows:

Firm Name	Location
N/A	

2

## DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Project:** Energy Systems Upgrade – Andrew Jackson State Office Building

**Agency:** General Services

**Category:** Minor

**SBC Number:** 529/073-01-2016

**Project Approval Date:** 03/10/2016

**Total Project Budget:** \$ 1,504,000.00

**MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost):** \$ 1,176,153.00

**Designer Fee:** \$ 104,577.00

**Project Description:** Energy systems upgrade, including mechanical, controllable LED lighting, window film and existing building commissioning.

<b><u>Ranking</u></b>	<b><u>Recommendation</u></b>
1)	<b>Oliver Little Gipson Engineering, Inc.</b> - Firm proposes a strong project team which includes some well qualified consultant support. Project approach was very thorough and well thought out. Submittal provides examples of previous project experience that are both relevant and recent. Workload appears to be light.
1)	<b>I.C. Thomasson Associates, Inc.</b> - Proposed a well thought out project approach, including a phasing plan. They also showcased a strong project team, with all members being located in Nashville. Firm has lots of experience on similar scoped new projects, whereas this project is renovation.
2)	<b>Allen &amp; Hoshall, Inc.</b> Showcased experience working within the facility and an understanding of the State's energy requirements. Presented a strong and talented project team, though most of the team is in Memphis. Workload appears to be moderate.

**Other Firms Submitted:** Krell Engineering, LLC; Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.

## DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Project:** Porter Lab Energy Systems Upgrade – Ellington Agriculture Center

**Agency:** General Services

**Category:** Minor

**SBC Number:** 100/000-01-2016

**Project Approval Date:** 03/10/2016

**Total Project Budget:** \$ 1,161,000.00

**MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost):** \$ 997,293.00

**Designer Fee:** \$ 83,763.00

**Project Description:** Energy upgrades including existing building commissioning, steam boiler removal with a preheat replacement system and control integration for lab exhaust hoods.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
<b>1)</b>	<b>Olert Engineering, Inc</b> – The firm’s submittal demonstrated experience working on projects of similar size and scope to our project. The firm has completed other projects at this location providing valuable experience that will be beneficial to the success of this project. Proposed project team is well qualified and has many years of experience working with STREAM.
<b>2)</b>	<b>Oliver Little Gipson Engineering, Inc.</b> – The firm showcased their experience working with the State on previous projects of similar scope. Proposed project team is well qualified and has worked together for a considerable amount of time.
<b>3)</b>	<b>Krell Engineering, Inc</b> – Firm’s submittal showcased experience on projects of similar scope, but not necessarily similar size. Proposed project team consists of well qualified in-house personel.

**Other Firms Submitted:** N/A

## DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Project:** Statewide – Civilian Conservation Corps Cabin Renovations

**Agency:** Environment & Conservation

**Category:** Standard

**SBC Number:** 126/000-03-2015

**Project Approval Date:** 07/09/2015

**Total Project Budget:** \$ 5,900,000.00

**MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost):** \$ 4,807,000.00

**Designer Fee:** \$ 380,172.00

**Project Description:** Renovate cabins at three State parks. Upgrades to include HVAC, plumbing and electrical systems.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1)	<b>Sparkman &amp; Associates</b> – The firm demonstrated that previous experience with TDEC and on historic renovation projects would be beneficial to the success of this project. They presented a well thought-out project approach that showcased importance of modern conveniences while maintaining the historic character of the buildings. Proposed project team, including Principal-In-Charge, is well qualified.
2)	<b>Upland Design Group</b> – Firm showcased previous experience working on projects with similar scope, as well as a historic restoration at a facility which is a part of this project. The firm’s location is close to two of the three projects sites.
3)	<b>Goodwyn Mills and Cawood</b> –Proposed project team is well qualified and fully capable of completing design services for this project. Their submittal exhibited some previous experience working on projects in State Parks. Firm’s location in Nashville could be an issue as two of the project locations are in East Tennessee.

**Other Firms Submitted:** Allen & Hoshall, Inc.; Benefield Richters Company; Bullock Smith & Partners; Cogent Studio, LLC; Cope Associates, Inc. Architecture; McFarlin Huitt Panvini, Inc. ; TLM Associates, Inc.