



DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Tennessee School for the Deaf - New High School and Infrastructure Upgrades

Agency: Education

Category: Major

SBC Number: 168/007-01-2013

Total Project Budget: \$ 29,030,000.00

MACC (Maximum Allowable Construction Cost): \$ 22,600,000.00

Project Description:

The current high school at the Tennessee School for the Deaf (TSD) is comprised of four buildings dating from 1924 through 1965. These buildings are obsolete, inefficient, and do not meet current ADA, LSC, and NFPA codes. These facilities do not foster a healthy, conducive, and productive learning environment by today's standards for the deaf or hearing impaired. Therefore this project will consist of the design and construction of a new high school facility located in the heart of the existing historic campus where demolition of an existing building, significant mass grading & drainage improvements, utility infrastructure upgrades and associated work shall be required to provide a new state of the art facility for the students, faculty and staff.

The Tennessee School for the Deaf and Hearing Impaired offers individualized and comprehensive educational programs with the goal of this project to provide a total learning environment in a facility that utilizes state of the art curricula, materials, and methods for preparing deaf and hearing-impaired students for adult life.

This new high school complex will include the design and construction of a new high school building comprised of an administration, kitchen and dining hall, media center, classrooms and vocational center (**Career & Technical Education – CTE**) that shall meet the specific needs of the deaf and hearing impaired and/or dual-diagnoses.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Recommended Designers</u>
1	93.00	Blankenship & Partners
2	82.67	The Lewis Group
3	79.00	Ross Fowler/Weeks Ambrose McDonald

Other Firms Submitted: Archimania, Bullock Smith & Partners, Cope Architecture, EOA Architects, Grieve & Associates, Michael Brady, Inc, Upland Design Group

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

1) Firm: Blankenship & Partners

Comments: Clearly demonstrated knowledge of unique challenges and opportunities of project; in depth explanation of project approach; understanding of social and technical aspects of deaf culture; firms principal is hearing impaired, brings personal experience into project approach; experience in relevant projects, especially schools for the deaf; addressed need for hazmat consultant

2) Firm: The Lewis Group

Comments: Clearly defined roles/responsibilities of project team; design reflected maintaining style of current campus buildings; understands challenges of schools for the deaf; consultant well integrated into proposal and demonstrated relevant experience; lacked hazmat consultant information

3) Firm: Ross Fowler/Weeks Ambrose McDonald

Comments: Firms principal and consultant has experience in design of schools for the deaf; well defined roles of project team; recognized importance of communication with stakeholders as well as tenants;

Designer Evaluation Scores Comments

RFQ Score Matrix

Project: New High School and Infrastructure Upgrades

Department: Education

Facility: Tennessee School for the Deaf

SBC Number: 168/007-01-2013

Project Category: Major

Project Budget: \$29,030,000.00

Project MACC: \$22,600,000.00

Designer	Evaluation of Submitted Documents Request For Qualifications Maximum 100 Points						Total	Rank
	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6		
Archimania	62.00	43.00	29.00	52.00	73.00	54.00	52.17	11
Blankenship & Partners	90.00	95.00	97.00	94.00	88.00	94.00	93.00	1
Bullock Smith & Partners	75.00	50.00	58.00	65.00	68.00	75.00	65.17	7
Cope Architecture	77.00	70.00	71.00	83.00	73.00	72.00	74.33	4
EOA	70.00	85.00	58.00	71.00	74.00	72.00	71.67	5
Grieve Associates	75.00	80.00	53.00	68.00	73.00	70.00	69.83	6
Michael Brady Inc	70.00	45.00	47.00	49.00	67.00	52.00	55.00	10
Red Chair Architects	65.00	66.00	51.00	57.00	83.00	64.00	64.33	9
The Lewis Group	85.00	86.00	82.00	85.00	70.00	88.00	82.67	2
Upland Design Group	75.00	76.00	45.00	63.00	72.00	60.00	65.17	7
Weeks Ambrose McDonald	87.00	87.00	80.00	74.00	63.00	83.00	79.00	3

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Kitchen and Vocational Repairs - Northwest Correctional Complex

Agency Correction

Category: Minor

SBC Number: 142/016-01-2014

Project Approval Date: 07/10/2014

Total Project Budget: \$ 2,750,000.00

MACC \$ 2,090,000.00

(Maximum Allowable Construction Cost):

Designer Fee: \$ 70,000.00

Project Description: The project will review the present layout of the kitchen and adjacent vocational space. The project will address specific requirements for the upgrade of the kitchen and the future space for vocational activities. The pre-planning effort will provide a long term solution to both functions.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommended Designers</u>
1	Evans Taylor Foster Childress
2	Kline Swinney
3	Spirit Architects

Comments: The top three choices appear to have correctional experience, expertise and adequate staff to perform the work of this project. Choice 1 has staff in closer proximity to the project site and has a solid history working on similar projects with their team of engineering and kitchen design consultants. Choice 1 also exhibits a clear understanding of the requirements and the difficulties of completing construction projects inside of a secure institution in a manner that minimizes the impact on the day to day operations.

Other Firms Submitted: Allen & Hoshall, Inc.; Clark/Dixon Associates, Architects

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Building Systems Compliance Study

Agency Correction

Category: Minor

SBC Number: 140/001-01-2014

Project Approval Date: 07/10/2014

Total Project Budget: \$ 250,000.00

MACC N/A
(Maximum Allowable Construction Cost):

Designer Fee: \$ 240,000.00

Project Description: The project will study present conditions of critical building systems. The study will address retro-commissioning, code compliance and public health standards for sprinkler systems, fire assemblies/doors, negative air, smoke evacuation, airborne infection isolation, ductwork, indoor air quality and grease and food waste management.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommended Designers</u>
1	Gobbell Hayes Partners, Inc.
2	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc. (SSR)

Comments:

While the top two choices have correctional experience, Choice 1 has presented a building forensic focused team with problem solving experiences in architectural and engineering issues that relate directly to the scope of this project. Their submittal addressed the items and concepts that will be managed as a part of this study. Choice 2 did exhibit expertise, however included nothing related to the forensic focus that is required to meet the intended project goals. This is a holistic building system/architectural, multi-engineering discipline project. The non-recommended firms do not appear to have all the disciplines in-house and therefore are considered not adequately qualified for consideration on this project.

Other Firms Submitted: Neville Engineering LLC; TLC Engineering for Architecture

4

Date: 9/10/2014

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

Project: Various Facilities Steam Systems Replacement

Agency Correction

Category: Standard

SBC Number: 140/001-03-2014

Project Approval Date: 07/10/2014

Total Project Budget: \$ 4,400,000.00

MACC \$ 3,685,000

(Maximum Allowable Construction Cost):

Designer Fee: \$ 297,646.00

Project Description: The project will replace high pressure steam systems at Turney Center Industrial Complex Site 1 and Morgan County Correctional Complex with a hot water system. The project will also replace ancillary equipment associated with the steam system. The steam systems will be required to remain operational and change-over must not disrupt ongoing operations at the institutions.

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Recommended Designers</u>
1	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc (SSR)
2	I.C. Thomasson Associates, Inc.

Other Firms Submitted: NONE

DESIGNER EVALUATION SUMMARY

1) Firm: Smith Seckman Reid, Inc (SSR)
Comments: This design firm has the appropriate experience, expertise, staff and is the first choice because it has extensive experience and knowledge of TDOC's existing building systems and infrastructure. Additionally this firm has a good understanding of the ongoing changes and the impact of TDOC Detention Project Procedures on design when working within existing occupied correctional facilities.

2) Firm: I.C. Thomasson Associates, Inc.
Comments: Choice 2 presented appropriate experience indicating expertise to perform the work required by the project. Project examples at active correctional facilities was lacking

3) Firm: None
Comments:

**Designer Selection Evaluation
Score Summary Matrix**

Project: *Facilities Steam Systems Replacement*

Department: Corrections

Facility: Statewide, Tennessee

SBC Number: 140/001-03-2014

Project Category: Standard

Total Project Budget: \$4,400,000.00

Project MACC: \$3,685,000.00

	Designer	Evaluation of Submitted Letter of Interest Qualifications												
		Evaluator 1			Evaluator 2			Evaluator 3			Total	Rank		
		Raw Rank	Rank Score	Raw Rank	Rank Score	Raw Rank	Rank Score	Raw Rank	Rank Score					
1	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc	1	7	1	1	7	1	1	7	1	7	21.00	1	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc
2	I. C. Thomasson Associates, Inc	2	6	2	2	6	2	2	6	2	6	18.00	2	I. C. Thomasson Associates, Inc
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														



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

5

Designer Recommendations

Project: UoM Campus Parking Expansion
Category: Minor
Total Budget 1,100,000
MACC: 515,350
SBC No.: 166/007-17-2014

Add parking lot on the Park Avenue campus. Project includes parking lot with curbs, lighting, drainage and landscaping.

Top ranking firms and comments:

1. Allen & Hoshall, Inc.

Four projects listed were very similar in type and scope. The proposed team lists three Civil Engineers (incl. the PM), each working on 1-5 of the example projects. The Landscaping consultant proposed worked on one example project. All other services are in-house, including Civil and Electrical.

2. A2H, Inc.

Two projects listed were very similar in type and scope. The proposed team lists four Civil Engineers (incl. the PM), each working on 1-3 of the example projects. All services are in-house, including Civil, Electrical, and Surveying.

3. Burr & Cole Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Three projects listed were very similar in type and scope, and done at UoM. The proposed PM worked on all five example projects; the Consultants worked on three. Electrical Engineer and Landscaping consultants are proposed - staff members were not listed.

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

Firm Name	Location
A2H, Inc.	Lakeland
Allen & Hoshall, Inc.	Memphis
Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc.	Memphis
Burr & Cole Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Memphis
Cannon & Cannon, Inc.	Nashville
ETI Corporation	Memphis
Griggs & Maloney, Inc.	Murfreesboro
Kimley-Horn	Memphis
Pickering Firm, Inc.	Memphis
Renaissance Group, Inc.	Lakeland
Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.	Memphis
TLM Associates, Inc.	Jackson

6



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE • CHATTANOOGA • MARTIN • MEMPHIS • TULLAHOMA

DIVISION OF FACILITIES PLANNING

Designer Recommendation

September 12, 2014

Project: Tom Black Track / LaPorte Stadium Improvements
UT Knoxville
SBC 540/009-13-2014

Category: Standard

Total Budget: \$3,500,000.00

MACC: \$3,190,000.00

This project will replace the track surface, replace lighting and controls, provide a new pavilion and restrooms on the south side, provide new press box on the south side, replace the video board, and provide a meeting and restroom building at the north east corner.

1. Ross/Fowler and McCarty Holsaple McCarty Architects, a Joint Venture

This team brings a wide breadth of knowledge on this project. They have worked on this site previously and have worked closely with Athletic Department on other projects. They have proposed an experienced staff that has worked together previously. Both firms are located in Knoxville.

2. Lindsay & Maples, Architects, Inc.

This firm has submitted projects that have been completed for the University or are athletics related. They have provided good service on previous work for the University. They have brought together a solid team who has a proven track record. They are located in Knoxville.

3. Barge Waggoner Sumner and Cannon, Inc.

They submitted relevant projects that have similar components to this project. The staff is experienced and all disciplines are in house. They have worked with the campus previously and have a good working relationship with them. This firm is located in Knoxville.

A total of 10 firms submitted qualifications for this project. Other firms submitting are as follows:

Architects Weeks Amborse McDonald, Inc.
Blankenship & Partners
Design Innovation Architects, Inc.
Falconnier Design Co.
Johnson Architecture, Inc.
The Lewis Group Architects, Inc., P.C.
Smee + Busby Architects, P.C.

UTK Tom Black Track / La Porte Stadium Improvements SBC No. 540/009-13-2014		A. Project Experience 0 to 45	B. Services 0 to 45	C. Special Requirements 0 to 10	Grand Total	Rank
1	Architects Weeks Amborse McDonald, Inc.	35	38	7	80	4
2	Blankenship, & Partners	36	35	7	78	7
3	Barge Waggoner Sumner and Cannon, Inc.	40	38	6	84	3
4	Design Innovation Architects, Inc.	38	35	6	79	6
5	Falconnier Design Co.	28	30	5	63	10
6	Johnson Architecture, Inc.	25	30	9	64	9
7	The Lewis Group Architects, Inc., P.C.	39	35	6	80	4
8	Lindsay & Maples, Architects, Inc.	40	40	6	86	2
9	Ross/Fowler and McCarty Holsapple McCarty Architects, a Joint Venture	41	40	7	88	1
10	Smee + Busby Architects, P.C.	30	30	5	65	8

7



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE • CHATTANOOGA • MARTIN • MEMPHIS • TULLAHOMA

DIVISION OF FACILITIES PLANNING

Designer Recommendation

September 12, 2014

Project: Building Exterior Repairs
UT Chattanooga
SBC 540/005-05-2014

Category: Minor

Total Budget: \$2,500,000.00

MACC: \$2,145,000.00

This project will make masonry repairs to Davenport Hall and Fine Arts Center retaining walls along McCallie, Oak and Vine Streets, and make exterior repairs and reroof structures at 545 and 551 Oak Street.

1. Cogent Studio, LLC

All referenced projects are of similar scope to this project. This firm is located in Chattanooga. They have submitted a qualified team. They have not had a contract with UT, but have been interested in doing UT work. This is a new firm with an experienced staff who are well qualified to provide professional services.

2. Hefferlin + Kronenberg Architects, PLLC

This firm is located in Chattanooga, and they have good experience with similar projects needing exterior building repair along with being a Historical Consultant. They have assembled a team that has worked with the campus previously on other projects.

A total of 3 firms were solicited with 2 responding for this work.



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE • CHATTANOOGA • MARTIN • MEMPHIS • TULLAHOMA

DIVISION OF FACILITIES PLANNING

Designer Recommendation

September 12, 2014

Project: Link Building HVAC Improvements
UT Health Science Center
SBC 540/013-01-2014

Category: Minor

Total Budget: \$3,000,000.00

MACC: \$2,650,000.00

This project will upgrade air handlers and air distribution system serving the Link Building. Lighting and ceilings will be upgraded where necessary.

1. OGCB, Inc.

This firm has done previous work in this building. They have also submitted other similar projects with the same scope on other buildings for UTHSC. The team that they have proposed is experienced and has worked together previously. This firm is located in Memphis.

2. Allen & Hoshall

All highlighted projects show their familiarity with the same scope as this project. They have proposed an experienced staff that has been working with the campus on other projects. They are located in Memphis.

3. Pickering Firm, Inc.

Projects submitted are equivalent to the work needed for this project. The staff is all in house and they are knowledgeable. They have worked with the campus previously and have a good working relationship with them. This firm is located in Memphis.

A total of 3 firms were solicited for this work.