### Designer Recommendations

**Project:** Blue Oval City TCAT Campus  
**Category:** Major  
**Total Budget:** $40,000,000  
**MACC:** $37,100,000  
**Designer Fee:** $2,022,782  
**SBC Project No:** 166/000-04-2021  
**SBC/OSA Approval:** 11/10/2021

This project will design and construct a new campus at the Memphis Regional Megasite. The initial facility will provide training focused on electric vehicle and battery manufacturing and repair with the curriculum concentrating on mechatronics engineering and auto mechanics, as well as additional programs and training to support associated industries.

1. **Goodwyn Mills Cawood LLC**  
   This submittal demonstrates they are the most qualified team to complete this project, as reflected in the scoring. The previous experience presented in their proposal includes three similar building projects. The projects include a new TCAT campus, automotive education programs, and sustainable design, which are priorities for this project. This firm has the capability to complete the project with their own personnel; the relevant projects were completed by the proposed team. They provided a detailed description of services addressing specific requirements of this project with examples from previous similar projects. Their proposed schedule meets the critical fast-tracked requirement for this project.

2. **Archimania, PC.**  
   This firm's submittal includes a mix of automotive, sustainable, and higher education projects. They include an architectural consultant with experience building two new TCAT buildings. The consultant was the designer and only architect on those projects. The role of the consultant on this project is limited to programming, their inclusion during other phases is unclear. The submitting firm and the architectural consultant do not have any previous TBR experience as a team. General strategies to provide the required services are included, and the schedule submitted meets the fast-track requirement of this project.

3. **Fleming Architects PC**  
   The experience submitted includes TCAT dual enrollment spaces at high schools, an automotive dealership, and higher education projects. They include an architectural consultant with higher education master planning experience. The submittal includes very limited TCAT experience. The submitting firm and the master planning consultant do not have any previous experience working together. Strategies to provide the required services are detailed, and the schedule submitted meets the fast-track requirement of this project.
A total of 11 firms submitted Letters of Interest for this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2H, Inc.</td>
<td>Lakeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Hoshall, Inc.</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANF Architects, Inc.</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archimania, PC</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brg3s, Inc.</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming PC</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwyn Mills Cawood LLC</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haizlip Studio, PLLC</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRK, Inc.</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self + Tucker Architects, Inc.</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFR Inc. (dba Wold</td>
<td>HFR Design)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tennessee Board of Regents
### Blue Oval City TCAT Campus
#### Overall Evaluation & Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Firm</th>
<th>Evaluator 1</th>
<th>Evaluator 2</th>
<th>Evaluator 3</th>
<th>Evaluator 4</th>
<th>Evaluator 5</th>
<th>Median Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2H, Inc.</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>75.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Hoshall, Inc.</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANF Architects, Inc.</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archimania, PC</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>85.50</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>85.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brg3s, Inc.</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming Architects PC</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>83.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwyn Mills Cawood LLC</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haizlip Studio, PLLC</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRK, Inc.</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self + Tucker Architects, Inc.</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wold</td>
<td>HFR Design</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualifications & Experience

**Evaluator**

- **Blue Oval City TCAT - Combined Scores.xlsx**
- **12/9/2021**

### Notes

- **Median**: 73.0 69.0 84.0 71.0 69.0 71.0
- **Average**: 76.3 70.5 84.0 72.2 69.9 73.4
- **High**: 98.0 87.0 98.0 95.0 90.0 95.0
- **Low**: 62.0 59.0 72.0 55.5 51.0 59.0
- **Difference**: 36.0 28.0 26.0 39.5 39.0 36.0
Designer Evaluation Summary

Project: TSB Building and Site Improvements
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Category: Standard
SBC Project No.: 168/005-02-2021
Project Approved By: SBC
Project Approval Date: 12.09.2021
Total Project Budget: $4,120,000.00
Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC): $2,849,000.00
Designer Fee: $235,000.00
Project Description: Upgrades to the auditorium to include relocation of mechanical systems and site drainage repairs; upgrades to safety and security systems to comply with the SAVE Act; and all required related work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>I.C. Thomasson Associates, Inc. – Submittal showcased firm's previous experience on work within educational facilities; proposed project team is well qualified and has related educational experience; project approach was specific to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>GHP, Inc. – Firm has really good experience working on similar scoped projects; project team is well qualified; proposed approach showcased a clear understanding of project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Design House 1411, LLC – Firm has good experience working at site and on similar scope projects; proposed project team is very well qualified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designers submitting a Letter of Interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design House 1411, LLC</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP, Inc.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst-Rosche, Inc.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designer Evaluation Summary

Project: WTSD SAVE Act Compliance Upgrades
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Category: Standard
SBC Project No.: 168/009-02-2021
Project Approved By: SBC
Project Approval Date: 12.09.2021
Total Project Budget: $1,510,000.00
Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC): $1,012,000.00
Designer Fee: $92,000.00
Project Description: Upgrade safety and security systems to comply with the SAVE Act and all required related work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Building Systems Group Engineering, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Submittal showcased firm has good experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working on projects of similar size and scope;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed project team is well qualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>A2H, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Firm has good related experience; proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approach is specific to scope of work; located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in close proximity to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>GHP, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Firm appears to have good relatable project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experience; proposed team is well qualified;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some concerns regarding geographic proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to project site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designers submitting a Letter of Interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2H, Inc.</td>
<td>Lakeland, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Systems Group Engineering, LLC</td>
<td>Millington, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP, Inc.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Designer Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>Multi Agency Law Enforcement Training Academy – Training Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency:</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category:</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC Project No.:</td>
<td>529/017-01-2021-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approved By:</td>
<td>SBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approval Date:</td>
<td>12.09.2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Budget:</td>
<td>$370,920,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC):</td>
<td>$47,565,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer Fee:</td>
<td>$2,550,485.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>Project includes the integration of five existing State of Tennessee law enforcement training academies into a single complex, TLETA, POST, TCI, THP and TBI. This includes all ancillary needs including administrative offices, classrooms, gymnasiums, and other indoor and outdoor training functions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>90.17</td>
<td><strong>TMPartners, PLLC</strong> – Firm’s submittal showcased good recent, relevant, and local experience on law enforcement training scoped projects; proposed project team is well qualified and has recent related experience; proposed project approach is detailed and was specific to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>87.83</td>
<td><strong>HFR, Inc.</strong> – Submittal shows that firm this full-service firm has good prior State experience; proposed project team is well qualified; project approach was very specific and detailed and provided a thorough focus on collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>78.17</td>
<td><strong>The Orcutt/Winslow Limited Liability Limited Partnership</strong> – Firm has good experience working with State on similarly complex projects with State; proposed team and sub-consultants are very well qualified; proposed approach was specific to project, but appeared to lack some details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designers submitting a response to the Request for Qualifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFR, Inc.</td>
<td>Brentwood, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Orcutt/Winslow Limited Liability Limited Partnership</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMPPartners, PLLC</td>
<td>Brentwood, TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Designer Selection Evaluation**

**Score Summary Matrix**

**Project:** Multi-Agency Law Enforcement Training Academy - Training Academy  
**Agency:** General Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitting Firms</th>
<th>Evaluator 1</th>
<th>Evaluator 2</th>
<th>Evaluator 3</th>
<th>Evaluator 4</th>
<th>Evaluator 5</th>
<th>Evaluator 6</th>
<th>Section B Subtotal</th>
<th>Section C Subtotal</th>
<th>Section C Subtotal</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>Ranked firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMPartners, PLLC</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wold</td>
<td>HFR</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 12/13/2021

**Revised:** 2018-12-07 DSP-0501
Designer Evaluation Summary

Project: Multi Agency Law Enforcement Training Academy – Dining & Housing
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES
Category: Major
SBC Project No.: 529/017-01-2021-05
Project Approved By: SBC
Project Approval Date: 12.09.2021
Total Project Budget: $370,920,000.00
Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC): $57,960,000.00
Designer Fee: $3,067,535.00

Project Description:
Project includes design of three primary elements: cadet housing, in-service training housing, and kitchen and dining facilities. Both cadet housing and in-service training housing is anticipated to utilize double room, private bath, hotel-type arrangement in groupings that can be subdivided and cordoned off. The kitchen & dining facility will be designed to feed approximately 670 persons or approximately 1,800 to 2000 meals/day, seven days per week with third party food services operations. Design includes all food service elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>91.80</td>
<td>Earl Swensson Associates, Inc. – Both firm and proposed project team have a strong resumé of dormitory and food service design; submittal showcased firm’s experience on similar scoped projects for State; proposed approach was detailed and indicated a focus on communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>85.80</td>
<td>Moody Nolan, Inc. – Firm’s submittals showcased experience on similar scoped projects; proposed team is very well qualified; proposed approach demonstrates a defined and well-planned approach to delivers this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designers submitting a response to the Request for Qualifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl Swensson Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody Nolan, Inc.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Designer Selection Evaluation
#### Score Summary Matrix

**Project:** MALETA - Dining and Housing  
**Agency:** General Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitting Firms</th>
<th>Section B (Max = 40)</th>
<th>Section C (Max = 60)</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>Ranked firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluator 1</td>
<td>Evaluator 2</td>
<td>Evaluator 3</td>
<td>Evaluator 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Swensson Associates</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody Nolan</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designer Evaluation Summary

Project: Davy Crockett Covered Parking Ceiling
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES
Category: Standard
SBC Project No.: 529/077-01-2020
Project Approved By: SBC
Project Approval Date: 10.08.2020
Initial Designer Selection Date: 10.19.2020
Total Project Budget: $620,000.00
Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC): $426,800.00
Designer Fee: $32,925.00
Project Description: Installation of dropped ceiling system, adding insulation to the under deck of the floor above, and all required related work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>RANKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>BHDG Architects, Inc. – Firm has good experience working on similar scoped projects; project team is well experienced; proposed approach is specific to project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>M. Shanks Architects – Firm has very good experience working on similar scoped renovation projects; proposed approach is good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designers submitting a Letter of Interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHDG Architects, Inc.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Shanks Architects</td>
<td>Pegram, TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>