* Board Submittal Checklist No. 2
Capital Project – Stage II Submittal
(Architect Ranking, Project Scope and Project Budget) /8

Campus: The University of Alabama
Project Name: Adapted Athletics Facility
Meeting Date: April 7 – 8, 2016

1. Completed Board Submittal Checklist No. 2
2. Transmittal Letter to Chancellor from Campus President requesting the project be placed on the agenda for the forthcoming Physical Properties Committee and Board of Trustees (or Executive Committee) meetings
3. Proposed Board Resolution requesting approval of Stage II Submittal (Architect Ranking, Project Scope and Project Budget; authority to proceed with Owner/Architect contract negotiations)
4. Campus correspondence/photos providing supporting project information
5. Completed Executive Summary – Proposed Capital Project /2
6. Executive Summary - Architect, Engineer, Selection process (include Interview Outline). /3, /4, /5
7. Campus letter requesting approval of the ranking of firms and authority to submit to the Physical Properties Committee for approval – signed by the Chair of the Physical Properties Committee and signed by the UA System Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer. /6
8. Project Planning Report /2
9. Preliminary Business Plan (if applicable) /7
10. Campus map(s) showing Project site

Prepared by: [Signature]
Approved by: [Signature]

/1 Reference Tab 3H - Board Rule 415 Instrucational Guide
/2 Reference Tab 3E - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide
/3 Reference Tab 3K - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide
/4 Reference Tab 3L - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide
/5 Reference Tab 3M - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide
/6 Reference Tab 3N - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide
/7 Reference Tab 3V - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide
/8 After completion of negotiations on Owner/Architect Agreement, provide notification to Chair of the Physical Properties Committee and UA Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer.
Reference Tab 3-O-Board Rule 415, Instructional Guide

* Basic documents required for this Board Submittal Package. Include other supporting materials, correspondence, etc., as may be required to fully describe or illustrate project being submitted for approval to Physical Properties Committee and Board of Trustees.
March 7, 2016

Chancellor Robert Witt  
The University of Alabama System  
500 University Boulevard East  
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35401

Dear Chancellor Witt:

I am pleased to send to you for consideration by the Board of Trustees at its April 8, 2016 meeting the following resolution:

- Board Item – Action: Stage II Submittal: Adapted Athletics Facility

Please contact us if you have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stuart R. Bell  
President

SRB/dj

Enclosure
RESOLUTION

ADAPTED ATHLETICS FACILITY

WHEREAS, on February 5, 2016, The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama (“Board”) approved the Stage I submittal and amendment to the Campus Master Plan to include the Adapted Athletics Facility project (“Project”); and

WHEREAS, the Consultant Selection Committee of The University of Alabama (“University”) has completed Part 1 of the Consultant Selection process in accordance with Board Rule 415 and negotiations will be conducted following Board approval as follows:

 Ranking of Top Firms
 1. KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL
 2. Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL
 3. Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL
 4. Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc., Montgomery, AL

WHEREAS, the Project location and program have been reviewed and are consistent with the University Design Standards, and the principles contained therein; and

WHEREAS, the Project will be funded from Gifts in the amount of $5,000,000 and University funds in the amount of $5,000,000; and

WHEREAS, the budget for the Project remains as stipulated below:
**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Access Control</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication/Data</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency* (5%)</td>
<td>$411,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Project Management Fee** (3%)</td>
<td>$259,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineer Fee*** (6.1%)</td>
<td>$514,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (Geotech, Construction Materials Testing and special inspection)</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees and Services (testing, advertising, printing)</td>
<td>$85,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contingency is based on 5% of construction and landscaping.

**UA Project Management Fee is based on 3% of construction, landscaping, and contingency.

***Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 6.1% of construction plus $20,000 for reimbursable expenses.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama that Stuart R. Bell, President, Lynda Gilbert, Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer, or those officers named in the most recent Board Resolutions granting signature authority for The University of Alabama be, and each hereby is, authorized to act for and on behalf of the Board of Trustees to execute an architectural agreement with KPS Group, Inc. of Birmingham, AL for architectural services in accordance with Board Rule 415 for this Project.
March 3, 2016

To: Stuart R. Bell
From: Lynda Gilbert

Subject: Board Item – Action: Stage II Submittal: Adapted Athletics Facility

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, a Consultant Selection Committee, appointed by the University of Alabama ("University") solicited proposals from qualified architectural firms for the Adapted Athletics Facility project ("Project"). The selection committee’s recommendations were forwarded to and approved by the Physical Properties Committee Chair and Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer. The University is requesting approval to begin negotiations with the top ranked firms as follows:

1. KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL
2. Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL
3. Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL
4. Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc., Montgomery, AL

The Project will be funded by Gifts in the amount of $5,000,000 and University funds in the amount of $5,000,000.

This Project location and program have been reviewed and are consistent with the Campus Master Plan, University Design Standards, and the principles contained therein.

I have attached an Executive Summary, Project Summary, Executive Consultant Selection Process – Part 1, Letter of Approval of Ranking from the Physical Properties Committee Chair and Executive Vice Chancellor for Finance and Chief Operating Officer, Project Planning Report, Location Map, and Resolution for your review. Subject to your approval, I recommend this item be forwarded to the Chancellor for inclusion as an Action Item on the agenda of the Physical Properties Committee at the Board of Trustees meeting scheduled for April 7 – 8, 2016.

LG/ccj

Attachments

pc w/attachment: Michael Rodgers
Michael Lanier
Tim Leopard
Ben Henson
Josh Martin
Brent Hardin

271 Rose Administration | Box 870142 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487 | 205-348-4530 | Fax 205-348-9633
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT

BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUBMITTAL

Meeting Date: April 7 – 8, 2016

CAMPUS: The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
PROJECT NAME: Adapted Athletics Facility
PROJECT LOCATION: 401 5th Avenue, East
ARCHITECT: Requesting in this submittal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THIS SUBMITTAL:</th>
<th>PREVIOUS APPROVALS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Campus Master Plan Amendment</td>
<td>February 5, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Stage I</td>
<td>February 5, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>SPACE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Building Addition</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Building Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Campus Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | 100% | 27,036 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Preliminary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Access Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication/Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency*</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$ 411,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Project Management Fee**</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$ 259,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineer Fee***</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$ 514,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (Geotech, Construction Testing Materials, special inspection)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees and Services (testing, advertising, printing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 85,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT COST</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 10,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contingency is based on 5% of construction and landscaping.
**UA Project Management Fee is based on 3% of construction, landscaping, and contingency.
***Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 6.1% of construction plus $20,000 for reimbursable expenses.
ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE (O&M) COSTS:
(Utilities, Housekeeping, Maintenance, Insurance, Other)
Per GSF: 27,036 gsf x ~$6.96/gsf $ 188,136.58
TOTAL ESTIMATED ANNUAL O&M COSTS: $ 188,136.58

FUNDING SOURCE:
Capital Outlay:

| Gifts       | $ 5,000,000 |
| University funds | $ 5,000,000 |

O&M Costs:
Education and General funds $ 188,136.58

NEW EQUIPMENT REQUIRED:
N/A

RELATIONSHIP & ENHANCEMENT OF CAMPUS PROGRAMS:
To be located on the south façade of the existing Student Recreation Center, the proposed Adapted Athletics facility ("Project") will be home to the national championship Adapted Athletics program on the campus of The University of Alabama ("University").

The Project will position the University to be a national leader in adapted athletics and reflect the commitment to embrace diversity.

The Project will also provide numerous opportunities for outreach including hosting tournaments, coaching and player clinics, and camps and programs.
Project Summary

Adapted Athletics Facility

The Adapted Athletics facility ("Project") will be home to the national championship Adapted Athletics program on the campus of The University of Alabama ("University"). The two-story structure of 27,036 gross square feet will be located on the south façade of the existing Student Recreation Center (UREC), east of the main entrance of the UREC.

The proposed Project will entail space allocated for a NCAA regulation sized basketball court in an 11,500 square foot gymnasium, an approximately 3,000 square foot two-level lobby/concourse, an approximately 3,000 square foot office suite, an approximately 2,500 square foot locker room, and an approximately 5,000 square foot weight/workout room.

The purpose built, dedicated gymnasium will include seating for approximately 500, home and visitors’ locker rooms equipped with separate lockable lockers, and direct access roll-in showers. Centrally located to the Project will be a spacious two-story entrance lobby with display/trophy areas and a dramatic second floor viewing platform for the arena below. The administrative area will feature six administrative offices, large storage area for wheelchairs and equipment, laundry facilities, and support areas for the coaches and staff for Adapted Athletics. A multi-purpose team meeting room equipped with A/V to support film study, game planning, and various team functions will also be provided.

The Project is being strategically planned to make use of existing circulation paths, toilet facilities, infrastructure, and services within the existing UREC and will provide a shared use opportunity among multiple campus programs.
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
**CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS**
**BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUBMITTAL**

Meeting Date:  April 7 – 8, 2016  
Campus:  The University of Alabama  
Project Name:  Adapted Athletics Facility  
Project Location:  401 5th Avenue, East  
Prepared By:  Vince Dooley/Carla Coleman Jones  
Date:  March 2, 2016  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Range of Construction Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Building Renovations</td>
<td>$ ___________ to $ ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Building Addition</td>
<td>$ 7,900,000 to $ 8,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ New Construction</td>
<td>$ ___________ to $ ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Campus Infrastructure</td>
<td>$ ___________ to $ ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Equipment</td>
<td>$ ___________ to $ ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>$ ___________ to $ ___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Type – Group I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Industrial Building Without Special Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Parking Structures/Repertive Garages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Simple Loft Type Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Warehouses/Utility Type Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Type – Group II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments and Dormitories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit Halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture/Industrial Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Building (Without Tenant Improvements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Garage/Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type – Group III</th>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Classroom Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Care Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiums</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Dining Halls</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Schools</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office Facilities and Clinics</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Institutions</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings (with tenant improvements)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground and Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Centers</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadiums</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Utilities Plants</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply and Distribution Plants</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Treatment and Underground Systems</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Substations and Primary and Secondary Distribution Systems, Roads, Bridges and Major Site Improvements when performed as Independent projects</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Type – Group IV</td>
<td>Percentage of Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquariums</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Buildings with special features</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Buildings</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaters and similar facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type – Group V</th>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residences and Specialized Decorative Buildings</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Repetitive Design or Duplication of Facilities**

Does the Building Program/Requirements support repetitive design or duplication of Facilities justifying an adjustment in A/E Design Fees?  
☐ Yes  ☒ No

**Building Program Development**

Will the A/E Agreement require the Development of a Comprehensive Building/Design Program in lieu of one provided by Owner requiring an adjustment in A/E Fees?  
☒ Yes  ☐ No

**Construction Consultant Services**

Will the University be utilizing a Construction Consultant who will perform some of the services normally provided by the Architect requiring an adjustment of A/E Fees?  
☐ Yes  ☒ No
Multiple Prime Trade Contracts

Will the project be competitively bid and constructed using Multiple Trade Contracts requiring additional services from the A/E?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

Design Build Services

Will the University be using a Design/Build process, which will result in a reduction in contracted design services and a corresponding adjustment in A/E Fees?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

Architect/Engineer Project Notifications

☐ Advertised through State Building Commission
☐ Local/State Trade Journals
☒ Posted on Campus Web Pages
☒ Direct Contact with A/E Companies/Firms
☐ Other: Newspaper and email distribution list

Appointed Consultant Selection Committee (CSC): (Name and Title)

1. Josh Martin, Project Manager
2. Vince Dooley, Architectural Design Coordinator
3. Garrett Goodman, Staff Architect
4. Dan Wolfe, University Planner and Designer
5. Brent Hardin, Director Adapted Wheelchair Athletics
6. Susanna Johnson, Director, Furnishings and Design
7. Tim Leopold, Associate Vice President for Construction
8. Leslie Abernathy, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations

Qualified Firms/Companies Submitted:

1. Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL
2. Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc., Montgomery, AL
3. KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL
4. Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL
Ranking of Most Qualified Firms to be submitted to the Physical Properties Committee

1. KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL
2. Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL
3. Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL
4. Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc., Montgomery, AL

Reviewed and approved by:

[Signature]
Chairman of Consultant Selection Committee

[Signature]
Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer
ONE: RESPONDENT’S STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS (Maximum 6 points)

A. Describe your firm's or team's experience working with other universities and state agencies.

B. Describe your firm's or team's experience working with The University of Alabama.
   a. The UA desires to have input in the procurement of consultants once the top ranked firm is selected.

C. The UA encourages the use of certified minority-owned businesses and certified women-owned businesses in its construction program. Describe your firm's approach in soliciting certified minority-owned or women-owned firms and consultants.

TWO: RESPONDENT’S PERFORMANCE ON PAST REPRESENTATIVE PROJECTS (Maximum 12 points)

A. Identify and describe the proposed team's past experience providing A/E services that are identical or similar to this project within the last ten (10) years. List the projects in order of priority, with the most relevant project listed first.

B. Provide references (for each project listed above, identify the following):

   • The Owner's name and their representative who served as the day-to-day liaison during the design and construction phases of the project, including current contact information.

   The Owner may contact these references during this qualification process.

C. Has your firm/organization within the past seven (7) years ever been terminated from a design project? If yes, please give pertinent details.
THREE: LITIGATION AND CLAIMS  (Maximum 6 points)

A. Does your firm/organization or any of its officers currently have any judgments, claims, arbitration or mediation proceedings pending or outstanding? If yes, please give pertinent details and outcome(s).

B. Has your firm/organization within the past seven (7) years filed any lawsuits or requested arbitration or mediation proceedings in regard to any of your construction projects? If yes, please give pertinent details and outcome(s).

FOUR: RESPONDENT'S ABILITY TO MEET INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS  
(Maximum 4 points)

A. Does your firm/organization have the ability to meet all of the UA insurance requirements? (see attached)

B. What is your process for managing any claims of the contractors during the project?

FIVE: PROJECT SPECIFIC CRITERIA  (Maximum 12 points)

A. Generally describe your experience and approach to programming and design of recreational facility.

B. In regards to universities/colleges describe some of your design challenges and solutions while addressing accessibility upgrades.

C. Show any experience where you have changed the exterior facade of a building to add aesthetic value (primarily with curtain wall systems if applicable).

D. Give examples of projects where you have had to phase the design so that construction can occur while the building is occupied.
1. **Welcome/Introduction** *(time allotted = 5 minutes)*
   a. Design Team
      i. Brief introduction of your firm.
      ii. Proposed consultants (engineers and specialty consultants are not required to be present at interviews).

2. **Athletic and Accessibility Facility Expertise** *(8 points max, time allotted = 10 minutes)*
   a. Describe your team’s expertise with athletic facility design as it relates to emerging trends and best practices.
   b. What is your knowledge base and approach in dealing with accessible facilities? Show past solutions and successes where accessibility was a priority.

3. **Design Concept/Case Study** *(18 points max, time allotted = 20 minutes)*
   a. Please review the design program and scope and provide your design concept for the expansion. Your concept should demonstrate scope and architectural character for the expansion.
      i. Contextual Exterior Design – Provide design feedback and ideas for the contextual implications in blending the addition into the UA Recreational Center.

4. **Roles & Execution** *(4 points max, time allotted = 5 minutes)*
   a. Design and construction roles
      i. Explain your firm’s day to day roles and responsibilities for the project.
      ii. For the leadership roles, explain the hierarchy of roles and who is ultimately accountable for project success.
   b. Provide a proposed design and construction schedule for this project assuming a Fall 2017 occupancy date. Discuss challenges and strategies for managing the schedule among all parties to ensure project success.
March 2, 2016

Mr. C. Ray Hayes
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer
Sid McDonald Hall
500 University Boulevard, East
Tuscaloosa, AL 35401

Mr. James W. Wilson, III
Chair, Physical Properties Committee
Chairman and CEO
Jim Wilson & Associates, LLC
2660 Eastchase Lane, Suite 100
Montgomery, AL 36117

RE: Consultant Selection Process
    Adapted Athletics
    UA Project No: 372-16-804

Dear Mr. Hayes and Trustee Wilson,

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, on February 5, 2016, The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama ("Board") approved the Stage I submittal and an amendment to The University of Alabama's ("University") Campus Master Plan to include the Adapted Athletics project ("Project") at a projected cost of $10,000,000. This Project will be home to the national championship Adapted Athletics program.

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, notifications for the Project, including a brief description of the Project program, location, and preliminary budget, were advertised, issued by email to Alabama-based firms and others in the consultant database, and posted on the University campus web page. Firms desiring to be considered were requested to provide brochures to the University outlining their qualifications, experience, and proposed team members.
A Consultant Selection Committee, appointed by the University in accordance with the provisions of Board Rule 415, reviewed the submitted brochures and subsequently interviewed the following architectural firms:

- Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL
- Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc., Montgomery, AL
- KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL
- Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL

The Consultant Selection Committee then determined the following ranking for the firms deemed most qualified for the Project:

1. KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL
2. Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL
3. Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL
4. Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc., Montgomery, AL

The primary selection criteria used in the ranking of the firms included the following:

1. The firms are familiar with the University facilities standards and the regulatory requirements for the design of the Project.
2. The firms presented the most experience with phased design and sustainable design.
3. The firms presented the most favorable listing of qualified principals, staff, and associated engineers for the Project along with a commitment to meet the University’s schedule for completion of the design and construction of the Project.
4. The firms are committed to using Alabama-based consultant engineers and architects for the Project.
5. The firms represented a clear understanding of the project program and goals, as well as how to achieve them.
6. The firms represented a clear knowledge of design requirements for "barrier free" construction, competitive adapted athletics, and ADA.
Approval is hereby requested for:

1. The ranking of consultant firms listed hereinbefore.
2. Approval to submit this ranking to the Physical Properties Committee for review and approval.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Lynda Gilbert
Vice President for Financial Affairs
and Treasurer

LG/ccj

Attachment

pc/atchmt: Michael Rodgers
          Michael Lanier
          Tim Leopard
          Ben Henson
          Josh Martin
The above listing of firms ranked as the most qualified for the Project is hereby approved and by forwarding this executed document to the Chancellor’s office, the ranking is approved for inclusion in the Board materials to the Physical Properties Committee.

Mr. C. Ray Hayes / Recommend For Approval
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer

Trustee James W. Wilson, III / Approval Recommended
Chair of the Physical Properties Committee
Part 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS
BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUBMITTAL

Meeting Date: April 7 – 8, 2016

Campus: The University of Alabama

Project Name: Adapted Athletics Facility

Project Location: 401 5th Avenue, East

Prepared By: Vince Dooley/Carla Coleman Jones Date: March 2, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Range of Construction Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Renovations</td>
<td>$________________ to $______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Addition</td>
<td>$7,900,000 to $8,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$________________ to $______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Infrastructure</td>
<td>$________________ to $______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$________________ to $______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$________________ to $______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type – Group I</th>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Industrial Building With Special Facilities | %
| Parking Structures/Repetitive Garages | %
| Simple Loft Type Structure | %
| Warehouses/Utility Type Buildings | %
| Other | %
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type – Group II</th>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Apartments and Dormitories</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Exhibit Halls</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Manufacture/Industrial Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Office Building (Without Tenant Improvements)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Printing Plants</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Service Garage/Facility</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type – Group III</th>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ College Classroom Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Convention Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Extended Care Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Gymnasiums</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Hospitals</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Institutional Dining Halls</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Laboratories</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Libraries</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Medical Schools</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Medical Office Facilities and Clinics</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Mental Institutions</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Office Buildings (with tenant improvements)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parks</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Playground and Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Public Health Centers</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Research Facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Stadiums</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Central Utilities Plants</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Water Supply and Distribution Plants</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Sewage Treatment and Underground Systems</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Electrical Substations and Primary and Secondary Distribution Systems, Roads, Bridges and Major Site Improvements when performed as independent projects</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Building Type – Group IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquariums</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Buildings with special features</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Buildings</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaters and similar facilities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Type – Group V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Percentage of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residences and Specialized Decorative Buildings</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Repetitive Design or Duplication of Facilities

Does the Building Program/Requirements support repetitive design or duplication of Facilities justifying an adjustment in A/E Design Fees?  
☐ Yes  ☒ No

### Building Program Development

Will the A/E Agreement require the Development of a Comprehensive Building/Design Program in lieu of one provided by Owner requiring an adjustment in A/E Fees?  
☒ Yes  ☐ No

### Construction Consultant Services

Will the University be utilizing a Construction Consultant who will perform some of the services normally provided by the Architect requiring an adjustment of A/E Fees?  
☐ Yes  ☒ No
Multiple Prime Trade Contracts

Will the project be competitively bid and constructed using Multiple Trade Contracts requiring additional services from the A/E?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

Design Build Services

Will the University be using a Design/Build process, which will result in a reduction in contracted design services and a corresponding adjustment in A/E Fees?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

Architect/Engineer Project Notifications

☐ Advertised through State Building Commission
☐ Local/State Trade Journals
☒ Posted on Campus Web Pages
☒ Direct Contact with A/E Companies/Firms
☒ Other: Newspaper and email distribution list

Appointed Consultant Selection Committee (CSC): (Name and Title)

1. Josh Martin, Project Manager
2. Vince Dooley, Architectural Design Coordinator
3. Garrett Goodman, Staff Architect
4. Dan Wolfe, University Planner and Designer
5. Brent Hardin, Director Adapted Wheelchair Athletics
6. Susan Johnson, Director, Furnishings and Design
7. Tim Leopard, Associate Vice President for Construction
8. Leslie Abernathy, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations

Qualified Firms/Companies Submitted:

1. Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL.
2. Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc., Montgomery, AL.
3. KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL.
4. Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL.
Ranking of Most Qualified Firms to be submitted to the Physical Properties Committee

1. KPS Group, Inc., Birmingham, AL.
2. Williams Blackstock Architects, Birmingham, AL.
3. Evan Terry Associates, LLC, Birmingham, AL.

Reviewed and approved by:

Chairman of Consultant Selection Committee

Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer
ONE: RESPONDENT'S STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS (Maximum 6 points)

A. Describe your firm's or team's experience working with other universities and state agencies.

B. Describe your firm's or team's experience working with The University of Alabama.
   a. The UA desires to have input in the procurement of consultants once the top ranked firm is selected.

C. The UA encourages the use of certified minority-owned businesses and certified women-owned businesses in its construction program. Describe your firm's approach in soliciting certified minority-owned or women-owned firms and consultants.

TWO: RESPONDENT'S PERFORMANCE ON PAST REPRESENTATIVE PROJECTS (Maximum 12 points)

A. Identify and describe the proposed team's past experience providing A/E services that are identical or similar to this project within the last ten (10) years. List the projects in order of priority, with the most relevant project listed first.

B. Provide references (for each project listed above, identify the following):
   - The Owner's name and their representative who served as the day-to-day liaison during the design and construction phases of the project, including current contact information.

   The Owner may contact these references during this qualification process.

C. Has your firm/organization within the past seven (7) years ever been terminated from a design project? If yes, please give pertinent details.
THREE: LITIGATION AND CLAIMS (Maximum 6 points)

A. Does your firm/organization or any of its officers currently have any judgments, claims, arbitration or mediation proceedings pending or outstanding? If yes, please give pertinent details and outcome(s).

B. Has your firm/organization within the past seven (7) years filed any lawsuits or requested arbitration or mediation proceedings in regard to any of your construction projects? If yes, please give pertinent details and outcome(s).

FOUR: RESPONDENT’S ABILITY TO MEET INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS
(Maximum 4 points)

A. Does your firm/organization have the ability to meet all of the UA insurance requirements? (see attached)

B. What is your process for managing any claims of the contractors during the project?

FIVE: PROJECT SPECIFIC CRITERIA (Maximum 12 points)

A. Generally describe your experience and approach to programming and design of recreational facility.

B. In regards to universities/colleges describe some of your design challenges and solutions while addressing accessibility upgrades.

C. Show any experience where you have changed the exterior facade of a building to add aesthetic value (primarily with curtain wall systems if applicable).

D. Give examples of projects where you have had to phase the design so that construction can occur while the building is occupied.
1. Welcome/Introduction (time allotted = 5 minutes)
   a. Design Team
      i. Brief introduction of your firm.
      ii. Proposed consultants (engineers and specialty consultants are not
          required to be present at interviews).

2. Athletic and Accessibility Facility Expertise 8 points max (time allotted = 10 minutes)
   a. Describe your team’s expertise with athletic facility design as it relates to
      emerging trends and best practices.
   b. What is your knowledge base and approach in dealing with accessible
      facilities? Show past solutions and successes where accessibility was a
      priority.

3. Design Concept/Case Study - 18 points max (time allotted = 20 minutes)
   a. Please review the design program and scope and provide your design concept
      for the expansion. Your concept should demonstrate scope and architectural
      character for the expansion.
      i. Contextual Exterior Design – Provide design feedback and ideas for
         the contextual implications in blending the addition into the UA
         Recreational Center.

4. Roles & Execution - 4 points max (time allotted = 5 minutes)
   a. Design and construction roles
      i. Explain your firm’s day to day roles and responsibilities for the
         project.
      ii. For the leadership roles, explain the hierarchy of roles and who is
          ultimately accountable for project success.
   b. Provide a proposed design and construction schedule for this project
      assuming a Fall 2017 occupancy date. Discuss challenges and strategies for
      managing the schedule among all parties to ensure project success.
TO: OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA  

FROM: OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA  

1. PROJECT: Adapted Athletics Facility  

2. LOCATION: 401 5th Avenue, East  

3. ARCHITECT/ENGINEER: Requesting in this submittal  

4. PROJECT STATUS:  
   A. SCHEMATIC DESIGN  
      DATE INITIATED: TBD  
      % COMPLETE: 0%  
      * DATE COMPLETED: TBD  
   
   B. PRELIMINARY DESIGN:  
      DATE INITIATED: TBD  
      % COMPLETE: 0%  
      * DATE COMPLETED: TBD  
   
   C. CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS:  
      DATE INITIATED: TBD  
      % COMPLETE: 0%  
      * DATE COMPLETED: TBD  
   
   D. SCHEDULED BID DATE: TBD  

5. CURRENT PROJECT BUDGET: PRELIMINARY  
   A. CONSTRUCTION $8,100,000  
   B. LANDSCAPING $125,000  
   C. FURNITURE, FIXTURES, AND EQUIPMENT $250,000  
   D. SECURITY/ACCESS CONTROL $75,000  
   E. TELECOMMUNICATION/DATA $110,000  
   F. CONTINGENCY** (5%) $411,250  
   G. UA PROJECT MANAGEMENT FEE*** (3%) $259,088  
   H. ARCHITECT/ENGINEER FEE*** (6.1%) $514,100  
   I. EXPENSES (GEOTECH, CONSTRUCTION TESTING MATERIALS, SPECIAL INSPECTION) $70,000  
   J. OTHER FEES AND SERVICES (TESTING, ADVERTISING, PRINTING) $85,562  

   K. TOTAL PROJECT COST $10,000,000  

* Contingency is based on 5% of construction and landscaping.  
** UA Project Management Fee is based on 3% of construction, landscaping, and contingency.  
*** Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 6.1% of construction plus $30,000 for reimbursable expenses.  

6. FUNDING/RESOURCES: Gifts - $5,000,000  
   University funds - $5,000,000  

7. REMARKS:  

* FINAL AGENCY APPROVAL SUBMITTED BY: Tim Leopold  
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