



**University of Alabama System
Board Rule 415 (2/2005)
Board Submittal Checklist Criteria**

*** Board Submittal Checklist No. 2
Capital Project - Stage II Submittals/1
(Architect Ranking) /8**

Campus: The University of Alabama
Project Name: Paty Residence Hall Renovation
Meeting Date: November 8 - 9, 2018

- * 1. Completed Board Submittal Checklist No. 2
- 2. Transmittal Letter to Chancellor from Campus President requesting the project be placed on the agendas 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 Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. /6
- 8. Project Planning Report/2
- 9. Business Plan (if applicable)/7
- 10. Campus map(s) showing Project site

Prepared by: 

Approved by: 

/1 Reference Tab 3H - Board Rule 415 Instructional 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 System Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. 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.

RESOLUTION

PATY RESIDENCE HALL RENOVATION

WHEREAS, on September 21, 2018, in accordance with Board Rule 415, The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama (“Board”) approved a Stage I submittal for the Paty Residence Hall Renovation project (“Project”) consisting of 90,384 gross square feet located at 210 McCorvey Drive; and

WHEREAS, the Project will assist the University in providing capacity for high demand on-campus housing while meeting the needs and expectations of students and providing a safe environment; and

WHEREAS, the Consultant Selection Committee, appointed by 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 approval as follows:

Ranking of Top Firms:

1. Ward Scott Architecture, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
2. Davis Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
3. CMH Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama

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

WHEREAS, the Project will be funded from Housing and Residential Communities Reserves in the amount of \$15,600,000 and will address \$14,820,000 in campus deferred maintenance liability; and

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

BUDGET:	CURRENT
Construction – Renovation	\$ 11,450,000
Window Procurement Package	\$ 350,000
Landscaping	\$ 100,000
Security/Access Control	\$ 700,000
Telecommunication/Data	\$ 515,000
Contingency* (10%)	\$ 1,190,000
UA Project Management Fee** (3%)	\$ 392,700
Architect/Engineer Fee*** (6.36%)	\$ 728,875
Expenses (Construction Materials Testing and Special Inspections)	\$ 90,000
Other Fees and Services (Testing, Advertising, Printing)	\$ 83,425
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$ 15,600,000

*Contingency is based on 10% of the costs of construction, window procurement and landscaping.

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

***Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 4.9% of the cost of construction, window procurement and landscaping plus a 25% major renovation factor.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama that Stuart R. Bell, President, Matthew M. Fajack, 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 Ward Scott Architecture, Inc., Tuscaloosa, Alabama, for architectural services in accordance with Board Rule 415 for this Project.




Division of
Financial Affairs

MEMO

October 4, 2018

To: Stuart R. Bell

From: Matthew M. Fajack 

Subject: Board Item – Action. Stage II Submittal:
Paty Residence Hall Renovation

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, a Consultant Selection Committee, appointed by The University of Alabama (“University”), solicited proposals from qualified architectural firms for the Paty Residence Hall Renovation project (“Project”). The Consultant Selection Committee’s recommendations were forwarded to and approved by the Physical Properties Committee Chair and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. The University is requesting approval to begin negotiations for the Project with the top ranked firms as follows:

1. Ward Scott Architecture, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
2. Davis Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
3. CMH Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama

The Project will be funded from Housing and Residential Communities Reserves in the amount of \$15,600,000 and will address approximately \$14,820,000 in campus deferred maintenance liability.

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 Consultant Selection process – Part 1, Letter of Approval from the Physical Properties Committee Chair and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, Interview Outline, Resolution, Executive Summary, Project Summary, Project Planning Report and Location map 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 November 8 – 9, 2018.

MMF/ccj

pc w/atcmts: Michael Rodgers
Michael Lanier
Tim Leopard
Sommer Coleman
Steven Mercado

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUBMITTAL**

Meeting Date: November 8 – 9, 2018

CAMPUS: The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama

PROJECT NAME: Paty Residence Hall Renovation

PROJECT LOCATION: 210 McCorvey Drive

ARCHITECT: Requesting in this submittal

<p>THIS SUBMITTAL:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Stage I</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stage II</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Stage III</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Stage IV</p>	<p>PREVIOUS APPROVALS:</p> <p><u>September 21, 2018</u></p> <hr/> <hr/>
--	--

PROJECT TYPE	SPACE CATEGORIES	PERCENTAGE	GSF
<input type="checkbox"/> Building Construction			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building Renovation	Residential Facility	100%	90,384
<input type="checkbox"/> Building Addition			
<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment			
TOTAL		100%	90,384

BUDGET	Current
Construction – Renovation	\$ 11,450,000
Window Procurement Package	\$ 350,000
Landscaping	\$ 100,000
Security/Access Control	\$ 700,000
Telecommunication/Data	\$ 515,000
Contingency* (10%)	\$ 1,190,000
UA Project Management Fee** (3%)	\$ 392,700
Architect/Engineer Fee*** (6.36%)	\$ 728,875
Expenses (Construction Materials Testing, Special Inspections)	\$ 90,000
Other Fees and Services (Testing, Advertising, Printing)	\$ 83,425
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$ 15,600,000

*Contingency is based on 10% of the costs of construction, window procurement, and landscaping.

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

***Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 4.9% of the costs of construction, window procurement and landscaping plus a 25% major renovation factor.

ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE (O&M) COSTS:	
(Utilities, Housekeeping, Maintenance, Insurance, Other)	
	\$ 0*
TOTAL ESTIMATED ANNUAL O&M COSTS:	\$ 0*

*There is not an anticipated increase in O&M cost relative to this project. Increases in HVAC operating cost due to compliance with current code will be offset by the use of energy efficient LED lighting and improved windows.

FUNDING SOURCE:	
Capital Outlay:	
Housing and Residential Communities Reserves	\$ 15,600,000
Deferred Maintenance:	
This Project will address a current deferred maintenance liability in the amount of \$14,820,000.	
O&M Costs:	\$ N/A*

*Paty Residence Hall is an existing Auxiliary facility and accordingly is already funded. Ongoing O&M costs are funded from the annual operating budget for Housing and Residential Communities.

NEW EQUIPMENT REQUIRED:

RELATIONSHIP & ENHANCEMENT OF CAMPUS PROGRAMS:

The Paty Residence Hall (“Paty”) Renovation (“Project”) will assist The University of Alabama (“University”) with addressing the high demand for on-campus housing. The renovated facility will also provide for capacity in the housing system so that strategic renovations can be made to existing facilities as part of the Housing and Residential Communities’ R&R Plan.

The proposed Project will address several areas that impact enrollment. Offering students a cost-effective on-campus housing option (traditional, mixture of double and single occupancy with community bath) is optimal to the ability to provide various price points for housing as the suite-style accommodations are more costly. Updates in Paty will address that demand for affordable on-campus housing that is appealing to students.

The proposed Project will also allow Housing and Residential Communities (HRC) the opportunity to offer the students development opportunities through the Living-Learning Communities program that will attract a broad range of users.

Lastly, this Project will permit HRC to retain Paty in its inventory and remain a viable revenue generator. If investments are not made, Paty will not be a residence hall of choice for future students.

Furthermore, safety and security of the residents will be improved through the incorporation of security and access control upgrades and the incorporation of current life safety technology.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1
Project: Paty Residence Hall Renovation
BOT Submittal: Stage II
Meeting Date: November 8 – 9, 2018

Project Summary

PATY RESIDENCE HALL RENOVATION

The Paty Residence Hall (Paty Hall) Renovation project (“Project”), located at 210 McCorvey Drive, will entail the renovation of 90,384 gross square feet including select interior demolition, interior fit-up, lighting upgrades, restroom and plumbing renovations, security and access control upgrades, and selected exterior improvements. Paty Hall currently houses 488 residents but will be programmed for approximately 400 following the renovation.

With the renovation, Housing and Residential Communities (HRC) will be able to make targeted improvements to the restroom facilities, shower areas, residential living spaces, and common study spaces that will offer students more amenities in the building. HRC will also be able to offer an increased number of desirable single spaces in the building through this Project, which will attract students to reside in Paty Hall. This renovation will allow HRC to open the building to other opportunities such as the relocation of the Culverhouse Business Living Learning Community (LLC) to Paty Hall. The relocation of the Culverhouse LLC will facilitate the razing of Friedman in Summer 2019.

Through the creation of a faculty-in-residence apartment and the ability to make the building coded by wing, due to added access points and security measures, Paty Hall will become The University of Alabama’s (“University”) first fully updated traditional residence hall on campus. This renovation will be the first in a series of renovations to address needs in other existing HRC facilities. Lastly, the reinvestment of Paty Hall is needed to continue to offer students a lower price point for living on campus. This renovation will allow the University to maintain traditional rates at a level that provides students with a variety of price points when making their housing selection.

Security and access control enhancements will be a critical component of the Project with new closed-circuit television cameras, building entrance card swipe, and keyless unit entry door locks included in the scope of the Project.

The interior fit-up will include renovated casework in the bedrooms, wall furring to conceal exposed wire mold, and finish upgrades. Existing lighting will be replaced with LED fixtures

throughout the building. Plumbing upgrades will replace existing fixtures in all showers and restroom areas.

Finish upgrades will occur throughout the building. Common areas will be upgraded to current University design standards for materials and colors in line with other residential facilities. Some enhanced layout in the common spaces will be considered to provide improved student gathering spaces.

The select exterior improvements include window replacement, re-working the south loading dock area, and landscaping and irrigation.

The facility will be upgraded to meet all current codes and standards. ADA access will also be addressed. The Paty Hall structural system is robust and the floor to floor elevations allow for adequate ceiling heights. The Project will primarily address deferred maintenance issues and essentially “reset” the life of the building. Given the central location, Paty Hall will efficiently serve the University community in a manner that meets students’ expectations for years to come.

The former dining hall space, most recently a computer lab, is not currently included in the renovation. That area is being programmed for potential academic use and will be considered at a later date.

Raising Cane’s will remain open during the renovation and is not included in the scope of the Project.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA SYSTEM
PROJECT PLANNING REPORT
DATE: November 8 - 9, 2018

INITIAL REPORT
 INTERIM REPORT
 FINAL REPORT
 1 REPORT NO.

TO: OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

FROM: OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

1. PROJECT: Paty Residence Hall Renovation

2. LOCATION: 210 McCorvey Drive

3. ARCHITECT/ENGINEER: Requesting in this submittal

4. PROJECT STATUS:		
A. SCHEMATIC DESIGN:	DATE INITIATED	<u>September-18</u>
	% COMPLETE	<u>50%</u>
	* DATE COMPLETED (Projected)	<u>November-18</u>
B. PRELIMINARY DESIGN:	DATE INITIATED	<u>November-18</u>
	% COMPLETE	<u>0%</u>
	* DATE COMPLETED	<u>December-18</u>
C. CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS:	DATE INITIATED	<u>December-18</u>
	% COMPLETE	<u>0%</u>
	* DATE COMPLETED	<u>January-19</u>
D. SCHEDULED BID DATE:		<u>January-19</u>

5. CURRENT PROJECT BUDGET:	CURRENT
A. CONSTRUCTION - RENOVATION	\$ 11,450,000
B. WINDOW PROCUREMENT PACKAGE	\$ 350,000
C. LANDSCAPING	\$ 100,000
D. SECURITY/ACCESS CONTROL	\$ 700,000
E. TELECOMMUNICATION/DATA	\$ 515,000
F. CONTINGENCY* (10%)	\$ 1,190,000
G. UA PROJECT MANAGEMENT FEE** (3%)	\$ 392,700
H. ARCHITECT/ENGINEER FEE*** (6.36%)	\$ 728,875
I. EXPENSES (CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS TESTING, SPECIAL INSPECTIONS)	\$ 90,000
J. OTHER FEES AND SERVICES (TESTING, ADVERTISING, PRINTING)	\$ 83,425
K. TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$ 15,600,000

*Contingency is based on 10% of the costs of construction, window procurement, and landscaping.

**UA Project Management Fee is based on 3% of the total costs of construction, window procurement, landscaping and contingency.

***Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 4.9% of the costs of construction, window procurement and landscaping plus a 25% major renovation factor.

6. FUNDING/RESOURCES: Housing and Residential Communities Reserves - \$15,600,000

7. REMARKS _____

* FINAL AGENCY APPROVAL

SUBMITTED BY: Tim Leopand

September 21, 2018

Dr. Dana S. Keith
Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration
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 – Part 1
Paty Residence Hall Renovation
UA Project No: 247-18-1697

Dear Dr. Keith and Trustee Wilson,

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, on September 21, 2018, The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama (“Board”) approved the Stage I submittal for the Paty Residence Hall Renovation project (“Project”) at a projected cost of \$15,600,000.

Also pursuant to Board Rule 415, on August 6, 2018, 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 of Alabama (“University”) campus web page. Firms desiring to be considered were requested to provide brochures to the University outlining their qualifications, relevant experience and proposed team members by August 20, 2018.

A Consultant Selection Committee, appointed by the University in accordance with the provisions of Board Rule 415, reviewed the submitted brochures and on August 29, 2018, interviewed the following architectural firms:

- CMH Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
- Davis Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
- Ward Scott Architecture, Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Paty Residence Hall Renovation
September 21, 2018
Page 2

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

1. Ward Scott Architecture, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
2. Davis Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
3. CMH Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama

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

1. The firms represented a clear understanding of the Project program and goals, as well as how to achieve them, specifically, expertise with renovating existing and support spaces.
2. The firms are familiar with the University facilities standards and the regulatory requirements for the design of the Project.
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.

Approval is hereby requested for:

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

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

Sincerely,



Matthew M. Fajack
Vice President for Financial Affairs
and Treasurer

MMF/ccj

Attachment

pc/atchmt: Michael Rodgers
Michael Lanier
Tim Leopard
Sommer Coleman
Steven Mercado

Paty Residence Hall Renovation
September 21, 2018
Page 3

The above listing of firms ranked as the most qualified for the Project are hereby approved and by forwarding this executed document to the Chancellor's office, the rankings are approved for inclusion in the Board materials to the Physical Properties Committee.

Dana S Keith 10/1/2018
Dr. Dana S. Keith: **Recommend for Approval**
Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration

DocuSigned by:
James W. Wilson, III
454FB4D0A3234D5
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: November 8 - 9, 2018

Campus: The University of Alabama
 Project Name: Paty Residence Hall Renovation
 Project Location: 210 McCorvey Drive
 Prepared By: Vince Dooley/Carla Coleman Jones Date: September 21, 2018

Project Type	Range of Construction Costs		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building Renovations	\$	11,000,000	to \$ 12,000,000
<input type="checkbox"/> Building Addition	\$	_____	to \$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	\$	_____	to \$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Campus Infrastructure	\$	_____	to \$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment	\$	_____	to \$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	\$	_____	to \$ _____

Building Type - Group I	Percentage of Project
<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Building Without Special Facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Parking Structures/Repetitive Garages	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Simple Loft Type Structure	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Warehouses/Utility Type Buildings	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	_____ %

Building Type - Group II	Percentage of Project
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Apartments and Dormitories	100 %
<input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit Halls	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Manufacture/Industrial Facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Office Building (Without Tenant Improvements)	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Printing Plants	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Service Garage/Facility	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Storm Shelter and Multi-Purpose Event)	_____ %

Building Type - Group III	Percentage of Project
<input type="checkbox"/> College Classroom Facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Convention Facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Extended Care Facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Gymnasiums	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Hospitals	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Dining Halls	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Laboratories	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Libraries	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Medical Schools	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Medical Office Facilities and Clinics	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Mental Institutions	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Office Buildings (with tenant improvements)	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Parks	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Playground and Recreational Facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Health Centers	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Research Facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Stadiums	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Central Utilities Plants	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Water Supply and Distribution Plants	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Sewage Treatment and Underground Systems	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Electrical Substations and Primary and Secondary Distribution Systems, Roads, Bridges and Major Site Improvements when performed as Independent projects	_____ %

Building Type - Group IV	Percentage of Project
<input type="checkbox"/> Aquariums	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Auditoriums	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Art Galleries	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> College Buildings with special features	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Communications Buildings	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Special Schools	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Theaters and similar facilities	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	_____ %

Building Type - Group V	Percentage of Project
<input type="checkbox"/> Residences and Specialized Decorative Buildings	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	_____ %

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. Vince Dooley, Architectural Design Coordinator
2. Garrett Goodman, University Architect
3. Dr. Steven Hood, Associate Vice President of Student Life
4. Dr. Matthew Kerch, Executive Director, Housing and Residential Communities
5. Steven Mercado, Project Manager
6. Courtney Ogelsby, Director, Furnishings and Design

Qualified Firms/Companies Submitted:

1. CMH Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
2. Davis Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
3. Ward Scott Architecture, Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Ranking of Most Qualified Firms to be submitted to the Physical Properties Committee

1. Ward Scott Architecture, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
2. Davis Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama
3. CMH Architects, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama

Reviewed and approved by:

Designated by:

DFSC00739047E

Chairman of Consultant Selection Committee


Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer

The University of Alabama
Architectural Presentation Outline

Paty Residence Hall Renovation

UA Project No. 247-18-1697

Part I

ONE: RESPONDENT'S STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS (Score 1 – 5)

- A. Describe your firm's experience working with other universities and state agencies.
- B. Describe your firm's experience working with The University of Alabama ("University").
 - o The University desires to have input in the selection of consultants once the top ranked firm is selected.
- C. The University 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 (Score 1 – 5)

- 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):
 - o 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 (Score 1 – 5)

- A. Does your firm/organization or any of its officers currently have any judgments, claims, and 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 (Score 1 - 5)

- A. Does your firm/organization have the ability to meet all of the University's insurance requirements? (see attached)
- B. What is your process for managing any claims of the contractors during the project?

FIVE: PROJECT SPECIFIC CRITERIA (Score 1 - 5)

- A. What is your design approach or methodology and standard of care with renovation projects?
- B. Discuss your firm's ability to meet aggressive design and construction schedule.
- C. Describe your firm's experience with the coordination of major building systems (i.e. mechanical and electrical).

Oral Interview Criteria/Focus

Paty Residence Hall Renovation

UA Project No. 247-18-1697

August 29, 2018

1. **Welcome/Introduction** (*time allotted = 5 minutes*)
 - a. Design Team
 - i. Brief Introduction of your firm and the person or team who is ultimately responsible for project success.

2. **Design Opportunities/Feedback** (*time allotted = 15 minutes*)
 - a. Please review the project programming information and provide design feedback and ideas that you feel could enhance this project.

3. **Project Design Schedule** (*time allotted = 15 minutes*)
 - a. Provide a proposed design and construction schedule for this project factoring the following key target dates listed below. Elaborate on your strategy to keep this project on schedule.

i. Stage II Architect Selection	Nov. 15, 2018
ii. Concept Progression & Engineering Analysis	Aug 1 – Nov. 15, 2018
iii. Construction Drawings to ABC	Dec. 7, 2018
iv. Bid Documents available to Bidders	Dec. 14, 2018
v. Bid Opening	Jan. 10, 2019
vi. Letter of Intent (LOI)	Jan. 18, 2019
vii. NTP to Contractor	Feb 11, 2019
viii. Construction Completion	July 5, 2019
 - b. Discuss your firm's approach to multiple bid packages (i.e. demolition, windows, general trades).

4. **Questions & Answers** (*time allotted = 5 minutes*)

Notes:

- Other criteria may be added as applicable.
- Presentations may be PowerPoint, illustration boards, or any other graphic format.
- If providing hand-outs, please provide at least 6 copies to Selection Committee.

LOCATION MAP

