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

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

	Campus	į	The University of Alabama
Project Name		Name:	University Archive Facility
	Meeting	Date:	June 15 – 16, 2017
*	<b>⊠</b> 1	Cor	mulated Daged Submittal Charleligt No. 2
•			mpleted Board Submittal Checklist No. 2
			nsmittal Letter to Chancellor from Campus President requesting the
			ject be placed on the agendas for the forthcoming Physical Properties
		Coı	mmittee and Board of Trustees (or Executive Committee) meetings
	$\boxtimes$ 3	B. Pro	posed Board Resolution requesting approval of Stage II Submittal
		(Ar	chitect Ranking, Project Scope and Project Budget; authority to proceed
		wit	h Owner/Architect contract negotiations)
	$\boxtimes$ 4		npus correspondence/photos providing supporting project information
	$\boxtimes$ 5	. Coi	npleted Executive Summary – Proposed Capital Project. /2
	<ul><li>□ 4</li><li>□ 5</li><li>□ 6</li></ul>	5. Exe	ecutive Summary – Architect, Engineer, Selection process (include
		Inte	erview Outline). /3, /4, /5
	$\boxtimes$ 7	. Car	mpus letter requesting approval of the ranking of architectural firms and
			hority to submit to the Physical Properties Committee for approval –
			ned by the Chair of the Physical Properties Committee and signed by the
		_	System Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. /6
			•
	=		ject Planning Report/2
			liminary Business Plan (if applicable)/7
		0. Car	mpus map(s) showing Project site

Prepared by:

<sup>/1</sup> Reference Tab 3H - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide

<sup>/2</sup> Reference Tab 3E - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide

<sup>/3</sup> Reference Tab 3K - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide

<sup>/4</sup> Reference Tab 3L - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide

<sup>/5</sup> Reference Tab 3M - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide /6 Reference Tab 3N - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide

<sup>/7</sup> Reference Tab 3V - Board Rule 415 Instructional Guide

<sup>/8</sup> 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

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





May 12, 2017

To:

Stuart R. Bell

From:

Lynda Gilbert

Subject:

Board Item - Action: Stage II submittal: University Archive Facility

Melly

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, a Consultant Selection Committee, appointed by The University of Alabama ("University"), solicited proposals from qualified architectural firms for the University Archive Facility project ("Project"). The Consultant 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 with the top ranked firms as follows:

- 1. Seay Seay & Litchfield Architects, Montgomery, Alabama
- 2. Designform, LLC, Birmingham, Alabama
- 3. Payne Design Group Architects, Montgomery, Alabama

The Project will be funded with University Funds in the amount of \$6,239,664.

This Project location and program have been reviewed and are consistent with 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 June 15 – 16, 2017.

LG/cci

pc w/atchmts: Michael Rodgers

Michael Lanier Tim Leopard Tom Love Danny Collins

#### RESOLUTION

#### UNIVERSITY ARCHIVE FACILITY

WHEREAS, in accordance with Board Rule 415, on April 7, 2017, The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama ("Board") approved a Stage I submittal for The University of Alabama Archive Facility Project ("Project"), an addition to The University of Alabama Book Storage Facility located at 1425 14<sup>th</sup> Street; 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 Board approval as follows:

# Ranking of Top Firms:

- 1. Seay Seay & Litchfield Architects, Montgomery, Alabama
- 2. Designform, LLC, Birmingham, Alabama
- 3. Payne Design Group Architects, LLC, Montgomery, Alabama

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 University Funds in the amount of \$6,239,664; and

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

BUDGET:	CURRENT
Construction	\$ 3,133,000
Landscaping	\$ 30,000
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	\$ 2,400,000
Security/Access Control	\$ 25,000
Telecommunication/Data	\$ 25,000
Contingency* (10%)	\$ 316,300
UA Project Management Fee** (3%)	\$ 104,379
Architect/Engineer Fee – Programming	\$ 20,000
Architect/Engineer Fee*** (4.5%)	\$ 140,985
Expenses (Geotech, Construction Materials Testing, Special	\$ 35,000
Inspections)	
Other Fees and Services (testing, advertising, printing)	\$ 10,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$ 6,239,664

<sup>\*</sup>Contingency is based on 10% of construction and landscaping.

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 executive an architectural agreement with Seay Seay & Litchfield Architects, of Montgomery, Alabama, for architectural services in accordance with Board Rule 415 for this Project.

<sup>\*\*</sup>UA Project Management Fee is based on 3% of construction, landscaping and contingency.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 4.5% of construction.

**ATTACHMENT NO. 1** 

Project: University Archive Facility BOT Submittal: Stage II Meeting Date: June 15 – 16, 2017

# **Project Summary**

## **UNIVERSITY ARCHIVE FACILITY**

The University Archive Facility project ("Project") will consist of an addition to the existing University of Alabama ("University") Book Storage Facility located at 1425 14<sup>th</sup> Street in the area of the University facilities compound. Space for this addition was planned when the Book Storage Facility was originally constructed and the building pad is roughly in place to the west of the existing building.

This Project is the first step in the realignment of Library space in order to meet the strategic plan of the University and to transform University Libraries as necessary to support the growth of the University, the academic mission, and the teaching, research and learning environment in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This Project will provide space for current and future collections and archives; thereby providing the opportunity to redevelop the current collection areas in Library facilities for student centric space, faculty offices, and other uses.

The proposed project is anticipated to be 14,919 gross square feet. An exterior wall height of approximately 36 feet will accommodate mobile shelving units 32 feet in height throughout the space. The new structure will be hardened and include specialized fire suppression and mechanical systems as appropriate to protect the collections.

The use of high density vertical shelving will yield an approximate 9:1 gain in square footage at a minimum, i.e. for every square foot of high density vertical shelving 9 square feet of space will be gained in the core of campus for other uses.

It is anticipated that the shelving will be provided in phases as needed. This phase will accommodate collections and archives currently housed in Gorgas Library and Mary Harmon Bryant and accommodate temporary storage during planned renovations of Gorgas Library. Future shelving installations would accommodate materials from Bruno, Rodgers, and McLure Libraries and future collections and archive needs.

# THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA SYSTEM PROJECT PLANNING REPORT

DATE: June 15 - 16, 2017

							-INTE	ERIM REPORT RIM REPORT L REPORT ORT NO.
TO;		FFICE OF THE CHANCELLO DARD OF TRUSTEES OF TH		F ALABAMA				OI(1 140.
FROM:		FFICE OF THE PRESIDENT HE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAN	МА					
	1.	PROJECT:	University Archive	Facility				
	2.	LOCATION:	1425 14th Street					
	3.	ARCHITECT/ENGINEER:	Requesting in this	submittal				
	4.	PROJECT STATUS: A. SCHEMATIC DESIGN	я	DATE INIT % COMPL * DATE CO			ji	Jun-17 0% TBD
		B. PRELIMINARY DESIGN		DATE INIT % COMPL * DATE CO			-	Sep-17 0% TBD
		C. CONSTRUCTION DOC	JMENTS:	DATE INIT % COMPL * DATE CO			=	Jan-18 0% TBD
		D. SCHEDULED BID DATE	<u>:</u>					Feb-18
	5.	CURRENT PROJECT BUDGA. CONSTRUCTION B. LANDSCAPING C. FURNITURE, FIXTURES D. SECURITY/ACCESS CO E. TELECOMMUNICATION. F. CONTINGENCY* (10%) G. UA PROJECT MANAGE! H. ARCHITECT/ENGINEER I. ARCHITECT/ENGINEER J. EXPENSES (GEOTECH, CO K. OTHER FEES AND SERV L. TOTAL PROJECT COST *Contingency is based on 10% of c **UA Project Management Fee is b ***Architect/Engineer Fee is based	S AND EQUIPMENT NTROL /DATA MENT FEE** (3%) FEE - PROGRAM FEE*** (4.5%) INSTRUCTION MATER VICES (SECURITY, A construction and landsca	MING RIALS TESTING, DVERTISING, F aping. etion, landscaping	POSTAGE)		\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	3,133,000 30,000 2,400,000 25,000 25,000 316,300 104,379 20,000 140,985 35,000 10,000 <b>6,239,664</b>
	6.	FUNDING/RESOURCES:	University funds -	\$6,239,664				
	7.	REMARKS						
* FINAL	AG	ENCY APPROVAL	SUBMIT	TED BY:	Thim	n & The	_	

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT

#### **BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUBMITTAL**

Me	eting Date:	June 15 – 16, 20	17	
CAMPUS:	The Universi	ty of Alabama, Tusc	caloosa Alahama	
		-	Saluusa, Alabama	
PROJECT NAME:	University A	rchive Facility		
PROJECT LOCATION:	1425 14th Str	eet		
ARCHITECT:	Requesting i	n this submittal		
THIS SUBMITTAL:		PREVIO	US APPROVALS:	
☐ Stage I		April 7, 2	017	
⊠ Stage II				
☐ Stage III				
☐ Stage IV				
PROJECT TYPE	SPAC	CE CATEGORIES	PERCENTAGE	GSF
☐ Building Construction				
⊠ Building Addition	Ware	house Storage	100%	14,919
☐ Building Renovation				
☐ Campus Infrastructure				
☐ Equipment				

BUDGET		Current
Construction	\$	3,133,000
Landscaping	\$	30,000
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	\$	2,400,000
Security/Access Control	\$	25,000
Telecommunication/Data	\$	25,000
Contingency* (10%)	\$	316,300
UA Project Management Fee** (3%)	\$	104,379
Architect/Engineer Fee – Programming	\$	20,000
Architect/Engineer Fee*** (4.5%)	\$	140,985
Expenses (Geotech, Construction Materials Testing, Special Inspections)	\$	35,000
Other Fees and Services (testing, advertising, printing)	_\$_	10,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$	6,239,664

100%

**TOTAL** 

14,919

<sup>\*</sup>Contingency is based on 10% of construction and landscaping.

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

\*\*\*Architect/Engineer Fee is based on 4.5% of construction.

89.365

89,365

# **ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE (O&M) COSTS:**

(Utilities, Housekeeping, Maintenance, Insurance, Other)

Per GSF: 14,919 gsf x ~\$5.99/gsf \$89,365

TOTAL ESTIMATED ANNUAL O&M COSTS:

#### **FUNDING SOURCE:**

Capital Outlay:

University funds \$ 6,239,664

\$

O&M Costs: University Annual Operating Funds \$

# **NEW EQUIPMENT REQUIRED:**

Warehouse Storage Shelving

#### **RELATIONSHIP & ENHANCEMENT OF CAMPUS PROGRAMS:**

The University Archive Facility project ("Project") is the first step in the realignment of Library space in order to meet the strategic plan of The University of Alabama ("University") and to transform University Libraries as necessary to support the growth of the University, the academic mission, and the teaching, research and learning environment in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. This Project will provide space for current and future collections and archives; thereby, providing the opportunity to redevelop the current collection areas in Library facilities for student centric space, faculty offices, and other uses.

Consolidating collections and archives will allow for more efficient management and operations and allow the University to meet its commitment as a United States Federal Depository Library, regional depository for the State of Alabama, and as a member of the Scholars Trust research library consortia.

With the increased emphasis on research, adequate Library space and collections are essential to supporting research activities.



May 10, 2017

Dr. Dana S. Keith Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Sid McDonald Hall 500 University Boulevard, East Tuscaloosa, AL 35401

Trustee 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 University Archive Facility

Dear Dr. Keith and Trustee Wilson,

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, on April 7, 2017, The Board of Trustees of The University of Alabama ("Board") approved the Stage I submittal for the University Archive Facility project ("Project") at a projected cost of \$6,239,664.

Pursuant to Board Rule 415, on April 9, 2017, 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 April 17, 2017.

A Consultant Selection Committee, appointed by The University in accordance with the provisions of Board Rule 415, reviewed the submitted brochures and on May 3, 2017, interviewed the following architectural firms:

- Adams Design Associates, Birmingham, Alabama
- Designform, LLC, Birmingham, Alabama
- Payne Design Group, LLC, Montgomery, Alabama
- Seay Seay & Litchfield Architects, Montgomery, Alabama

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

- 1. Seay Seay & Litchfield Architects, Montgomery, Alabama
- 2. Designform, LLC, Birmingham, Alabama
- 3. Payne Design Group, LLC, Montgomery, Alabama

University Archive Facility May 10, 2017 Page 2

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 archival and collections storage, hardened construction, high density mobile shelving, climatic controls for archival storage, and emerging trends and best practices for archival and collections storage.
- 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,

Lynda Gilbert

Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer

Attachment

pc/atchmt:

Michael Rodgers Michael Lanier Tim Leopard Tom Love Danny Collins

University Archive Facility

# Part 1

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

# CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUBMITTAL

	Meeting Dat	e: June 15	- 16, 2017			
Campus:	The University of Alak	oama				
Project Name:	University Archive Fa	cility				
Project Location:	1425 14 <sup>th</sup> Street					
Prepared By:	Vince Dooley/Carla C	oleman Jones	Dat	e: N	1ay 10, 2	2017
Project Type			Range of Co	nstru	iction C	osts
Buildin	g Renovations	\$		to	\$	
🛚 Buildin	g Addition	\$	3,000,000	to	\$	4,000,000
☐ New Co	onstruction	\$		to	\$	
Campu	s Infrastructure	\$		to	\$	
Equipm	ent	\$		to	\$	
☐ Other		\$		to	\$	
Building Type –	Group I		]	Perce	ntage of	f Project
	<b>Group I</b> ial Building Without Spec	cial Facilities		Perce	ntage of	f Project
☐ Industri				Perce	entage of	
☐ Industri	ial Building Without Spec			Perce —	entage of	%
☐ Industri ☐ Parking ☐ Simple	ial Building Without Spec Structures/Repetitive Ga	arages		Perce —	entage of	%
☐ Industri ☐ Parking ☐ Simple	ial Building Without Spec Structures/Repetitive Ga Loft Type Structure	arages		Perce — —	entage of	% %
☐ Industri ☐ Parking ☐ Simple ☐ Wareho	ial Building Without Spec Structures/Repetitive Ga Loft Type Structure	arages		Perce	entage of	% % % %
☐ Industri ☐ Parking ☐ Simple ☐ Wareho	ial Building Without Spec g Structures/Repetitive Ga Loft Type Structure buses/Utility Type Buildin	arages				% % % %
Industri Parking Simple Wareho Other  Building Type —	ial Building Without Spec g Structures/Repetitive Ga Loft Type Structure buses/Utility Type Buildin	arages				% % % % %
Industri Parking Simple Wareho Other  Building Type —	ial Building Without Spects Structures/Repetitive Gastructure Structure Stru	arages				% % % % %
Industri Parking Simple Wareho Other  Building Type — Apartme	ial Building Without Spects Structures/Repetitive Gastructure Structure Stru	ngs				% % % % Project %
Industri   Parking   Simple   Wareho   Other    Building Type –   Apartmatical Exhibit   Manufa	ial Building Without Spec g Structures/Repetitive Ga Loft Type Structure buses/Utility Type Buildin Group II ents and Dormitories Halls	arages ngs				% % % % f Project %
Industri   Parking   Simple   Wareho   Other    Building Type –   Apartmatical Exhibit   Manufa	ial Building Without Spects Structures/Repetitive Gastructure Structure Duses/Utility Type Building Group II  ents and Dormitories Halls Secture/Industrial Facilities Building (Without Tenant	arages ngs				% % % % f Project % %
Industri   Parking   Simple   Wareho   Other    Building Type -   Apartm   Exhibit   Manufa   Office H	ial Building Without Spects Structures/Repetitive Gastructure Structure Duses/Utility Type Building Group II  ents and Dormitories Halls Secture/Industrial Facilities Building (Without Tenant	arages ngs				% % % %  Project % % %

Buildin	g Type – Group III	Percentage of Project
	College Classroom Facilities	%
	Convention Facilities	%
	Extended Care Facilities	%
	Gymnasiums	%
	Hospitals	%
	Institutional Dining Halls	%
	Laboratories	%
	Libraries	%
	Medical Schools	%
	Medical Office Facilities and Clinics	
	Mental Institutions	%
	Office Buildings (with tenant improvements)	%
	Parks	%
	Playground and Recreational Facilities	%
	Public Health Centers	<del></del> %
	Research Facilities	%
	Stadiums	%
	Central Utilities Plants	%
	Water Supply and Distribution Plants	
	Sewage Treatment and Underground Systems	%
	Electrical Substations and Primary and Secondary	<del></del>
	Distribution Systems, Roads, Bridges and Major Site	%
	Improvements when performed as Independent projects	70
Building	g Type – Group IV	Percentage of Project
	Aquariums	<b>~~~</b>
	Auditoriums	%
	Art Galleries	%
	College Buildings with special features	<b>%</b>
	Communications Buildings	<b>%</b>
	Special Schools	%
	Theaters and similar facilities	%

Other

Building Type – Group V	Percentage of Pr	entage of Project		
Residences and Specialized Decorative Buildings	%			
Other				
Repetitive Design or Duplication of Facilities				
Does the Building Program/Requirements support repetitive design duplication of Facilities justifying an adjustment in A/E Design Fees	I I VAC	⊠ No		
Building Program Development		1		
Will the A/E Agreement require the Development of Comprehensive Building/Design Program in lieu of one provided Owner requiring an adjustment in A/E Fees?		⊠ No		
Construction Consultant Services				
Will the University be utilizing a Construction Consultant who we perform some of the services normally provided by the Archite requiring an adjustment of A/E Fees?		⊠ No		
Multiple Prime Trade Contracts				
Will the project be competitively bid and constructed using Multip	nle			
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?		⊠ 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. Danny Collins, Project Manager
- 2. Vince Dooley, Architectural Design Coordinator
- 3. Garrett Goodman, Staff Architect
- 4. Dan Wolfe, University Planner and Designer
- 6. Susanna Johnson, Director, Furnishings and Design

# Qualified Firms/Companies Submitted:

- 1. Adams Design Associates, Birmingham, Alabama
- 2. Designform, LLC, Birmingham, Alabama
- 3. Payne Design Group, LLC, Montgomery, Alabama
- 4. Seay Seay & Litchfield Architects, Montgomery, Alabama

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

- 1. Seay Seay & Litchfield Architects, Montgomery, Alabama
- 2. Designform, LLC, Birmingham, Alabama
- 3. Payne Design Group, LLC, Montgomery, Alabama

Reviewed and approved by:

Chairman of Consultant Selection Committee

Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer

#### Oral Interview Criteria/Focus

# **University Archive Facility**

UA Project No. 327-16-1044 Date: May 3, 2017

- 1. Welcome/Introduction (time allotted = 5 minutes)
  - a. Design Team
    - i. Brief introduction of your firm.
- 2. <u>Warehouse/ Storage and "Hardened Construction" Expertise</u> 8 points max (time allotted = 10 minutes)
  - a. Describe your team's expertise with warehouses storage using high-bay shelving and any emerging trends and best practices.
  - b. Discuss your firm approach in dealing with environmental conditions (i.e. humidity and temperature control, lighting and fire protection) to preserve stored material with respect to warehouses.
  - c. Discuss your firms experience with "hardened construction". The program list three thresholds for storm resistance. Provide feedback on design experience and cost.
- 3. Design Opportunities/Feedback 18 points max (time allotted = 15 minutes)
  - a. Please review the project program and provide any design feedback and ideas that you feel could enhance this project.
- 4. Roles & Execution 4 points max (time allotted = 5 minutes)
  - a. Provide a proposed design and construction schedule for this project assuming a January 2018 construction start date. Discuss challenges and strategies for managing the schedule among all parties to ensure project success.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Request for Qualifications (RFQ) – University Archive Facility UA# 327-16-1044
Selection Committee Evaluation/Rankings

On May 3, 2017 the Consultant Selection Committee (CSC) interviewed 4 firms to provide design services for the University of Alabama Archive Facility. We believe that all firms are capable and qualified but Seay, Seay & Litchfield (SS&L) clearly distinguished themselves from the others based on their responses to the oral criteria reflected in the BOT documentation previously provided as well as several other key factors:

### **Key Factors:**

#### 1. The firm level of specific design expertise with this project type.

SS&L was the Architect of Record for the addition to Archive & History Building (A&HB) located in Montgomery, Alabama. This 61,000 sq.ft. addition was primarily for archival storage for historical artifacts and involved a large volume of high density mobile shelving. Services provided extended from programming through project closeout allowing for continuity and accountability throughout all design deliverables. SS&L communicated the importance of this facility functioning properly and the protection of valuable assets and collections was paramount and tops on their agenda. Also their past performance with such a large scale project should give them foresight and allow them to be proactive with any design challenges, issues and solutions.

The majority of their "hardened construction" involved storm shelters. Two of these examples are located on a college or university campus therefore indicating SS&L experience with hardened construction within a campus environment.

# 2. The firm appeared to have a good understanding of the environmental conditions for storage and warehouses.

SS&L discussed several successful projects such as warehouses and storage facilities where climate controls must be sustained and no fluctuation is acceptable. The utilization of specialized fire suppression systems and mechanical systems has been done on various projects to preserve valuable collections and materials. A firm possessing this type of experience is vital to the success of our project.

3. The firms presented the most favorable listing of qualified principal(s) and staff.

While all the firms interviewed were knowledgeable, we feel that SS&L collectively displayed the most comprehensive understanding of this project's goals. The knowledge reflected in everyone's responses and level of engagement during Q&A. Lastly, we believe the staffing and manpower dedicated to this project will help ensure a successful project delivery and schedule.

Sincerely,

Vincent D. Dooley,

Selection Committee Chair

Architectural Design Coordinator

# **LOCATION MAP**

