

AGENDA FOR THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS BOARD OF TRUSTEES
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS SYSTEM OFFICE
BOARDROOM

AND VIA VIRTUALLY
12:00 P.M., APRIL 19, 2023

REGULAR SESSION

University of Arkansas System

1. Consideration of Request for Approval of Solar Services Agreement with Scenic Hill Solar, UASYS (Action)
2. Discussion of Potential Affiliation Between the University of Arkansas System and Transformative Education Services, Inc., UASYS

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

3. Consideration of Request for Approval of Academic Planning Retrenchment Proposal, UALR (Action)

University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

4. Consideration of Request for Selection of Design Professionals for the Hathaway Howard Fine Arts Renovation and Restoration Project, UAPB (Action)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

REGULAR SESSION RECONVENES

April 12, 2023

TO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

Dear Trustees:

Pursuant to University of Arkansas Board of Trustees resolution of March 2022, Vice President Chris Thomason at the University of Arkansas System is requesting authorization for the Office of the President to enter into a Solar Services Agreement (SSA) with Scenic Hill Solar (SHS) for the system-wide purchase of electricity produced by solar photo-voltaic production arrays. The SSA would be entered into pursuant to the Arkansas Guaranteed Energy Cost Savings Act (ACA 19-11-1201 et seq.), Arkansas Renewable Energy Development Act (Ark. Code Ann. §§ 23-18-601 et seq.), Arkansas Cost-Shifting Prevention Act of 2023 (Act 278), and the net metering rules of the Arkansas Public Service Commission (APSC).

The Arkansas Energy Office (AEO) has been designated by the Arkansas Legislature to implement the Guaranteed Energy Cost Savings Act (the “Act”) for state agencies, including institutions of higher education. As such, AEO has established standards for prequalification of energy services firms and maintains a list of those firms that can implement energy savings performance contracts (ESPC) with State agencies. The SSA will also include energy production and cost guarantees pursuant to the Act.

A Memorandum of Understanding for Participation, Arkansas Energy Performance Contracting Program (MOU), was fully executed by and between the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality, Energy Office, and the University of Arkansas System on September 6, 2022. The MOU is attached hereto and provided for reference.

Additionally, the University of Arkansas System, Solar Services Agreement RFP Evaluation Committee (UA Solar Committee), was appointed to review and make recommendations regarding the project. The UA Solar Committee consisted of seven (7) members from across the UA System. That membership reflected a diverse and experienced grouping that appropriately represented all campuses, divisions, and units.

On September 12, 2022, a Request for Proposals-Solar Services (RFP) was released to all eighteen (18) pre-qualified ESPC firms for the project. On November 7, 2022, five (5) firms submitted timely and fully responsive proposals. After review by the UA Solar Committee, three (3) responding ESPC firms were invited for interviews to be conducted on November 30, 2022.

2404 North University Avenue / Little Rock, Arkansas 72207-3608 / 501-686-2505

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville / University of Arkansas at Little Rock / University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences / University of Arkansas at Monticello / Division of Agriculture / Criminal Justice Institute
Arkansas Archeological Survey / Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas / University of Arkansas Community College at Hope - Texarkana
University of Arkansas Community College at Batesville / Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas
University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton / University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
University of Arkansas - Pulaski Technical College / University of Arkansas Community College at Rich Mountain
Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences and the Arts / University of Arkansas Clinton School of Public Service / University of Arkansas System eVersity

Board of Trustees
Page 2
April 12, 2023

With participation of AEO, the UA Solar Committee conducted interviews and, at the conclusion, officially recommended Scenic Hill Solar be awarded the project as the most qualified ESPC firm offering the lowest cost for this project. Pursuant to that selection, a letter of Intent to Award was issued on December 5, 2022. Thereafter, the UA System engaged in contract negotiations with Scenic Hill Solar with the goal of a contract to be issued by the University of Arkansas System to Scenic Hill Solar.

The negotiations, legal review, and approval of the SSA have been led and conducted by the UA System General Counsel along with participation of Vice President Chris Thomason and with the assistance of a consultant engaged through the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville campus. Under the terms of the SSA, Scenic Hill Solar will provide all capital costs, design, permitting, installation, utility interconnection, operations, and maintenance of the solar arrays and provide energy as a service to the University of Arkansas System. Over the 25-year term of the agreement, the UA System, through its participating campuses, divisions, and units, would purchase from Scenic Hill Solar the entire output of the arrays at the specified, fixed rates for the energy generated. Scenic Hill Solar in turn guarantees a minimum annual energy production from the arrays for purchase by the UA System. Based on reasonably projected utility rate increases, the SSA is expected to maintain positive cash flow each year over the life of the agreement. The SSA will provide purchase/buy-out provisions for the solar arrays at the discretion of both the UA System and Scenic Hill Solar. With approval of the APSC, this project will provide energy cost savings to most of the UA System campuses, divisions, and units. Cumulative savings over the life of SSA are estimated to total \$149,310,202.00.

I concur with Vice President Thomason's recommendation that the UA System execute the SSA with Scenic Hill Solar and have attached a resolution for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald R. Bobbitt", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Donald R. Bobbitt
President
Charles E. Scharlau Presidential Leadership Chair

Attachments

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS THAT the President is authorized to enter into a Solar Services Agreement with Scenic Hill Solar providing for Scenic Hill Solar to develop and own solar photovoltaic facilities to be located on multiple sites that will be acquired by Scenic Hill Solar and on properties owned by the Board of Trustees, and further providing for the purchase of electricity produced by such facilities at fixed rates for no less than 25 years for the benefit of multiple campuses, all on terms and conditions approved by the General Counsel.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS THAT the President is authorized to enter into such leases of University property and to execute such other documents as required to implement this resolution.

CAPITAL PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM

Campus – SYSTEM

Name of Proposed Facility:
System Wide Solar Net-metering

1. Project Function

- a. To provide substantial utility cost reductions to most of the UA System campuses, divisions and units.
- b. The project will consist of multiple photovoltaic solar arrays in up to 13 utility provider service areas, providing up to 74 megawatts of electrical energy. Arrays will be constructed on a combination of vendor owned or leased land, and land owned by the Board of Trustees.
- c. The electricity produced will be credited, through net-metering, to the cost of electricity provided by the regulated utilities to specified UA System locations.

2. Facility Location & Description

- a. An on-premises array is proposed for the University of Arkansas-Pulaski Technical College North Little Rock campus. It is anticipated that all other arrays will be located on either property owned by the Board of Trustees, or property owned or controlled by Scenic Hill Solar. These properties are located across the state.

3. Total Project Cost

- a. UA System campuses, divisions and units will pay for the electricity produced at rates that will vary among utility service areas. After at least 40 megawatts of capacity has been approved by the Public Service Commission, each campus, unit and division will pay \$.0395 per kilowatt hour.
- b. Through net-metering participating campuses, divisions and units will be eligible to apply the volume of purchased power to reduce the amount paid to the regulated utilities.
- c. It is anticipated that if all the proposed facilities receive PSC approval savings will total over \$149,000,000 over the 25-year life of the proposed contract.
- d. The developer, Scenic Hill Solar, has committed to pay all costs associated with planning, development and construction.

4. Parking Plan to Support New or Expanded Facility

Not applicable.

5. Source of Project Funds

- a. No University funds are required to fund the project.

**Memorandum of Understanding for Participation
Arkansas Energy Performance Contracting Program**



ARKANSAS
ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT

Department of Energy and Environment
Arkansas Division of Environmental Quality – Office of Energy
5301 Northshore Drive
North Little Rock, Arkansas 72118-5317
501-682-0744
www.adeq.state.ar.us/energy

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) is made this day of September in the year 2022 between the State of Arkansas, acting by and through the Arkansas Department of Energy and Environment, Division of Environmental Quality – Office of Energy, hereinafter called AEO, and the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas, hereinafter called the Owner.

WHEREAS, in 2013 the 89th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas amended the Guaranteed Energy Cost Savings Act, A.C.A. § 19-11-1201, with Act 554 that required the AEO to establish rules that set standards and govern the process in which state agencies engage Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) who pursue guaranteed energy cost savings contracts, also known as energy performance contracts (EPCs);

WHEREAS, in 2015 the 90th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas enacted the Local Government Energy Efficiency Project Bond Act, A.C.A. § 14-164-821, with Act 1275 that allowed local governments to pursue EPCs through the Arkansas Energy Performance Contracting (AEPC) Program;

WHEREAS, in 2019 the 92nd General Assembly of the State of Arkansas amended the Guaranteed Energy Cost Savings Act, A.C.A. § 19-11-1201, with Act 507 that allowed school districts to pursue EPCs through the Arkansas Energy Performance Contracting (AEPC) Program;

WHEREAS, AEO used a state-approved process to certify Qualified Providers (pre-qualified ESCOs) to provide energy performance contracting services for AEPC Program participants; and

WHEREAS, AEO is authorized to establish and collect a reasonable fee to cover the costs of administering the AEPC Program (Arkansas Code 19-11-1207.2); and

NOW, THEREFORE, it is agreed that:

- 1. Purpose of MOU.** The purpose of this MOU is to provide the Owner access to the services and support provided under the AEPC Program to assist in the development and implementation of EPC projects and to encourage the Owner to follow, adhere to, and benefit from the guidelines of the program.
- 2. Term of MOU.** This MOU becomes effective on the date which both the Director or authorized designee of AEO and the Director, or authorized representative, for the Owner have signed it. This MOU may be terminated by either party without cause upon 30 days written notice.
- 3. Consideration.** In consideration for the services rendered by the AEO under this MOU, the Owner shall engage in a good faith effort to reduce its energy and water consumption through participation in the AEPC Program and follow and generally adhere to its guidelines, rules, and provisions, herein.
- 4. Responsibilities of Owner.** The responsibilities of the Owner include, but are not necessarily limited to:
 - a. Agree to program participation by executing this MOU and engage the AEPC Program for assistance in project development;
 - b. Comply with the applicable procedures, rules and responsibilities outlined in the AEPC Policies & Procedures and Program Manual;

- c. Select one or more Energy Service Companies (ESCO) from the AEPC Pre-Qualified ESCOs list, using a secondary selection process that fulfills all applicable procurement laws, rules and policies;
- d. Use/execute the AEPC contracts, modified in collaboration with AEO, with the selected ESCO(s);
- e. Assign members to the Owner's project team which may include operations, maintenance, financial and upper management personnel;
- f. Ensure appropriate personnel attend project development meetings dependent upon the subject matter to be discussed;
- g. Provide access and escort to Owner's property and buildings under reasonable conditions;
- h. Provide information as needed for a feasibility study, if performed, the Investment Grade Audit, and other project development activities;
- i. Work with selected ESCO to develop/refine project parameters;
- j. Review/approve the ESCO's proposals, designs, and reports in a timely manner;
- k. Ensure recommendations of the AEPC Program during reviews are addressed to the extent that such recommendations are reasonable;
- l. Make arrangements for project funding/financing, as necessary, and with the assistance and upon the advice of legal counsel, execute appropriate financing and EPC contracts,
- m. Provide project management, as necessary;
- n. Make payments for ESCO services per contract terms;
- o. Authorize payment of the AEO Administration Fee. This fee may be financed as part of the project costs and is payable by the ESCO after EPC contract signing, per the AEPC Policies & Procedures, Program Manual and AEPC EPC Schedule Q; and
- p. Provide information to AEO as needed for project results tracking.

5. Responsibilities of AEO. The responsibilities of the AEO, and its designees, include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- a. Actively educate potential participants about the benefits and implementation of energy performance contracts;
- b. Help Owner through AEPC selection process by assisting with Request for Proposals process;
- c. Help Owner develop and initiate an energy performance contracting project;
- d. Review both Investment Grade Audit Report and Energy Performance Contract Proposal for accuracy and to ensure best value for Owner.
- e. Facilitate the performance contracting process to help ensure commitments are met by both the Owner and the ESCO,
- f. Provide technical guidance to the Owner and attend on-site meetings between the Owner and ESCO, as needed and subject to availability;
- g. Review measurement and verification reports;
- h. Monitor project implementation; and
- i. Identify solutions to mediate any conflicts between Owner and ESCO.

6. This MOU is not intended to create, nor will this MOU ever be construed or interpreted as creating, a binding and legally enforceable contract between the parties. There will be no legal or equitable remedies available to either party in the event either party fails to fully comply with the provisions of this MOU. The sole remedy for the failure of a party to fully comply with the provisions of this MOU will be termination of this MOU. The Owner acknowledges and agrees that AEO's services may include advice

and recommendations, but all decisions in connection with the Owner's EPC participation shall be the responsibility of and made by the Owner, its agents and contractors.

7. Signatures. In witness thereof, the parties to this MOU, either personally or through their duly authorized representatives, have executed this MOU on the days and dates set out below, and certify that they have read, understood, and agreed to the terms and conditions of this MOU.

STATE OF ARKANSAS

Acting by and through the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality – Energy Office

Jeremiah Herman

Name (print)

[Signature]
Signature

9/6/2022
Date

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

Dr. Donald R. Bobbitt, President

Name (print)

[Signature]
Signature

9/6/2022
Date

AEPC Program – Contact Information Sheet

Primary Contact at Owner

Name: Chris Thomason
Title: Vice President for Planning and Development
E-mail: cthomason@uasys.edu
Phone: 501-686-2940
Address: 2404 North University
Little Rock, AR 72207

Project Information

Name/location of buildings/facilities included in your project:

Potentially each of 19 campuses, units and divisions of the University of Arkansas System, including facilities in Fayetteville, Fort Smith, Mena, DeQueen, Nashville, Lockesburg, Ashdown, Texarkana, Little Rock, Monticello, Morrilton, DeWitt, Crossett, McGehee, Stuttgart, Helena-West Helena, Pine Bluff and Batesville.

Please list potential improvements related to your performance contract:

Solar power generation and net-metering.

UofA
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS SYSTEM

Office of the President

April 19, 2023

TO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

Dear Trustees:

In May of 2020, the Board approved the University of Arkansas at Little Rock's Academic Restructuring Plan and Academic Planning Retrenchment Proposal recommended by UALR Chancellor Christina Drale. In the retrenchment proposal, Dr. Drale advised that after a certain period of time, specific programs should be reviewed again to determine program viability. The attached "Academic Planning Retrenchment Recommendations Based on Follow Up of 2020 Retrenchment Proposal" details the reviewed programs.

UALR Chancellor Drale will be available at the meeting to discuss this further and answer any questions. I recommend approval. A proposed resolution for your consideration follows.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS THAT the Academic Planning Retrenchment
Proposal of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock presented by Chancellor
Christina Drale and recommended by President Donald R. Bobbitt on
April 19, 2023, pursuant to Board Policy 405.5, is hereby approved as
presented.

Sincerely,



Donald R. Bobbitt
President
Charles E. Scharlau Presidential Leadership Chair

Attachment

2404 North University Avenue / Little Rock, Arkansas 72207-3608 / 501-686-2505

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville / University of Arkansas at Little Rock / University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences / University of Arkansas at Monticello / Division of Agriculture / Criminal Justice Institute
Arkansas Archeological Survey / Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas / University of Arkansas Community College at Hope-Texarkana
University of Arkansas Community College at Batesville / Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas
University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton / University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
University of Arkansas – Pulaski Technical College / University of Arkansas Community College at Rich Mountain
Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences and the Arts / University of Arkansas Clinton School of Public Service / University of Arkansas Grantham

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

**ACADEMIC PLANNING RETRENCHMENT
RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON FOLLOW UP OF 2020 RETRENCHMENT PROPOSAL**

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Christina S. Drale, Chancellor

March 27, 2023

On May 4, 2020, I submitted a proposal for academic planning retrenchment that was ultimately recommended by University of Arkansas President Bobbitt and approved by the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees. In addition to recommending retrenchment in several areas, I recommended that specific programs be reviewed after a period of time to determine if further action is required. I have now reviewed the programs listed below and make the following recommendations.

- CP in Applied Art/Design
- MA in Art
- MA in Public History
- BA in French (World Languages-French and French Education Tracks)
- GC in Business and Professional Writing
- BS in Environmental Health Sciences
- MS in Health Education/Promotion
- MS Sport Management
- Engineering degrees following restructuring

Reviewed with no further action required-enrollment has grown.
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MA in Public History• Engineering degrees following restructuring (Mechanical, Electrical and Computer Engineering degrees) |
|--|

Deleted or in the process of being deleted through curricular change process with appropriate teach out protocols. No further action is required.

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MA in Art• BS in Environmental Health Sciences |
|---|

The following programs will be reviewed for viability in two years and may be modified through the curriculum change process. These are fully embedded programs.
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CP in Applied Art/Design• GC in Business and Professional Writing |
|--|

The following programs currently meet threshold metrics, but will be reviewed for viability in two years. No further action at this time is recommended.
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MS in Health Education/Promotion• MS Sport Management |
|--|

Recommended for Elimination

- BA in French (World Languages-French and French Education Tracks)
-

In 2020, I initially proposed to eliminate French because of a steep decline in student interest and the trend of removing language requirements from most programs. After campus review, I was persuaded to give French a second chance to rebound and improve its viability. That effort has proved unsuccessful and the program enrollment has continued to decline.

The metrics and benchmarks used in this follow up review are the same as those used in the original retrenchment proposal.

I used as a baseline two key indicators: 1) Student FTE (full-time equivalent) to Faculty FTE ratios and 2) SSCHs (student semester credit hours) to Faculty FTE ratios. Using the full-time equivalent metric is preferable to headcounts for faculty or student enrollment because it standardizes the metric for all units. FTE data were provided by our Office of Institutional Research and Analytics (OIRA) using federal IPEDS definitions and rules. Other data considered includes graduation rates and course enrollments as well as qualitative information such as stakeholder feedback.

I adhered to the 2020 benchmark thresholds which were a **Student FTE to Faculty FTE ratio of 12** and a **SSCH to Faculty FTE ratio of 200** as the minimums for retrenchment review. Normally, these ratios are only available at the department level, but since language faculty are distinct, these ratios can be calculated for programs within the Department of World Languages. These threshold levels are about 15-20% below what I believe the average would need to be to maintain minimal institutional sustainability. We are currently at an institutional student-faculty ratio of 13; I believe we need to be at a minimum of 14, and should work towards a goal of 16. The average ratio of other four-year public institutions in the state is between 16 to 17. By setting the threshold below the minimum sustainability level, it allows for reasonable consideration of departments that necessarily have small class sizes such as those in the arts and most labs, as well as departments that necessarily have higher levels of individualized instruction such as those with graduate programs, particularly doctoral programs.

In 2019, the French program was already at a low student-faculty ratio of 8:1 and this year has fallen to a ratio of 7:1. The SSCH ratio was 123:1 in 2019 and in fall of 2022 it fell to 108.5. Class sizes are generally very small. According to the Provost, even though course sections are "stacked" (different classes are combined into one), many still didn't meet the minimum enrollment standards of the university and the department has a pattern of requesting waivers for these low enrollment sections.

	Faculty FTE	Student: Faculty Ratio	SSCH: Faculty Ratio	Majors
Fall 2019	2	8.2	123	14
Fall 2020	2	9.7	146	17
Fall 2021	2	9	135	10
Fall 2022	2	7.2	108.5	10

On February 9, 2023, I notified the campus of my intention to recommend elimination of this program and asked the Provost to implement a review process in compliance with Board Policy 405.5. The

proposal was reviewed by the following groups and individuals that provided written responses to me on March 17, 2023:

- Provost
- Dean of the College of Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education (CHASSE)
- Interim Chair of the Department of World Languages
- Faculty Senate ad hoc committee
- Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Council
- CHASSE Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
- French Faculty
- Spanish Faculty
- CHASSE Assembly

The Provost, Dean, and Interim Chair all recommended elimination on the basis of declining enrollment and viability. The faculty groups all recommended retaining the program for a variety of reasons. Two of those arguments appear to be made on the merits of the program itself.

The faculty groups argue that second language study is an important part of a liberal arts degree. I don't disagree, but as I pointed out in my 2020 report, "without a broader requirement for second language study, any language besides Spanish will be difficult to sustain as a full major." Indeed, since my initial proposal in 2020, three more departments have dropped their second language requirement.

Another argument pointed out the ample number of French companies in Arkansas suggesting that their presence would encourage students to pursue French language study as a career enhancement. I wish this were so, but these companies have been here for a number of years, and I haven't seen any evidence of a positive influence on the study of French. I am unaware of any formal or informal relationship between our French program and French companies in Arkansas.

Other arguments focused on issues outside of the value of the program to our students. The Faculty Senate had concerns about the process, specifically that the review period was too rushed. They also argued that the retrenchment of French would not save enough money to be worth it, particularly in terms of damage to faculty morale. Several groups argued that the French faculty should be given more time because of the pandemic. The French faculty argued that they have plans to turn things around, but have not had time to implement those plans. I note these arguments, but do not find them persuasive in the matter of whether or not this program is sustainable. The arguments about what could be in the future are speculative and not grounded in examples of success in similar contexts.

I think it is fair to say that all of us are distressed by the decline of language study in higher education. The campus feedback demonstrates the strong connection we have to our own language study as individuals and our personal growth and benefit as a result. But since second language study is no longer a general graduation requirement in Arkansas, its survival depends more on demand, utility, and regional cultural presence. Spanish has this advantage, other languages do not. I said in my original proposal that I was concerned that the heartfelt support from faculty would not translate into more students studying French. Unfortunately, that has turned out to be the case.

I am recommending the elimination of the BA in French (World Languages-French and French Education Tracks) and its affiliated faculty members.

U of A
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS SYSTEM

Office of the President

April 14, 2023

TO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

Dear Trustees:

Chancellor Laurence B. Alexander, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, is requesting project approval and selection of design professionals for the Hathaway Howard Fine Arts Center Renovation and Restoration Project. The Fine Arts Center is a 62,914 square foot building that suffered significant damage due to fire, smoke, soot and mold damage. The Capital Project Proposal form is attached for your consideration. This project is being funded with proceeds from insurance claims.

Approval was granted to begin the selection process for design professionals on February 9, 2023. Following the process set out in Board Policy, the campus published a request for qualifications and interviews were conducted. The selection committee and Chancellor Alexander recommend the following firms in order of preference and as indicated on the attached scorecard.

WER Architects
Cromwell Architects
AMR Architects

I concur with Chancellor Alexander's recommendations. A proposed resolution for your consideration follows.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS THAT the Hathaway Howard Fine Arts Center Renovation and Restoration Project at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff as presented to the Board on this date is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff is authorized to select _____ as design professionals for the UAPB Hathaway Howard Fine Arts Center Renovation and Restoration Project.

Sincerely,



Donald R. Bobbitt, President
Charles E. Scharlau Presidential Leadership Chair

Attachments

2404 North University Avenue / Little Rock, Arkansas 72207-3608 / 501-686-2505

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville / University of Arkansas at Little Rock / University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences / University of Arkansas at Monticello/ Division of Agriculture / Criminal Justice Institute
Arkansas Archeological Survey/ Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas / University of Arkansas Community College at Hope-Texarkana
University of Arkansas Community College at Batesville / Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas
University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton / University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
University of Arkansas – Pulaski Technical College / University of Arkansas Community College at Rich Mountain
Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences and the Arts / University of Arkansas Clinton School of Public Service / University of Arkansas Grantham

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

CAPITAL PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM

Campus: University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

Name of Proposed Facility: Hathaway Howard Fine Arts Building

1. Proposed function of project. If the proposed project is new construction, describe this project's role in the campus master building plan.
 - The Hathaway-Howard Fine Arts Center is a 62,914 square foot building that suffered significant damage due to fire, smoke, soot, and mold damage. The project calls for professional vendors to renovate and restore the Fine Arts Center including the auditorium, multimedia offices and classrooms, the band room and classrooms in the art department, and all other areas that were impacted.
2. Proposed facility location & description (attach map).
3. Total estimated project cost, including construction and design, land acquisition, and fixtures.
 - The project is projected to cost \$4,800,000.00 for construction and \$100,000.00 for design.
4. Total estimated cost of furnishings.
 - The cost of the furnishings has not been determined.
5. Estimated time to substantial completion.
 - This restoration of the project is estimated to take 3-4 months.
6. Parking plan to support new or expanded facility.
 - Existing parking will be used for the building.
7. If this project will be phased, or is part of a phased, or multi-step, project, describe each proposed phase, the estimated timeline for subsequent phases, and the estimated cost of each phase.
 - We anticipate that the entire project will be completed in one phase.
8. Source of project funds. Where borrowing is proposed, include an estimated cost of financing.
 - The funds to restore the building will come from insurance. The university will not borrow funds for this project.

10.2013

Design Services Selection

As ranked by committee

PROJECT	Design Professional Service-Fine Arts Center	INTERVIEW DATE	4/6/2023
---------	--	----------------	----------

RANKING OF APPLICANTS

Selection Committee Member	A	B	C	D	E	F	G							Total
AMR Architects	4	3	2											9
Cromwell Architects	2	2	3											7
Jimmie Tucker Architects	3	4	4											11
WER Architects	1	1	1											3

Design Teams are ranked from 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest.

FINAL RANKING

Preferred / Recommended to Board of Trustees in the order shown

1	WER Architects
2	Cromwell Architects
3	AMR Architects

Eligible / Considered to be qualified, but less suited to the requirements of this job

4	Jimmie Tucker Architects

SELECTION COMMITTEE

By title

Associate Vice Chancellor -Finance and Administration
 Interim Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 Director of Facilities