



Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	190239	Award Date	6/24/2022 4:04 PM CDT
Solicitation Title	Hillsboro Water Line Upgrades (A&E)		
Buyer Name	Brad Wall	Buyer Email	brad.wall@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Evans Cline	BAO Email	evans.cline@nashville.gov

Awarded Supplier(s)

In reference to the above solicitation and contingent upon successful contract negotiation, it is the intent of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County to award to the following supplier(s):

Company Name	CDM Smith	Company Contact	Zack Daniel	
Street Address	210 25th Avenue North			
City	Nashville	State	TN	Zipcode 37203

Company Name		Company Contact		
Street Address				
City		State		Zipcode

Company Name		Company Contact		
Street Address				
City		State		Zipcode

Certificate of Insurance

The awarded supplier(s) must submit a certificate of insurance (COI) indicating all applicable coverage required by the referenced solicitation. The COI should be emailed to the referenced buyer no more than 15 days after the referenced award date.

Equal Business Opportunity Program

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) must submit a signed copy of the letter of intent to perform for any and all minority-owned (MBE) or woman-owned (WBE) subcontractors included in the solicitation response. The letter(s) should be emailed to the referenced business assistance office (BAO) rep no more than two business days after the referenced award date.

Yes, the EBO Program is applicable.

No, the EBO Program is not applicable.

Monthly Reporting

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) will be required monthly to submit evidence of participation and payment to all small (SBE), minority-owned (MBE), women-owned (WBE), LGBT-owned (LGBTBE), and service disabled veteran owned (SDV) subcontractors. Sufficient evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to copies of subcontracts, purchase orders, applications for payment, invoices, and cancelled checks.

Questions related to contract compliance may be directed to the referenced BAO rep.

Yes, monthly reporting is applicable.

No, monthly reporting is not applicable.

Public Information and Records Retention

Solicitation and award documentation are available upon request. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

Right to Protest

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.

Mdl Supervisor (Initial)

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

RFQ #190239 - Hillsboro Water Line Upgrades (A&E)					
	CDM Smith	Gresham Smith	HDR Engineering Inc.	Orchard, Hiltz & McCliment, Inc. dba OHM Advisors	Smith Seckman Reid Inc.
Contract Acceptance	Accepted Metro's standard contract without exceptions	Accepted Metro's standard contract without exceptions	Accepted Metro's standard contract without exceptions	Accepted Metro's standard contract without exceptions	Accepted Metro's standard contract without exceptions
Company Information and Capacity to Perform (10 Points)	10.00	8.00	7.00	5.00	7.00
Team Qualifications and Experience (15 Points)	15.00	12.00	13.00	10.00	12.00
Firm Qualifications and Experience (35 Points)	32.00	32.00	28.00	20.00	30.00
Project Approach and Schedule (40 Points)	33.00	36.00	29.00	24.00	35.00
Total (100 Points)	90.00	88.00	77.00	59.00	84.00

CDM Smith

Strengths - The offeror's design team demonstrated the largest volume of survey and design footage. The offeror provided a detailed description of their firm's quality assurance via client surveys and discussion of employee safety throughout all levels of their team. When prioritizing work for Metro, the offeror provided a tangible example of their utilization program and how they would manage team member time. The offeror's resumes demonstrated that the team has applicable experience on multiple large diameter transmission mains. The offeror's resumes demonstrated detailed information for all three phases survey, design, and CEI. The offeror listed numerous project collaborations with their proposed subcontractors. The offeror's org chart clearly differentiated prime and subconsultant team members. The offeror presented detailed project experience to demonstrate why they are the most qualified and best choice to be awarded with the resulting contract. The offerors reference projects were of similar size and scope as to what Metro is seeking to procure in the resulting contract. Provided a clear, well organized, and detailed narrative and understanding of project tasks and management. Efficient use of resources and project QA/QC was exemplary.

Weaknesses - Compared to other proposals, the offeror's knowledge and experience with the designing and installing water mains lacked some detail. None of the reference projects demonstrated the design costs. The offeror's Project Gantt chart did not use the appropriate notice to proceed (NTP) date and proposed second longest project delivery. Examples of previous projects with similar challenges and risks were lacking compared to other proposals. Examples and mitigation of risks and construction impacts were lacking compared to other proposals.

Gresham Smith

Strengths - The offeror's proposal in the company information and capacity to perform section generally provided the requested information with a very specific structure. The offeror's org chart clearly differentiated prime and subconsultant team members. The offeror presented detailed information on why they are the most qualified and best choice to be awarded with the resulting contract. The offeror presented detailed information on their knowledge and experience with designing and installing water mains. The offeror provided a well-organized and detailed narrative and understanding of project tasks and management. Examples of previous projects with similar challenges and risks were exemplary. Examples and mitigation of risks and construction impacts were exemplary. Efficient use of resources and project QA/QC was satisfactory. Project Gantt chart was satisfactory and proposed fastest project delivery.

Weaknesses - The offeror's volume of work was less than other proposers and the offeror listed a combined footage rather than differentiated between survey and design work as requested. The offeror's description of their quality assurance/safety/errors and omissions (E&O) record lacked detail in comparison to other proposals submitted. Compared to other proposals, project experience highlighted for some key team members not as applicable to what Metro is seeking in the resulting contract. The offeror's response to the team qualifications and experience section was more generic than other proposals submitted. The offeror listed few project collaborations with their proposed subconsultants. Some of the offeror's reference projects were less similar in size and scope as to what Metro is seeking to procure in the resulting contract. The flow charts (Figure D-1 and D-2) provided in the project management process were difficult to interpret. The schedule and resource management section lacked detail.

HDR Engineering Inc.

Strengths - The offeror's proposal in the company information and capacity to perform section generally provided the requested information. The offeror has experience with multiple comparable large diameter transmission mains. The offeror provided detailed information pertaining to their proposed subcontractors. The offeror listed numerous project collaborations with their proposed subcontractors.

Weaknesses - The offeror's description of their liquidated damage assessments were vague and provided a lack of transparency when compared to other proposals submitted. The offeror's volume of work was less than other proposers and the projects surveyed and designed may not reflect an adequate capacity to perform. The offeror's description of their quality assurance/safety/errors and omissions (E&O) record lacked detail in comparison to other proposals submitted. The workload/availability chart was difficult to interpret and was unclear. The offeror's response to the team qualifications and experience section was more generic than other proposals submitted. Based on the resumes, the offeror's experience in construction inspection was lacking compared to other proposals. The offeror's knowledge and experience with the designing and installing water mains lacked specific detail. The offeror's reference projects were less similar in size and scope as to what Metro is seeking to procure in the resulting contract. The offeror's narrative and understanding of project tasks and management was generic/not project specific. Examples of previous projects with similar challenges and risks were lacking compared to other proposals. Examples and mitigation of risks and construction impacts were lacking compared to other proposals. The efficient use of resources and project QA/QC was not discussed in sufficient detail. The offeror's Project Gantt chart did not use the appropriate notice to proceed (NTP) date.

Orchard, Hiltz & McCliment, Inc. dba OHM Advisors

Strengths - The offeror's proposal in the company information and capacity to perform section provided some of the requested information. The offeror's CEI team well qualified relative to other firms. The offeror provided a detailed discussion of community engagement.

Weaknesses - The offeror's volume of work for water main survey and design was vague and the limited number of projects presented appeared inconsistent. The offeror failed to provide a description on how work will be prioritized for Metro given current projects. The offeror's description of their quality assurance/safety/errors and omissions (E&O) record lacked detail and organization in comparison to other proposals submitted. The offeror's response to the team qualifications and experience section was more generic than other proposals submitted. Based on the resumes, the offeror's design experience was lacking compared to other proposals. The offeror didn't specifically address why they are the most qualified firm and best choice to be awarded with the resulting contract. The offeror's knowledge and experience with the designing and installing water mains lacked specific detail. The offeror's reference projects were not presented in a clear and concise manner for Metro to determine if the projects were of similar scope to what Metro is seeking to procure in the resulting contract. The offeror's narrative and understanding of project tasks and management was generic/not project specific. Examples of previous projects with similar challenges and risks were minimal compared to other proposals. Work in limited access and environmentally sensitive areas were not discussed by the offeror. Examples and mitigation of risks and construction impacts were minimal compared to other proposals. The efficient use of resources and project QA/QC was not discussed in sufficient detail. The offeror's Project Gantt chart did not use the appropriate notice to proceed (NTP) date and proposed the longest project delivery.

Smith Seckman Reid Inc.

Strengths - The offeror's proposal in the company information and capacity to perform section generally provided the requested information and a transparent response for liquidated damage assessments/claims. The offeror presented detailed information and specific roles for each subcontractor, including benefits to MWS. The offeror's org chart differentiated prime and subconsultant team members. The offeror presented detailed information on why they are the most qualified and best choice to be awarded with the resulting contract. The offeror's reference projects were of similar size and scope as to what Metro is seeking to procure in the resulting contract. Examples of previous projects with similar challenges and risks were sufficient. Efficient use of resources and project QA/QC was sufficient. Project Gantt chart submitted was above average.

Weaknesses - The offeror listed a combined footage rather than differentiated between survey and design work as requested. The offeror's description of their quality assurance/safety/errors and omissions (E&O) record lacked detail in comparison to other proposals submitted. The offeror's description of how work would be prioritized for Metro was vague and generic. Based on the resumes submitted, the team members listed projects not as comparable as other proposers; specifically, listing mostly pump stations, treatment plants, and reservoirs. The offeror's knowledge of surveying and designing water mains lacked detail. For their reference projects, the offeror failed to provide information regarding the final design and construction costs after change orders. The offeror's narrative and understanding of project tasks and management lacked detail compared to other proposals. Examples of construction impacts were lacking compared to other proposals.



Statement of M/WBE Utilization **A&E ONLY**

Proposer's/Firm's Name: CDM Smith Inc.	Proposer's Phone #: 615.340.6539
Solicitation Title: Hillsboro Water Line Upgrades	Proposer's Email Address: danielza@cdmsmith.com
Solicitation #: 190239	Total Bid Amount: To be determined at negotiation
EBO Goal (%) : <u>5.00</u> MBE% <u>4.00</u> WBE%	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) Yes

The following MWBE* subcontractor(s)/supplier(s) will be utilized for the performance of this project:

#	MBE/WBE Firm Name	MBE/WBE Firm Address	Phone/E-Mail	Certificate Type (MBE or WBE)	* MBE/WBE Group Type *	Code # UNSPS/NAICS	Description of Work
1	7NT Engineering	600 Superior Ave. East, Cleveland, OH 44114	614.961.2026	MBE	1	8110	Geotechnical Design
2	Burch Transportation, LLC	901 Woodland Street, Nashville, TN 37206	615.258.8551	WBE	5	8110	Traffic Control Planning/Design
3				Select	Select		
4				Select	Select		
5				Select	Select		
6				Select	Select		
7				Select	Select		

I am the duly authorized representative and certify the facts and representations contained in this form and supporting documents are true and correct.

Authorized Representative (Printed Name/Title/Signature) Zack Daniel, PE/Vice President	Date 03/12/2022
--	--------------------

*Note: MWBE is defined as business enterprise maintaining a significant business presence in the Program Area & performing a commercial useful function that is owned by one or more of the following: (1) African Americans (2) Native Americans, (3) Hispanic Americans, (4) Asian Americans, and (5) Women.

Has Prime Complied with EBO Goal?	Yes	For Internal Office Use ONLY If No, Good Faith Efforts Met?	BAO Only
-----------------------------------	-----	---	----------

BAO Representative: Evans Cline

BAO Notes:

Prime acknowledges they can achieve both M/WBE subcontracting goals. Consistent with the procurement code, actual dollar amounts and percentages will confirmed during contract negotiations.

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Evans Cline
Contract Specialist: Brad Wall
Date: 6/15/22
Department Name: Water
RFP/ITB Number: 190239

Project Name: Hillsboro Water Line Upgrades (A&E)

SBE/SDV Requirement Acknowledged?		
Primary Contractor	SBE/SDV Requirement Acknowledged?	Comments
CDM Smith	Yes	Proposer acknowledged the 13% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. The prime is not an approved SBE and proposed the engagement of SBE firms Lamar Dunn and Associates, 7NT, and Burch Transportation.