



Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	345249	Award Date	8/10/2023 3:40 PM CDT
Solicitation Title	Program Management for the Implementation of the East Bank Vision Plan		
Buyer Name	Scott Ferguson	Buyer Email	scott.ferguson@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Sierra Washington	BAO Email	sierra.washington@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	HDR Engineering Inc.	Company Contact	Brian Trotter	
Street Address	120 Brentwood Commons Way, Suite 525			
City	Brentwood	State	TN	Zipcode 37027
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 (I) *Michelle A. Hernandez Lane*

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

8/10/2023 | 3:42 PM CDT

RFQ# 345249 - Program Management for the Implementation of the Imagine East Bank Vision Plan								
Evaluation Criteria	AECOM Technical Services, Inc	CONSOR Engineers, LLC	Cummings Management Group, Inc	Gardiner & Theobald	GRESHAM SMITH	HDR Engineering Inc	Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc	Lamar Dunn & Associates, Inc
Round 1								
Solicitation Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Contract Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, with exceptions	Yes	Yes	Yes, with	Yes
ISA Questionnaire Completed and Terms Accepted	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)	22	23	18	18	23	24	21	23
Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)	27	26	23	22	28	32	29	30
Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)	34	33	30	32	31	37	31	31
Round 1 Totals	83	82	71	72	82	93	81	84

Strength & Weaknesses

AECOM Technical Services, Inc

Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the scope of work requirements. Q#5 - Firm did not adequately identify how they will assist Metro in managing risks for the Program as well as any regulatory compliance.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not adequately clearly define the organizational structure in chart form and highlight all key team members and key subconsultants. Q#2 -Firm's percentages of availability for all key team members not adequate for who will be working on the Program. Q#3 - Firm did not adequately document the qualifications for their team to provide the services identified in the scope of services, highlight any key subconsultants and document which parts of the scope of services they will

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not identify a minimum of five (5) programs of similar scope and size for which the Proposer has provided program management services following the outline of the Scope of Services.

CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#6 - Firm did not adequately document the ability of the Proposer to provide full staffing and ensure a seamless transition to comply with Program requirements for all active projects upon contract execution.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#3 - Firm did not adequately document the qualifications for their team to provide the services identified in the scope of services, highlight any key subconsultants and document which parts of the scope of services they will complete. Q#4 - Firm did not adequately document the experience of key team members in performing program management services, particularly for programs of a similar scope and scale.

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not identify a minimum of five (5) programs of similar scope and size for which the Proposer has provided program management services following the outline of the Scope of Services.

Cummings Management Group, Inc

Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the scope of work requirements. Q#2 - Firm did not adequately describe their approach in meeting the requirements of the Program and how they will ensure that projects will comply with the provisions of the plan. Q#3 - Firm did not adequately detail their approach to controls management and how they will manager the programs schedule and budget and ensure the program can be successfully audited. #Q4 - Firm did not adequately describe about they you will assist Metro in modifying the program as needed based on publicly funded project determinations, private developer projects, regulatory changes, results from updated Program objectives and the results of performance for completed projects.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#2 -Firm's percentages of availability for all key team members not adequate for who will be working on the Program. Q#3 - Firm did not adequately document the qualifications for their team to provide the services identified in the scope of services, highlight any key subconsultants and document which parts of the scope of services they will complete. Q#4 - Firm did not adequately document the experience of key team members in performing program management services, particularly for programs of a similar scope and scale.

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not identify a minimum of five (5) programs of similar scope and size for which the Proposer has provided program management services following the outline of the Scope of Services.

Gardiner & Theobald**Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)**

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Firm's response exceeded page count. Q#1 - Firm did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the scope of work requirements. Q#2 - Firm did not adequately describe their approach in meeting the requirements of the Program and how they will ensure that projects will comply with the provisions of the plan. Q#6 - Firm did not adequately document the ability of the Proposer to provide full staffing and ensure a seamless transition to comply with Program requirements for all active projects upon contract execution.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Firm's response exceeded page count. Q#1 - Firm did not adequately clearly define the organizational structure in chart form and highlight all key team members and key subconsultants. Q#4 - Firm did not adequately document the experience of key team members in performing program management services, particularly for programs of a similar scope and scale.

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not identify a minimum of five (5) programs of similar scope and size for which the Proposer has provided program management services following the outline of the Scope of Services. Q#3 - Firm did not provide enough details for the scope of services provided under each program by the Proposer.

GRESHAM SMITH**Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)**

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#2 - Firm did not adequately describe their approach in meeting the requirements of the Program and how they will ensure that projects will comply with the provisions of the plan. Q#6 - Firm did not adequately document the ability of the Proposer to provide full staffing and ensure a seamless transition to comply with Program requirements for all active projects upon contract execution.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not adequately clearly define the organizational structure in chart form and highlight all key team members and key subconsultants. Q#2 - Firm's percentages of availability for all key team members not adequate for who will be working on the Program. Q#3 - Firm did not adequately document the qualifications for their team to provide the services identified in the scope of services, highlight any key subconsultants and document which parts of the scope of services they will complete. Q#4 - Firm did not adequately document the experience of key team members in performing program management services, particularly for programs of a similar scope and scale.

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not identify a minimum of five (5) programs of similar scope and size for which the Proposer has provided program management services following the outline of the Scope of Services. Q#2 - Firm had some details missing from the cited programs.

HDR Engineering Inc**Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)**

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below. Q#2 - Firm described in detail their approach in meeting the requirements of the Program and how they will ensure that projects will comply with the provisions of the plan.

Weaknesses Q#6 - Firm did not adequately document the ability of the Proposer to provide full staffing and ensure a seamless transition to comply with Program requirements for all active projects upon contract execution.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#2 - Firm's percentages of availability for all key team members not adequate for who will be working on the Program. Q#4 - Firm did not adequately identify the anticipated level of effort for the tasks identified in the scope of services and document the capacity of the proposed team to meet the requirements within the duration allowed under the Plan.

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#3 - Firm did not provide enough details for the scope of services provided under each program by the Proposer.

Jones Lang LasSalle Americas, Inc

Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the scope of work requirements. Q#2 - Firm did not adequately describe their approach in meeting the requirements of the Program and how they will ensure that projects will comply with the provisions of the plan.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not adequately clearly define the organizational structure in chart form and highlight all key team members and key subconsultants. Q#2 -Firm's percentages of availability for all key team members not adequate for who will be working on the Program. Q#3 - Firm did not adequately document the qualifications for their team to provide the services identified in the scope of services, highlight any key subconsultants and document which parts of the scope of services they will complete. Q#4 - Firm did not adequately document the experience of key team members in performing program management services, particularly for programs of a similar scope and scale.

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not identify a minimum of five (5) programs of similar scope and size for which the Proposer has provided program management services following the outline of the Scope of Services. Q#2 - Firm had some details missing from the cited programs.

Lamar Dunn & Associates, Inc

Management Plan and Approach (25 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below. Q#2 - Firm described in detail their approach in meeting the requirements of the Program and how they will ensure that projects will

Weaknesses Q#6 - Firm did not adequately document the ability of the Proposer to provide full staffing and ensure a seamless transition to comply with Program requirements for all active projects upon contract execution.

Team Structure, Qualifications and Capacity to Perform (35 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below. Q#2 - Firm described in detail their approach in meeting the requirements of the Program and how they will ensure that projects will comply with the provisions of the plan.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not adequately clearly define the organizational structure in chart form and highlight all key team members and key subconsultants. Q#2 -Firm's percentages of availability for all key team members not adequate for who will be woQ#2 -Firm's percentages of availability for all key team members not adequate for who will be working on the Program. Q#3 - Firm did not adequately document the qualifications for their team to provide the services identified in the scope of services, highlight any key subconsultants and document which parts of the scope of services they will complete.

Relevant Project Experience (40 Points)

Strengths Firm's response addressed everything we requested in the RFP except for the weaknesses noted below.

Weaknesses Q#1 - Firm did not identify a minimum of five (5) programs of similar scope and size for which the Proposer has provided program management services following the outline of the Scope of Services. Q#2 - Firm had some details missing from the cited programs.

Ferguson, Scott (Finance)

From: Washington, Sierra (Finance)
Sent: Wednesday, August 9, 2023 2:09 PM
To: Ferguson, Scott (Finance)
Cc: Frye, Jeremy (Finance); Wood, Christopher (Finance - Procurement)
Subject: 345249 - Program Management for the Implementation of the Imagine East Bank Vision Plan
Attachments: RFQ 345249- Program Management for the Implementation of the East Bank Vision Plan (A&E)- SBE Assessment.pdf; 345249 Program Management for the Implentation of of the Imagine East Bank Vision Plan EBO.pdf

Hi Scott,

Please accept this as my final assessment for the referenced RFQ#. The awardee is compliant with the EBO program having acknowledged the established M/WBE subcontracting goals. The SBE/SDVs have been confirmed. This contract will require B2GNow monitoring. Please see attachments.

Thank you,

Sierra M. Washington
Contract Compliance Officer
Department of Finance -Office of Minority and Women Business Assistance (BAO)
Metropolitan Government
Nashville & Davidson County
(p) [615.880.2783](tel:615.880.2783)



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

Proposer's/Firm's Name: HDR Engineering, Inc.	Proposer's Phone #: 629.228.7515
Solicitation Title: Program Management for the Implementation of the Imagine East Bank Vision Plan	Proposer's Email Address: james.czarnecky@hdrinc.com
Solicitation #: 345249	Total Bid Amount:
EBO Goal (%) : <u>8.00</u> MBE% <u>13</u> WBE%	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) Y

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 LLC	555 Marriott Drive, Suite 315, Nashville, TN 37214	travis.burn@7nteng.com / 502.261.4545	MBE	4	UNSPSC 81000000 UNSPSC 81101703	Utility Coordination
2	ACM Project & Program Managers	525 Avis Drive, Suite 2, Ann Arbor, MI 48108	dk@acmpm.com / 704.517.5438	WBE	5	UNSPSC 80101500 UNSPSC 80101600	PMIS
3	Fairpointe Planning LLC	810 Dominican Drive, Nashville, TN 37228	halli@fairpointeplanning.com / 615.880.1111	MBE	1	UNSPSC 80101500 UNSPSC 80101600	Civic Engagement
4	Wilmot Inc.	3102 West End Avenue, Suite 400, Nashville, TN 37203	twilmot@wilmotinc.com / 615.385.4444	WBE	5	UNSPSC 77101600 UNSPSC 77101601	Program Management
5	Rohadfox Construction Control Services	171 17th Street, NW, Suite 630, Atlanta, GA 30363	shobuz.kbal@rcsc.net / 404.880.1111	Select	1	UNSPSC 81000000 UNSPSC 81101703	Plan Review
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) Brian Trotter	Date 06/01/2023
--	---------------------------

*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 Acknowledged EBO Goals Achievement? Yes	For Internal Office Use ONLY If No, Good Faith Efforts Met?	BAO Only
--	---	-----------------

BAO Representative: Sierra Washington **Metro Buyer:** Scott Ferguson

Project Manager: Ben York **Date:** 08/09/23

BAO Notes:
Prime has acknowledged the established M/WBE goals set by the solicitation, and has acknowledged that they can meet them.

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Sierra Washington

Contract Specialist: Scott Ferguson

Date: 08/09/2023

Department Name: Planning Commission

RFP/ITB Number: 345249

Project Name: Program Management for the Implementation of the East Bank Vision Plan (A&E) (9% SBE/SDV Requirement)

Primary Contractor:	SBE/SDV Requirement Acknowledged	Comments
HDR Engineering, Inc.	Yes	Proposer acknowledged 9% participation requirement of SBE/SDV over life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed to utilize the following SBE subcontractors: Wilmot Inc. for River North Program Management.