



RFQ 792194 – Centralized Building Automation System
Protest of “Intent to Award”

Cost Criteria:

Lee Company received a score of 28 out of a possible 35. Why was the maximum point value not awarded as it was in other categories?

Weaknesses:

- Did not mention current Metro set-up.
 - *Clarification needed from evaluators as to what set-up they are referring to (systems or existing contracts?)*
- Did not mention the ITS environment and how everything will work together.
 - *Lee Company addressed this in the Project Understanding section (p. 2 last paragraph).*
- No history and background in the project and understanding section.
 - *Lee Company addressed background in the Project Understanding section (p. 1)*
 - *Company history was provided in the summary of the Business Plan and Approach section (p. 3)*
- Two of the three references are Metro buildings.
 - *All 3 references noted provided all information required in the Background Reference section of RFQ 792194.*
 - *Please clarify how two out of three references being Metro facilities is viewed as a weakness.*
- The schedule lacked detail and there was no timeline provided.
 - *The timelines were provided in the Metro BAS Proposal document.*
 - *Timelines were provided by facility with duration.*
 - *Project scheduling and facility access was address in the Business Plan and Approach section (p.1, paragraphs 2 & 3).*
- Didn't mention product updates.
 - *Lee Company addressed this in the Business Plan and Approach section (p. 4, paragraphs 4 & 5).*
 - *It was also addressed in the Service and Maintenance section (p. 1, paragraph 6 & 7)*
 - *Also addressed in the Sample Service Agreement*
- Did not mention service and training.
 - *Lee Company addressed in the Business Plan and Approach section (p. 1, paragraph 3), (p. 4, paragraph 3).*
- Didn't mention how they would involve Trane, but are using a Trane product.
 - *Lee Company addressed Trane involvement in the Business Plan and Approach section (p.3, Proposed Solution Section)*