



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

May 13, 2019

Tiffany Dickerson
Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC
225 Polke Avenue STE 100
Nashville, TN 37203
Re: **RFQ# 1131657, Gulch Pedestrian Bridge A&E Consultant**

Dear Ms. Dickerson:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 1131657 for Gulch Pedestrian Bridge A&E Consultant. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC, contingent upon successful contract negotiations. Please provide a certificate of Insurance indicating all applicable coverages within 15 business days of the receipt of this letter.

If the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements were a part of this solicitation, the awardee must forward a signed copy of the "Letter of Intent to Perform as Subcontractor/Subconsultant/Supplier/Joint Venture" for any minority/women-owned business enterprises included in the response to the Business Assistance Office within two business days from this notification.

Additionally the awardee will be required to submit evidence of participation of and contractor's payment to all Small, Minority, and Women Owned Businesses participation in any resultant contract. This evidence shall be submitted monthly and include copies of subcontracts or purchase orders, the Prime Contractor's Application for Payment, or invoices, and cancelled checks or other supporting payment documents. Should you have any questions concerning this requirement, please contact JoeAnn Carr, BAO Representative, at (615) 880-2338 or at joeann.carr@nashville.gov.

Depending on the file sizes, the responses to the procurement solicitation and supporting award documentation can be made available either by email, CD for pickup, or in person for inspection. If you desire to receive or review the documentation or have any questions, please contact Genario Pittman by email at genario.pittman@nashville.gov Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

Thank you for participating in Metro's competitive procurement process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Michelle A. Hernandez Lane".

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane, Purchasing Agent

Cc: Solicitation File, Other Offerors

Pursuant to M.C.L. 4.36.010 Authority to resolve protested solicitations and awards.

A. Right to Protest. 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.

Procurement Division

730 Second Avenue South, Suite 112
P.O. Box 196300
Nashville, Tennessee 37219-6300

www.Nashville.gov
Phone: 615-862-6180
Fax: 615-862-6179



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

**Request for Mayoral Selection of A&E Firm
RFQ 1131657, Gulch Pedestrian Bridge A&E Consultant**

Metro received three (3) proposals for the A&E Review Board to consider. At the conclusion of the Review Board meeting, two of the firms received the same score resulting in a tie for the highest evaluated firms. The Review Board submits for review and selection by the Mayor the three (3) evaluated firms listed below in alphabetical order, accompanied by the Review Board's summary.

While it is acknowledged that the selection is solely that of the Mayor, it is the Review Board's recommendation that **either Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC or WSP USA Inc.** be considered for this project. Please note that WSP USA Inc. was previously awarded the contract for this project; however, the contract expired before the design work was completed by the firm.

- A&E Firm:** Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC *LN*
- Strengths:** Firm provided a detailed description of why their team (prime and sub-consultants) is best suited for the project. Firm provided detailed information identifying the role of the proposed team and the qualifications and experience of the proposed team. Firm provided detailed referenced projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. Firm provided a detailed description of their approach to minimize disruptions to the performance of this project. Firm provided a detailed 3-dimensional modeling approach. Firm provided a detailed explanation of their approach to quality management. Firm provided a detailed description of their policies for ensuring environmentally friendly practices, along with the overall project being completed in an environmentally friendly way.
- Weaknesses:** Firm's organizational chart lacked specific details. Firm's fast track proposal schedule lacked specific details. Firm's Gantt Chart referenced an extended period for construction documents. Firm's proposed Project Manager and Design Coordinator lacked specific details for the organizational capacity.
- MWBE Plan:** Proposer is compliant with the requirements of the Procurement NonDiscrimination Program having engaged in good faith effort outreach to registered, certified MWBEs: Sykes Consulting, Inc.-MBE (Accepted), DF & H Services, PLLC.-WBE (Accepted) and Logan Patri Engineering, Inc.-MBE (Declined).
- SBE/SDV Plan:** Proposer acknowledged 20% participation requirement of SBE/SDV over life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE subcontractors Civil Site Design Group, PLLC, EDGE Planning, Landscape Architecture & Graphic Design, and DF & H Services, PLLC.

A&E Firm: Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Strengths: Firm provided referenced projects of similar size, scope, and complexity.

Weaknesses: Firm's demonstration of sub-consultants relevant experience lacked specific details. Firm failed to provide the actual schedule duration for their referenced projects. Firm failed to provide amounts for referenced projects. Firm's description of their team's organizational structure lacked specific details. Firm's description of their innovative approach that would be used in this project to reduce cost lacked specific details. Firm failed to provide an organizational chart. Firm's description of their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance for this project lacked specific details. Firm's explanation of their approach to quality management for this project lacked specific details. Firm failed to provide their policy for ensuring environmentally friendly practices, along with the overall project being completed in an environmentally friendly way. Firm's explanation of their team's disciplines lacked specific details. Firm's explanation of their team's proposed availability for this project lacked specific details.

MWBE Plan: Proposer is compliant with the requirements of the Procurement NonDiscrimination Program having engaged in good faith effort outreach to registered, certified MWBEs: CIA, Civil Infrastructure Associates, LLC-WBE (Accepted), Connico Inc.-WBE (Accepted) and Varallo Public Relations-WBE (Accepted).

SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged 20% participation requirement of SBE/SDV over life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE subcontractors Connico, Inc., CIA, Civil Infrastructure Associates, LLC, Varallo Public Relations.

A&E Firm: WSP USA Inc.

Strengths: Firm provided a detailed description of why their team (prime and sub-consultants) is best suited for the project. Firm provided a detailed description of their approach to minimize disruptions to the performance of this project. Firm provided a detailed explanation of their approach to quality management. Firm provided a detailed explanation of potential issues/challenges associated with the project. Firm provided a detailed description of their policies for ensuring environmentally friendly practices, along with the overall project being completed in an environmentally friendly way. Firm provided detailed organizational capacity associated with the project.

Weaknesses: Firm failed to provide costs for referenced projects. Firm's explanation for the role of the sub-consultants' involvement on the project lacked specific details. Firm only provided one project of similar scope within the last five years (required to provide more than one project within the last five years). Firm's description of

their innovative approach that would be used in this project to reduce cost lacked specific details.

MWBE Plan: Proposer is compliant with the requirements of the Procurement NonDiscrimination Program having engaged in good faith effort outreach to registered, certified MWBEs: Booker Engineering, Inc.-MBE (Accepted), Civic Engineering and Information Technologies, Inc.-WBE (Accepted), -MBE (Declined) and Varallo Public Relations-WBE (Accepted).

SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged 20% participation requirement of SBE/SDV over life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE subcontractors Varallo Public Relations, Booker Engineering, Inc., and Hawkins Partners, Inc.

RFQ# 1131657 Gulch Pedestrian Bridge A&E Consultant			
Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	WSP USA Inc.
Qualifications and Experience (35 Points)	35	32	32
Methodology/ Business Plan (35 Points)	32	28	34
Organizational Capacity (30 Points)	29	27	30
Total (100 Points)	96.00	87.00	96.00

Strengths & Weaknesses

Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC (96.00 Points)

Strengths: Firm provided a detailed description of why their team (prime and sub-consultants) is best suited for the project. Firm provided detailed information identifying the role of the proposed team and the qualifications and experience of the proposed team. Firm provided detailed referenced projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. Firm provided a detailed description of their approach to minimize disruptions to the performance of this project. Firm provided a detailed 3-dimensional modeling approach. Firm provided a detailed explanation of their approach to quality management. Firm provided a detailed description of their policies for ensuring environmentally friendly practices, along with the overall project being completed in an environmentally friendly way.

Weaknesses: Firm's organizational chart lacked specific details. Firm's fast track proposal schedule lacked specific details. Firm's Gantt Chart referenced an extended period for construction documents. Firm's proposed Project Manager and Design Coordinator lacked specific details for the organizational capacity.

Neel-Schaffer, Inc. (87.00 Points)

Strength: Firm provided referenced projects of similar size, scope, and complexity.

Weaknesses: Firm's demonstration of sub-consultants relevant experience lacked specific details. Firm failed to provide the actual schedule duration for their referenced projects. Firm failed to provide amounts for referenced projects. Firm's description of their team's organizational structure lacked specific details. Firm's description of their innovative approach that would be used in this project to reduce cost lacked specific details. Firm failed to provide an organizational chart. Firm's description of their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance for this project lacked specific details. Firm's explanation of their approach to quality management for this project lacked specific details. Firm failed to provide their policy for ensuring environmentally friendly practices, along with the overall project being completed in an environmentally friendly way. Firm's explanation of their team's disciplines lacked specific details. Firm's explanation of their team's proposed availability for this project lacked specific details.

WSP USA Inc. (96.00 Points)

Strengths: Firm provided a detailed description of why their team (prime and sub-consultants) is best suited for the project. Firm provided a detailed description of their approach to minimize disruptions to the performance of this project. Firm provided a detailed explanation of their approach to quality management. Firm provided a detailed explanation of potential issues/challenges associated with the project. Firm provided a detailed description of their policies for ensuring environmentally friendly practices, along with the overall project being completed in an environmentally friendly way. Firm provided detailed organizational capacity associated with the project.

Weaknesses: Firm failed to provide costs for referenced projects. Firm's explanation for the role of the sub-consultants' involvement on the project lacked specific details. Firm only provided one project of similar scope within the last five years (required to provide more than one project within the last five years). Firm's description of their innovative approach that would be used in this project to reduce cost lacked specific details.