DocuSign Envelope ID: 368010C3-DFB2-4C9D-B5AB-C1EEBF0CCA24

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

9/28/2020 | 9:58 AM CDT

Jennifer Duncan
Gresham Smith
222 Second Avenue S. Ste. #261
Nashville TN 37201

Re: ***RFQ# 23015 CEI Services***

Dear Ms. Duncan:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above ***RFQ# 23015 CEI Services***. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to **Gresham Smith**, 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 Equal Business Opportunity (EBO) 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 **Evans Cline**, BAO Representative, at **615-862-6137** or at **evans.cline@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 Buyer **Christina Alexander** by email at **christina.alexander@nashville.gov** Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

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

Sincerely,

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.

RFQ# 23015
Review Board Score Sheet

Offeror	Collier Engineering Co. Inc.	Gresham Smith	Orchard Hiltz & McCliment Inc.	Ragan-Smith Assoc. Inc.	Rummel Klepper & Kahl LLP	Smith Seckman Reid Inc.	TRC Worldwide Engineering Inc.	Volkert Inc.	WSP USA Inc.
Contract Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Non-Responsive
ISA Questionnaire	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Experience, Qualification (30 Points)	26.00	26.00	26.00	27.00	25.00	25.00	14.00	29.00	
Capacity to Perform (25 Points)	20.00	23.00	22.00	24.00	20.00	24.00	12.00	25.00	
Business Plan & Approach (45 Points)	41.00	41.00	41.00	42.00	35.00	42.00	20.00	43.00	
Total Evaluation Scores	**87.00**	**90.00**	**89.00**	**93.00**	**80.00**	**91.00**	**46.00**	**97.00**	

Evaluation Comments

Collier Engineering Co. Inc.

Strengths

Firm's proposal demonstrated ADA inspection experience. Firm's proposal demonstrated other Governmental experience. Firm's proposal provided detailed PPE plan. Firm's proposal demonstrated FEMA experience. Firm's proposal demonstrated Metro Public Works project experience. Firm provided reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Firm's proposal demonstrated infrastructure experience. Firm's project approach included a project tracking map and plan for working around special events. Firm provided all other required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.

Weaknesses

Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate capacity to perform. Firm's proposal lacked detail for major bridge work experience. Firm's proposed inspector experience lacked detail. Firm failed to provide team resumes. Firm failed to provide organizational chart. Firm failed to provide contact information for reference projects. Firm failed to provide traffic plan. Firm failed to demonstrate firm's understanding of intersection improvement projects.

Gresham Smith

Strengths

Firm's proposal demonstrated experience with TDOT. Firm's proposal demonstrated experience with Mater Water Services CEI projects to include bridges. Firm provided required certifications. Firm's proposal demonstrated capacity to perform and years in the industry. Firm's proposal demonstrated detailed document management plan. Firm's proposed project approach included the use of technology. Firm's proposal demonstrated TDOT CEI certification. Firm provided all other required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.

Weaknesses

Firm's reference projects lacked detail. Firm failed to provide contact information for reference projects. Firm's proposal lacked detail for development experience. Firm's proposed approach heavily relies on subcontractors. Firm's proposed key issues associated with scope of work projects lacked detail. Firm failed to provide report examples. Firm proposed using proprietary checklist. Firm failed to provide CEI traffic plan.

Orchard Hiltz & McCliment Inc.
Strengths
Firm's proposal demonstrated experience with and understanding of Metro processes. Firm provided reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Firm's proposal demonstrated infrastructure experience. Firm's proposal demonstrated CEI experience and years in the industry. Firm's proposal provided a detailed document management plan that includes time management and cost savings to Metro. Firm's proposal provided a detail project approach to include flexibility to accommodate Metro's needs, a plan to minimize change orders, GPS, field advisor software, digital records platform and the use of drones. Firm provided report examples. Firm provided all other required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.
Weaknesses
Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate TDOT experience as a Prime. Firm's proposal lacked detail for design services. Firm's proposal lacked detail for Federal project experience. Firm's proposal lacked detail for FEMA experience. Firm's proposal lacked detail for proposed inspection tasks.

Ragan-Smith Assoc. Inc.
Strengths
Firm's proposal demonstrated CEI experience. Firm provided reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Firm's proposal demonstrated capacity to perform and years of service in the industry. Firm provided required certifications. Firm's proposal demonstrated ability to handle multiple assignments. Firm's proposal demonstrated firm's understanding of potential infrastructure issues. Firm provided detailed organizational chart to include tasks, assignments and roles. Firm provided all other required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.
Weaknesses
Firm failed to provide contact information for reference projects. Firm's proposed software for document management lack detail. Firm's proposed approach for CEI services lacked detail. Firm failed to provide report examples. Firm's proposal lacked detail for traffic related issues. Firm's proposal lacked detail for FEMA experience.

Rummel Klepper & Kahl LLP
Strengths
Firm's proposal demonstrated years in the industry. Firm provided reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Firm provided required certifications. Firm's proposal demonstrated CEI experience. Firm's proposal provided a detail project approach to include flexibility to accommodate Metro's needs. Firm's project approach included real-time scheduling, TDOT tracking and fleming grid to track documents. Firm's proposal demonstrated utility cost recovery experience. Firm provided all other required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.
Weaknesses
Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate disaster experience. Firm's proposal failed to identify proposed Metro team. Firm's proposal lacked detail for Sidewalk/Roadway experience. Firm's proposal lacked detail for monthly reporting to Metro. Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate TDOT CEI training. Firm's proposal lacked detail for firm's ability to handle multiple projects. Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate FEMA experience. Firm's proposal lacked detail for project approach. Firm's proposed understanding of scope of work tasks lacked detail. Firm's proposal lacked detail for specific role assignments. Firm's proposed inspection process lacked detail. Firm failed to provide report examples.

Smith Seckman Reid Inc.

Strengths

Firm's proposal demonstrated completion of TDOT CEI training. Firm demonstrated firm's involvement in writing TDOT training material. Firm's proposal demonstrated firm's understanding of Metro's paving program. Firm provided required certifications. Firm provided reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Firm's proposal demonstrated capacity to perform and years of service in the industry. Firm proposed GIS staffing. Firm's proposal demonstrated FEMA experience. Firm proposed software that would interface with Metro's current software. Firm provided inspection report examples. Firm provided all other required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.

Weaknesses

Firm's proposed approach heavily relies on subcontractors. Firm's proposal lacked detail for knowledge of local Government work. Firm's proposal lacked detail for proposed team lead. Firm's proposal lacked detail for Sidewalk/Roadway projects. Firm's understanding of Metro vs. TDOT procedures lacked detail.

TRC Worldwide Engineering Inc.

Strengths

Firm provided required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.

Weaknesses

Firm's proposal lacked detail for team and firm experience. Firm's proposal lacked detail for CEI experience and was unclear and appeared to be for quality assurance only. Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate infrastructure experience for both firm and subcontractors. Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate experience for scope of work in this solicitation. Firm failed to provide reference projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Firm's proposal failed to demonstrate firm's capacity to perform scope of work. Firm's proposal was unclear and lacked detail for years of service performing scope of work in this solicitation. Firm's business plan and approach lacked detail, appeared to be copied and pasted, no firm information provided. Firm's proposal failed to provide understanding of project scope of work, tasks and sub-tasks. Firm failed to provide report examples.

Volkert Inc.

Strengths

Firm's proposal demonstrated firm's CEI experience. Firm's proposal demonstrated firm's TDOT and infrastructure experience. Firm's proposal demonstrated firm's familiarity with Municipalities of similar size, scope and complexity. Firm's proposal demonstrated firm's knowledge of TDOT Regions 1, 2 and 3. Firm's proposal demonstrated firm's capacity to perform and years in the industry. Firm proposed real-time document management. Firm provided required certifications. Firm's proposal provided detailed information for tasks and subtasks for proposed scope of work. Firm's proposal provided detailed information for how firm proposes to handle rejected work. Firm proposal identified lead persons for each task. Firm's proposal demonstrated FEMA experience. Firm's proposal demonstrated a detailed quality control plan to include meeting with Metro for work/task check-ins. Firm provided all other required information, with the exception of below noted weaknesses.

Weaknesses

Firm's proposal lacked detail on firm's ability to handle multiple assignments. Firm's proposal lacked detail for development and sidewalk experience. Firm failed to provide reference project(s) for Local TDOT programs.

WSP USA Inc.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Firm deemed non-responsive for failure to provide required EBO documents.

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Evans Cline

Contract Specialist: Christina Alexander

Date: 8/19/20

Department Name: Public Works

RFP/ITB Number: 23015

Project Name: (A&E) Construction Engineering & Inspection Services

Primary Contractor	SBE/SDV Requirement Acknowledged?	Comments
Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc.	Yes	Proposer acknowledged the 20% 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 Booker Engineering, Inc. and Asa Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.	Yes	Proposer acknowledged the 20% 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 Geotek Engineering Company, Inc and Wilson & Assoc., PC.
Volkert, Inc.	Yes	Proposer acknowledged the 20% 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 KS Ware and Assoc., Inc., duGard Communications, and Civil Infrastructure Assoc., Inc.
Gresham Smith	Yes	Proposer acknowledged the 20% 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 KS Ware and Assoc., Inc., duGard Communications, Geotek Engineering, Inc., Connico, Inc., Asa Engineering and Consulting, and Civil Infrastructure Assoc., Inc.

A&E EBO Compliance Results Form

Department Name: Public Works

RFP/ITB Number: 23015

Solicitation Name: (A&E) Construction Engineering & Inspection Services

Primary Contractor	Acknowledge Established EBO Goals (Yes/No)	Determination Comments/% of Participation Proposed or Bid
Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc.	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Equal Business Opportunity Program having acknowledged M/WBE goals and can achieve as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of Booker Engineering, Inc. (MBE) and Asa Engineering and Consulting, Inc. (WBE). Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Equal Business Opportunity Program having acknowledged M/WBE goals and can achieve as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of Geotek Engineering Co. and Morgan and Morgan (MBEs) and KS Ware & Assoc. and CIVIC Engineering & IT (WBEs). Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
Volkert, Inc.	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Equal Business Opportunity Program having acknowledged M/WBE goals and can achieve as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of duGard Communications (MBE) and KS Ware and Associates, LLC, Civil Infrastructure Associates, and Civil Engineering and Information Technologies, Inc. (WBEs). Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
Gresham Smith	YES	Proposer is compliant with the Equal Business Opportunity Program having acknowledged M/WBE goals and can achieve as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of KS Ware and Associates (MBE) and Civic Engineering and IT, Connico, Inc., Civil Infrastructure Associates, Geotek Engineering Co., Inc., and Asa Engineering (WBEs). Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.

*Denotes Contractor with whom follow up was required

Date: 8/19/2020

Metro Bu Christina Alexander

BAO Rep Evans Cline