

SW Manager (Initial)



Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	GG000049	Award Date	6/9/2026 12:00 PM CDT
Solicitation Title	Building Envelope Commissioning Services		
Buyer Name	Brad Wall	Buyer Email	brad.wall@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 (1)	Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.
Company Name (2)	
Company Name (3)	
Company Name (4)	
Company Name (5)	
Company Name (6)	

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.

Michelle R. Hernandez Lane
Michelle Lane
Interim Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

ZK (Initial)
Zak Kelley



RFQ #GG000049 – Building Envelope Commissioning Services

Company Name	Project Approach (30 Points)	Experience and Qualifications (30 Points)	Cost/Pricing (40 Points)	Financial Offer	Contract Exceptions (Y/N)	Total Points (100)
Facility Diagnostics, LLC	27.00	30.00	33.23	\$5,640,000.00	Yes	90.23
Paladin, Inc.	24.00	22.00	39.85	\$4,702,886.10	No	85.85
SK Collaborative LLC	30.00	26.00	34.61	\$5,415,318.53	No	90.61
Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.	30.00	30.00	40.00	\$4,685,000.00	Yes	100.00
The Epsten Group, Inc.	30.00	25.00	32.89	\$5,697,766.53	No	87.89

Facility Diagnostics, LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
- The offeror provides sufficient processes to ensure that building envelope performance requirements are met and validated during testing and verification and meets expectations in this regard. - Offeror’s description of their approach and utilization of the Facility Grid tool to identify and resolve building envelope deficiencies is thorough and above expectation in this regard. - The offeror provides experience performing detailed reviews of architectural design documents related to building envelope systems, including examples of issues encountered and how those issues were resolved; specifically, offeror outlined detailed processes used to resolve issues encountered and is above expectation in this regard. - Offeror demonstrates significant experience participating in projects pursuing LEED certification and is above expectations in this regard. - Offeror provides at least three project references for Building Envelope Commissioning projects with detailed information about the scope of their projects and concise work samples where the proposer was the principal BECx firm and is above expectations in this regard. - The offeror provides a sufficient description of how their team will collaborate with architects, contractors, and other consultants throughout the BECx process and meet expectations in this regard. - Based on the listing of the individuals and resumes of those who will serve as the Building Envelope Commissioning Authority (BECxA), the offeror provides a sufficient team and meets expectation in this regard.	- The description provided by the firm of their approach to integrating Building Envelope commissioning activities into design and construction lacks specific details and clarity and is below expectation in this regard. - Offeror describes that they would consider certain factors but didn’t specifically address how they will determine the appropriate level of commissioning effort for various systems and equipment and is below expectation in this regard.

Paladin, Inc.	
Strengths	Weaknesses
- The offeror’s proposal specified the exact field testing related to BECx and meets expectations in this regard. - The offeror’s proposal demonstrated certain factors to determine the appropriate level of commissioning. - The offeror provides experience performing detailed reviews of architectural design documents and meets expectations in this regard. - Offeror demonstrates experience participating in projects pursuing LEED certification and meet expectations in this regard.	- The offeror failed to specifically address their approach to integrating Building Envelope commissioning activities into design and construction and is below expectation in this regard. - Offeror provides a broad and generic process to ensure that building envelope performance requirements are met and validated during testing and verification and are below expectation in this regard. - Offeror describes that they would consider certain factors but didn’t specifically address how they will determine the appropriate level of commissioning effort for various systems and equipment and is below expectation in this regard. - The offeror’s description of their approach to identifying and resolving building envelope deficiencies throughout the project lifecycle is generic and below expectation in this regard. - The offeror lacked detail on processes used to resolve issues encountered when demonstrating specific examples regarding the reviews of architectural design documents related to building envelope systems and is below expectation in this regard. - Offeror lacks specific detail in their description used to demonstrate experience participating in projects pursuing LEED certification and is below expectations in this regard.

	• The project references did not clearly address three Building Envelope Commission projects where the proposer was the principal BECx firm and are below expectations in this regard. • The offeror’s description of how their team will collaborate with architects, contractors, and other consultants throughout the BECx process lacks detail; specifically, lacks information regarding the different phases of the design and construction where BECx firm plans to collaborate with project stakeholders and is below expectations in this regard. • Based on the listing of the individuals and resumes of those who will serve as the Building Envelope Commissioning Authority (BECxA), the offeror failed to specifically identify a Certified Commissioning Professional (CCP) and is below expectation in this regard.
--	--

SK Collaborative LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• The offeror provides a detailed description of their approach to integrating Building Envelope commissioning activities into design and construction and is above expectation in this regard; specifically, the offeror gave a detailed outline of the components they would be reviewing and checking during design and construction. • The offeror provides sufficient processes to ensure that building envelope performance requirements are met and validated during testing and verification and meets expectations in this regard. • Offeror describes specific factors based on a risk assessment and forward thinking on how they would determine the appropriate level of commissioning effort for various systems and equipment and is above expectation in this regard. • Offeror’s description of their approach to identify and resolve building envelope deficiencies is thorough and above expectation in this regard. • The offeror provides satisfactory experience performing reviews of architectural design documents related to building envelope systems, including examples of issues encountered and how those issues were resolved, which can be found in project 1 and 2 in the commissioning outcomes of their project references and meet expectations in this regard. • Offeror demonstrates sufficient experience participating in projects pursuing LEED certification and meets expectations in this regard. • Offeror provides at least three project references for Building Envelope Commissioning projects where the proposer was the principal BECX firm and meets expectations in this regard. • The offeror provides a sufficient description of how their team will collaborate with architects, contractors, and other consultants throughout the BECx process and meet expectations in this regard.	• The offeror states that they are familiar with projects pursuing LEED certification but lacked information related to their experience and documentation efforts used to pursue LEED certification and are below expectation in this regard. • Based on the listing of the individuals and resumes of those who will serve as the Building Envelope Commissioning Authority (BECxA), the offeror failed to specifically identify a Certified Commissioning Professional (CCP), Certified Commissioning Authority (CxA) and is below expectation in this regard.

Smith Seckman Reid, Inc.	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• The offeror provides a detailed description of their approach to integrating Building Envelope commissioning activities into design and construction and is above expectation in this regard; specifically, the offeror gave a detailed outline of the components they would be reviewing and checking during design and construction. • The offeror provides sufficient processes to ensure that building envelope performance requirements are met and validated during testing and verification and meets expectations in this regard. • Offeror describes the specific test methods performed to determine the appropriate level of commissioning effort for various systems and equipment and is above expectation in this regard. • Offeror’s description of their approach to identify and resolve building envelope deficiencies is thorough and above expectation in this regard. • The offeror provides satisfactory experience performing reviews of architectural design documents related to building envelope systems, including examples of issues encountered and how those issues were resolved and meet expectations in this regard. • Offeror demonstrates significant experience participating in projects pursuing LEED certification and is above expectations in this regard. • Offeror provides at least three project references for Building Envelope Commissioning projects with detailed information about the scope of their projects and concise work samples where the proposer was the principal BECX firm and is above expectations in this regard.	• No specific deficiencies were noted.

• The offeror provides a sufficient description of how their team will collaborate with architects, contractors, and other consultants throughout the BECx process and meet expectations in this regard. • Based on the listing of the individuals and resumes of those who will serve as the Building Envelope Commissioning Authority (BECxA), the offeror provides a robust team, as well as copies of the actual certificates and credentials for some of the team members and is above expectation in this regard.	
---	--

The Epsten Group, Inc.	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• The offeror provides a sufficient description of their approach to integrating Building Envelope commissioning activities into design and construction and meets expectations in this regard. • The offeror provides detailed processes to ensure that building envelope performance requirements are met and validated during testing and verification and are above expectations in this regard; specifically, they outlined various methods and testing services performed. • Offeror provides a sufficient description of how they determine the appropriate level of commissioning effort for various systems and equipment and meets expectations in this regard. • The offeror provides a sufficient approach to identifying and resolving building envelope deficiencies throughout the project lifecycle and meets expectations in this regard. • The offeror provides satisfactory experience performing reviews of architectural design documents related to building envelope systems, including examples of issues encountered and how those issues were resolved, which can be found in their project references for Meijer, Inc., and Nashville Public Library Goodlettsville Branch and meets expectations in this regard. • Offeror demonstrates experience participating in projects pursuing LEED certification and meet expectations in this regard. • The offeror provides a sufficient description of how their team will collaborate with architects, contractors, and other consultants throughout the BECx process and meet expectations in this regard.	• Offeror provides a Building Envelope Commissioning project where the proposer was the principal BECx firm for the Nashville Public Library Goodlettsville Branch; however, this project was not full BECx but rather non-destructive water testing. • Based on the listing of the individuals and resumes of those who will serve as the Building Envelope Commissioning Authority (BECxA), the offeror failed to specifically identify a Certified Commissioning Professional (CCP).

Building Envelope Commissioning Services; RFQ #GG000049		
	SBE/SDV Requirement	Total Cost Points
	7.00%	40.00
Offeror's Name	Bids	RFP Cost Points
Facility Diagnostics, LLC	\$5,640,000.00	33.23
Paladin, Inc.	\$4,702,886.10	39.85
SK Collaborative LLC	\$5,415,318.53	34.61
Smith Seckman Reid Inc.	\$4,685,000.00	40.00
The Epsten Group, Inc.	\$5,697,766.53	32.89

BAO Small Business Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Sierra Washington
Contract Specialist: Brad Wall
Date: 05/20/2026

Department Name: General Services
RFP/ITB Number: GG000049

Project Name: Building Envelope Commissioning Services						
Primary Contractor*	Primary Contractor Ownership	Prime Bid Amount	Total Proposed SBE/SDV (\$)	Acknowledged SBE/SDV Requirement	SBE/SDV Requirement (%)	Comments
Smith, Seckman and Reid, Inc.	N/A	\$ 4,685,000	TBD	Yes	7%	The prime has acknowledged the 7% required as noted by the solicitation, and understands consequences of misrepresentation.