

J&R Manager (Initial)



Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	GG000047	Award Date	6/29/2026 12:07 PM CDT
Solicitation Title	Sewer System Rehabilitation Services		
Buyer Name	Christina Alexander	Buyer Email	christina.alexander@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Jeremy Frye	BAO Email	jeremy.frye@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)	Ace Pipe Cleaning, Inc.
Company Name (2)	Inliner Solutions, LLC
Company Name (3)	Insituform Technologies, LLC
Company Name (4)	SAK Construction LLC
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 GG000047 – Sewer System Rehabilitation Services

Company Name	Company Information and Capacity (25 Points)	Construction Team and Experience on Similar Projects (50 Points)	Approach for Specialty Project Work and Schedule (25 Points)	Total Points (100)
Ace Pipe Cleaning, Inc.	22	46	22	90
BLD Services, LLC	22	42	21	85
GCU, LLC dba Gulf Coast Underground, LLC	24	37	17	78
Inliner Solutions, LLC	25	45	23	93
Insituform Technologies, LLC	23	46	22	91
Jarrett Builder’s, Inc.	16	24	14	54
Musson Bros Inc.	22	42	18	82
SBW Constructors, LLC	19	38	19	76
SAK Construction LLC	22	46	22	90

Ace Pipe Cleaning, Inc.	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated relevant experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided information that documents firm's (including subcontractors/ subconsultants) qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Listed previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar size, scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations. • Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which met Metro’s expectations.	• Although the company’s info met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail for CIPP volume. • Although the reference projects met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail and was unclear for being on time and on budget, and who the team members were. • Although the project approach met Metro’s expectations the specific examples lacked detail.

- Identified other potential risks associated with the execution of these types of projects and gave specific examples from similar previous projects showing how firm successfully mitigated those projects' risks, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided company's plan/approach to minimize impacts to industries, residents, businesses, and the public during construction, addressing potential water and sewer usage restrictions, disruption to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and other potential issues that may impact their operations, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided specific examples of how similar previous projects were accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided a Quality Assurance Plan summary that firm will implement to ensure the performance of the Scope of Work, including oversight of subcontractor's work, which met Metro’s expectations.	
--	--

BLD Services, LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
- Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. - Demonstrated relevant experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided information that documents firm's (including subcontractors/ subconsultants) qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. - Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. - Listed previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project, which met Metro’s expectations. - Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar size, scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. - Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations. - Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which met Metro’s expectations. - Identified other potential risks associated with the execution of these types of projects and gave specific examples from similar previous projects showing how firm successfully mitigated those projects' risks, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided company's plan/approach to minimize impacts to industries, residents, businesses, and the public during construction, addressing potential water and sewer usage restrictions, disruption to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and other potential issues that may impact their operations, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided specific examples of how similar previous projects were accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. - Provided a Quality Assurance Plan summary that firm will implement to ensure the performance of the Scope of Work, including oversight of subcontractor's work, which met Metro’s expectations.	- Although the company’s info met Metro’s expectations, installation capacity for CIPP and literals were not provided. - Although the construction team experience met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail demonstrating manhole experience. - Although the reference projects met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail. - Although the project approach met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail communicating the impact to residence/businesses. - Although the quality assurance plan met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail.

GCU, LLC dba Gulf Coast Underground, LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated relevant experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided information that documents firm's (including subcontractors/ subconsultants) qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Listed previous projects which met Metro’s expectations. • Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar size, scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations. • Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified other potential risks associated with the execution of these types of projects and gave specific examples from similar previous projects showing how firm successfully mitigated those projects' risks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided company's plan/approach to minimize impacts to industries, residents, businesses, and the public during construction, addressing potential water and sewer usage restrictions, disruption to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and other potential issues that may impact their operations, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided specific examples of how similar previous projects were accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations.	• Although the information documenting qualifications met Metro’s expectations the subcontractor information lacked detail. • Although the construction team experience met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail demonstrating crew availability and capacity to perform. • Failed to provide a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project which does not meet Metro’s expectations. • Past projects that proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past were unclear and lacked detail and failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Although the project approach met Metro’s expectations the specific examples lacked detail. • Although the project approach met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail communicating the impact to residence/businesses. • Failed to provide a Quality Assurance Plan summary that firm will implement to ensure the performance of the Scope of Work, including oversight of subcontractor's work, which does not meet Metro’s expectations.

Inliner Solutions, LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated relevant experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided information that documents firm's (including subcontractors/ subconsultants) qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Listed previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar size, scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations. • Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified other potential risks associated with the execution of these types of projects and gave specific examples from similar previous projects showing how firm successfully mitigated those projects' risks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided company's plan/approach to minimize impacts to industries, residents, businesses, and the public during construction, addressing potential water and sewer usage restrictions, disruption to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and other potential issues that may impact their operations, which exceeded Metro’s expectations. • Provided specific examples of how similar previous projects were accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a Quality Assurance Plan summary that firm will implement to ensure the performance of the Scope of Work, including oversight of subcontractor's work, which met Metro’s expectations.	• Although the reference projects met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail. • Although the company information met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail demonstrating crew availability.

Insituform Technologies, LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided information that documents firm's qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Listed previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, which minimally met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project, which minimally met Metro’s expectations. • Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar size, scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations. • Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified other potential risks associated with the execution of these types of projects and gave specific examples from similar previous projects showing how firm successfully mitigated those projects' risks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided company's plan/approach to minimize impacts to industries, residents, businesses, and the public during construction, addressing potential water and sewer usage restrictions, disruption to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and other potential issues that may impact their operations, which exceeded Metro’s expectations. • Provided a Quality Assurance Plan summary that firm will implement to ensure the performance of the Scope of Work, including oversight of subcontractor's work, which minimally met Metro’s expectations.	• Although the company’s info met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail for CIPP volume. • Although the construction team experience met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail demonstrating crew availability and installation capacity. • Some of the provided resumes demonstrated limited lining experience, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Although the organizational Chart met Metro’s expectations, it lacked detail related to subcontractors. • Although the approach met Metro’s expectations the production rate and manhole tasks lacked detail. • No project examples were provided, failed to meet Metro’s expectations.

Jarrett Builder’s	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met minimally Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations. • Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which met Metro’s expectations.	• Although the company’s info met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail for CIPP volume. • No installation capacity failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • No rehabilitation tasks listed failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • High EMR, safety record lacked detail, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • No previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • No resumes, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Organizational chart lacked detail failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Construction team experience lacked detail demonstrating crew availability and installation capacity, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Reference projects were not of similar size, scope, and complexity, failed to meet Metro’s expectations.

Musson Bros Inc.	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated relevant experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided information that documents firm's (including subcontractors/ subconsultants) qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project, which minimally met Metro’s expectations. • Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations.	• Although the company’s info met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail for CIPP volume per year. • Although qualifications and experience met Metro’s expectations, it was unclear which experience was the prime’s, and which was the subcontractor’s. • Demonstrated limited crew availability for services, one crew for lining, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Reference projects not of similar size. • Organizational chart lacked detail failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • No previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • No project examples were provided, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • No work coordination addressed, failed to meet Metro’s expectations.

SBW Constructors, LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated relevant experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided information that documents firm's (including subcontractors/ subconsultants) qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Listed previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, which met Metro’s expectations. • Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar size, scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which minimally met Metro’s expectations.	• Failed to provide a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Failed to provide plans for integrating minimum functions, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Did not address bankruptcy, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated limited CIPP experience, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Specific examples lacked detail, failed to meet Metro’s expectations. • Although the quality assurance plan met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail.

SAK Construction LLC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Provided company's information, which met Metro’s expectations. • Demonstrated relevant experience of proposed team members. Included resumes of key individuals, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided information that documents firm's (including subcontractors/ subconsultants) qualifications and experience for tasks typically performed as part of project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified subcontractors who will work in conjunction with company to accomplish the typical CWN project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Listed previous projects firm and proposed subcontractors collaborated on in the past, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed organizational chart with key personnel for the project, which met Metro’s expectations. • Described in detail and provided documentation on a minimum of five (5) projects within the past seven (7) years of similar size, scope, and complexity, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provide approaches for each type of work (Comprehensive, CIPP, Manhole Rehabilitation, Service Renewal) for which the proposer wishes to be evaluated, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed narrative demonstrating company's understanding of a typical CWN project and how the desired deliverables in a typical project will be accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations.	• Although the company’s info met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail for volume of manhole services. • Although the reference projects met Metro’s expectations it lacked detail and was unclear demonstrating whether the company was prime or sub on the projects. • All resumes all referenced same 2 projects which demonstrated limited sub availability • Although the project approach met Metro’s expectations it failed to address potential risks.

• Included major tasks, sub-tasks, and number of crews for tasks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a detailed plan of how company proposes to manage a typical project integrating many management functions and production of work, which met Metro’s expectations. • Gave specific examples from similar previous projects that address the coordination of work in limited access areas and environmentally sensitive areas, which met Metro’s expectations. • Identified other potential risks associated with the execution of these types of projects and gave specific examples from similar previous projects showing how firm successfully mitigated those projects' risks, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided company's plan/approach to minimize impacts to industries, residents, businesses, and the public during construction, addressing potential water and sewer usage restrictions, disruption to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and other potential issues that may impact their operations, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided specific examples of how similar previous projects were accomplished, which met Metro’s expectations. • Provided a Quality Assurance Plan summary that firm will implement to ensure the performance of the Scope of Work, including oversight of subcontractor's work, which exceeded Metro’s expectations.	
---	--