



## METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

8/19/2021 | 3:34 PM CDT

Mr. Brian Hall  
AECOM Technical Services  
100 Corporate Centre Drive, Suite 250  
Franklin, TN 37067

Re: **RFQ # 63188, On-Call Traffic Engineering Services**

Dear Mr. Hall:

Due to the increased need for the scope of services outlined in RFQ 63188 On-Call Traffic Engineering Services, the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) will issue additional awards resulting from the completed evaluation process. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to AECOM Technical Services, contingent upon successful contract negotiations. Please provide a certificate of Insurance indicating all applicable coverages within 7 calendar 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 Christopher Wood, BAO Representative, at 615-862-6710 or at Christopher.Wood@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 Terri Ray by email at [terri.ray@nashville.gov](mailto:terri.ray@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.

Procurement Division

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

[www.Nashville.gov](http://www.Nashville.gov)  
Phone: 615-862-6180  
Fax: 615-862-6179

## RFQ 63199 On-Call Traffic Engineering Services Scoring and Justification

<i>Offeror/Evaluation Criteria (Points)</i>	<b>Management Plan and Approach (45 points)</b>	<b>Team Structure, Qualifications, and Capacity (35 Points)</b>	<b>Relevant Project Experience (20 points)</b>	<b>Total (100 Points)</b>
<b>AECOM Technical Services</b>	38.0	32.0	18.0	88.0
<b>ARCADIS</b>	42.0	31.0	15.0	88.0
<b>Barge Design Solutions, Inc</b>	40.0	32.0	16.0	88.0
<b>HDR Engineering Inc</b>	36.0	31.0	16.0	83.0
<b>HMB Professional Engineers, Inc</b>	27.0	27.0	11.0	65.0
<b>KCI Technologies, Inc</b>	37.0	33.0	17.0	87.0
<b>Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc</b>	43.0	34.0	19.0	96.0
<b>Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc</b>	25.0	27.0	13.0	65.0
<b>Stantec</b>	37.0	30.0	16.0	83.0
<b>The Corradino Group, Inc</b>	35.0	28.0	15.0	78.0
<b>TRC Worldwide Engineering, Inc</b>	23.0	20.0	10.0	53.0

### **AECOM Technical Services**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated a depth of relevant project experience of similar size, scope and complexity. Proposal demonstrated a team structure that has a depth of experience providing the scope of services. Proposal demonstrated innovation for intersection designs.

**Weaknesses** – Proposed key staff member no longer with AECOM. Proposal provided a general response to current litigations. Proposal lacked approach to innovation in emerging traffic engineering areas.

### **ARCADIS**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated relevant project experience related to connective vehicles and signal experience. Proposal demonstrated virtual meeting approach.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal failed to demonstrate relevant project experience in other scope of service areas. Proposal failed to demonstrate the depth of relevant project experience compared to other offerors. Proposed management plan and approach lacked detail compared to other offerors.

### **Barge Design Solutions, Inc**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated standard relevant project experience related to standard design projects. Proposal demonstrated a detailed management plan and approach.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal lacked relevant project experience details in emerging areas and technologies. Proposal lacked relevant project experience details compared to other offerors. Proposal lacked details related to how multiple projects would be handled. Proposal failed to provide percent allocation of some team members. Overall proposal lacked proofreading.

## RFQ 63199 On-Call Traffic Engineering Services Scoring and Justification

<i>Offeror/Evaluation Criteria (Points)</i>	<b>Management Plan and Approach (45 points)</b>	<b>Team Structure, Qualifications, and Capacity (35 Points)</b>	<b>Relevant Project Experience (20 points)</b>	<b>Total (100 Points)</b>
AECOM Technical Services	38.0	32.0	18.0	88.0
ARCADIS	42.0	31.0	15.0	88.0
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	40.0	32.0	16.0	88.0
HDR Engineering Inc	36.0	31.0	16.0	83.0
HMB Professional Engineers, Inc	27.0	27.0	11.0	65.0
KCI Technologies, Inc	37.0	33.0	17.0	87.0
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc	43.0	34.0	19.0	96.0
Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc	25.0	27.0	13.0	65.0
Stantec	37.0	30.0	16.0	83.0
The Corradino Group, Inc	35.0	28.0	15.0	78.0
TRC Worldwide Engineering, Inc	23.0	20.0	10.0	53.0

### **HDR Engineering Inc**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated comprehensive response and detailed for relevant project experience. Proposal demonstrated a strong team structure with adequate time allocation.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal demonstrated staff with innovative experience that was not local; Proposal lacked detail related to new project coordination. Proposal failed to demonstrate cost effectiveness of approach. Proposed approach to time to complete tasks lack detailed.

### **HMB Professional Engineers, Inc**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated large scale relevant project experience.

**Weaknesses** - Proposal lacked relevant project experience details compared to other offerors. Proposal failed to demonstrate how multiple project would be handled simultaneously. Proposed team structure lacked depth compared to other offerors. Proposed 20% availability for lead project manager. Proposed management plan and approach was generic and lacked specific details compared to other offerors.

### **KCI Technologies, Inc**

**Strengths** – Proposed demonstrated relevant project experience for standard traffic engineering. Proposed team structure demonstrated sufficient experience and included three project managers. Proposed approach to standard traffic engineering was extremely detailed.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal lacked relevant project experience details in innovation, emerging areas and technologies. Proposed approach lacked information related to emerging technologies.

### **Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc**

**Strengths** – Proposed relevant project experience was comprehensive and detailed specifically related to emerging technologies. Proposal demonstrated an approach to develop a connected automated vehicle readiness plan and roadmap. Proposal demonstrated approach and ideas to reduce costs by restructuring plan review process.

## RFQ 63199 On-Call Traffic Engineering Services Scoring and Justification

<i>Offeror/Evaluation Criteria (Points)</i>	<b>Management Plan and Approach (45 points)</b>	<b>Team Structure, Qualifications, and Capacity (35 Points)</b>	<b>Relevant Project Experience (20 points)</b>	<b>Total (100 Points)</b>
AECOM Technical Services	38.0	32.0	18.0	88.0
ARCADIS	42.0	31.0	15.0	88.0
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	40.0	32.0	16.0	88.0
HDR Engineering Inc	36.0	31.0	16.0	83.0
HMB Professional Engineers, Inc	27.0	27.0	11.0	65.0
KCI Technologies, Inc	37.0	33.0	17.0	87.0
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc	43.0	34.0	19.0	96.0
Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc	25.0	27.0	13.0	65.0
Stantec	37.0	30.0	16.0	83.0
The Corradino Group, Inc	35.0	28.0	15.0	78.0
TRC Worldwide Engineering, Inc	23.0	20.0	10.0	53.0

**Weaknesses** – Parts of overall proposal were difficult to read and follow. Proposed approach lacked information related to document management.

### **Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated experience performing regular traffic engineering tasks including civil intersection and signal design. Proposed approach demonstrated focus on regular traffic engineering task. Proposal demonstrated experience and approach related to data collection.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal lacked relevant project experience details compared to other offerors. Proposed organizational chart does not align with tasks. Proposal failed to demonstrate how multiple projects would be handled simultaneously. Proposal lacked relevant project experience details in emerging areas and technologies. Proposed approach lacked details related to emerging technology and cost reduction.

### **Stantec**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated relevant project experience for standard traffic engineering.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal lacked relevant project experience details in innovation, emerging areas and technologies. Proposed approach lacked information related to emerging technologies. Proposed management plan and approach was generic and lacked specific details compared to other offerors.

### **The Corradino Group, Inc**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated relevant project experience for standard traffic engineering.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal lacked relevant project experience details in emerging areas and technologies. Relevant project experience proposal lacked details related to emerging technology. Proposed management plan and approach was generic and lacked specific details compared to other offerors.

## RFQ 63199 On-Call Traffic Engineering Services Scoring and Justification

<i>Offeror/Evaluation Criteria (Points)</i>	<b>Management Plan and Approach (45 points)</b>	<b>Team Structure, Qualifications, and Capacity (35 Points)</b>	<b>Relevant Project Experience (20 points)</b>	<b>Total (100 Points)</b>
AECOM Technical Services	38.0	32.0	18.0	88.0
ARCADIS	42.0	31.0	15.0	88.0
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	40.0	32.0	16.0	88.0
HDR Engineering Inc	36.0	31.0	16.0	83.0
HMB Professional Engineers, Inc	27.0	27.0	11.0	65.0
KCI Technologies, Inc	37.0	33.0	17.0	87.0
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc	43.0	34.0	19.0	96.0
Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc	25.0	27.0	13.0	65.0
Stantec	37.0	30.0	16.0	83.0
The Corradino Group, Inc	35.0	28.0	15.0	78.0
TRC Worldwide Engineering, Inc	23.0	20.0	10.0	53.0

### **TRC Worldwide Engineering, Inc**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated relevant project experience for roadway design.

**Weaknesses** – Proposed relevant project experience lacked detailed compared to other offerors. Proposed relevant project experience was not within the past five years (i.e. Volkswagen experience 2009-2014). Proposed team structure is weak and lumped everyone into every proposed task. Proposed management plan and approach was generic and lacked specific details compared to other offerors.