



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

10/21/2021 | 10:40 AM CDT

Maggie Thomas
Smith Gee Studio, LLC
602 Taylor Street, Suite 201
Nashville, TN 37208

Re: **RFQ # 131220, Southeast Police Precinct Design Services (A&E)**

Dear Ms. Thomas:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 131220 for Southeast Police Precinct Design Services (A&E). This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to Smith Gee Studio, 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 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 Brad Wall by email at brad.wall@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
Phone: 615-862-6180
Fax: 615-862-6179

RFQ #131220 - Southeast Police Precinct Design Services (A&E)

	Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC	HFR, Inc	Moody Nolan, Inc	Smith Gee Studio, LLC	TMPartners, LLC
Contract Acceptance	Accepted contract without exceptions	Accepted contract without exceptions	Accepted contract without exceptions	Proposed Contract Exceptions	Proposed Contract Exceptions
Qualifications and Experience (50 Points)	42.00	43.00	38.00	46.00	42.00
General Management Plan (50 Points)	38.00	43.00	36.00	47.00	44.00
Total (100 Points)	80.00	86.00	74.00	93.00	86.00

Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC

Strengths - The offeror has been in business for 36 years and has extensive experience working with the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County on a variety of project types. The offeror demonstrated experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. The offeror's organizational chart was adequate. The offeror adequately demonstrated that they had at least one (1) key personnel on the team (prime consultant and subconsultants) who has experience in designing and constructing LEED certified buildings at the Gold level. The offeror has completed over 125 LEED Certified projects of which 35 are LEED Gold and 5 are LEED Platinum, and the offeror's proposal adequately described the firm's involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. The offeror's reference projects were of similar size and complexity as to what Metro is seeking in the resulting contract. The offeror provided an adequate description of the quality control procedures they would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. The offeror provided adequate information pertaining to their approach to dispute and claims resolution. The offeror adequately demonstrated their largest contracts currently in progress, along with identifying the team members included on those contracts that would be identified as key personnel for Metro's contract. The offeror adequately demonstrated the time dedicated to this project for the key personnel broken down by phase of work. The offeror provided an adequate description of their plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives provided by Metro.

Weaknesses - The offeror's demonstrated experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach indicated limited involvement in cost management. The difference in roles and responsibilities for the project manager and project architect are not well defined on the organizational chart and resumes. The offeror didn't specifically address the roles and responsibilities of the subconsultants on their resumes as requested. The project manager has limited public safety experience. The offeror demonstrated limited experience with projects of similar scope. The proposed team members involved on the reference projects were noted as the firms and not the individual team members and their tasks performed. The offeror's description of their role and participation in the value engineering process lacked detail on their approach to the budget management process. The offeror's identified risks were not project specific. The offeror's proposal lacked details on the key activities specifically associated with this type of project.

HFR, Inc

Strengths - The offeror has been in business for 111 years. The offeror demonstrated experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. The offeror's organizational chart was adequate. The offeror's resumes did a good job demonstrating their team's (prime consultant and subconsultants) experience with public safety projects. The offeror's reference projects were of similar size, scope, and complexity as to what Metro is seeking in the resulting contract. The offeror provided a detailed description of the quality control procedures they would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. The offeror provided an adequate description of their role and participation in the value engineering process. The offeror provided adequate information pertaining to their approach to dispute and claims resolution. The offeror identified project specific risks that their firm would anticipate on this type of project and provided countermeasures for those risks. The offeror provided an adequate description of the key activities associated with this type of project.

Weaknesses - The offeror's description of their firm's background, experience, and qualifications to accomplish the services being requested lacked detail. The offeror failed to clearly identify that they had at least one (1) key personnel on the team (prime consultant and subconsultants) who has experience in designing and constructing LEED certified buildings at the Gold level. The offeror's proposal lacked details on the firm's involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification; specifically, it is unclear what role the firm played in the certification process. The offeror failed to provide details regarding the LEED certification status on all reference projects except for one (City of Brooklyn Park Police Additions & Renovations). For the firm's five (5) largest contracts currently in progress, the firm's response was lacking a reference identifying the team members included on those contracts that would be identified as key personnel for Metro's contract. Based on the percentage of time dedicated to this project for the key personnel broken down by phase of work, the firm's project manager appears to have limited involvement during the early design phases. Based on the offeror's description of their plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements set by Metro, it is unclear if the offeror has a plan and process specific to achieving energy performance goals.

Moody Nolan, Inc

Strengths - The offeror has been in business for 39 years. The offeror's organizational chart was adequate. The offeror adequately demonstrated that they had at least one (1) key personnel on the team who has experience in designing and constructing LEED certified buildings at the Gold level. The offeror's reference projects were of similar size, scope, and complexity as to what Metro is seeking in the resulting contract. The offeror adequately demonstrated their largest contracts currently in progress, along with identifying the team members included on those contracts that would be identified as key personnel for Metro's contract.

Weaknesses - The offeror's description of their firm's background, experience, and qualifications to accomplish the services being requested lacked detail. The offeror's proposal lacked detail demonstrating their experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. On most of the resumes submitted, the offeror lacked detail on the responsibilities of the individual team members specific to Metro's project. The offeror's proposal lacked details on the firm's involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. The Central Precinct for Metropolitan Nashville Police Department reference project didn't specifically state the LEED certification status. The offeror's description of the quality control procedures they would employ on this project during both design and construction phases lacked detail. The offeror's description of their role and participation in the value engineering process lacked specific detail. The offeror's description of their approach to dispute and claims resolution lacked detail specific to their firm. Based on the percentage of time dedicated to this project for the key personnel broken down by phase of work, Metro is unclear who will lead the design in early phases. The offeror's countermeasures for their anticipated risks associated with this type of project lacked detail. The offeror's proposal lacked details on the key activities specifically associated with this type of project. The offeror's plan and process lacked detail demonstrating their ability to achieve the energy performance requirements set by Metro .

Smith Gee Studio, LLC

Strengths - The offeror has been in business for 11 years. The offeror provided detailed information on their firm and team's (prime consultant and subconsultants) background, experience, and qualifications to accomplish the services being requested. The offeror demonstrated experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach and provided a specific project (Ascend Amphitheater) they performed services on that used the CMAR delivery approach. The offeror's organizational chart was adequate. The offeror adequately demonstrated that they had at least one (1) key personnel on the team (prime consultant and subconsultants) who has experience in designing and constructing LEED certified buildings at the Gold level. The team's (prime consultant and subconsultants) reference projects were of similar size, scope, and complexity as to what Metro is seeking in the resulting contract. The offeror provided a detailed description of the quality control procedures they would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. The offeror provided an adequate description of their role and participation in the value engineering process. The offeror provided adequate information pertaining to their approach to dispute and claims resolution. The offeror adequately demonstrated the time dedicated to this project for the key personnel broken down by phase of work. The offeror identified project specific risks that their firm would anticipate on this type of project and provided countermeasures for those risks. The offeror provided a detailed and project specific description of the key activities associated with this type of project. The offeror provided an adequate description of their plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements set by Metro.

Weaknesses - The project manager has limited public safety experience . The offeror's proposal lacked details on the firm's involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. For the firms five (5) largest contracts currently in progress, the firm's response was lacking a reference identifying the team members included on those contracts that would be identified as key personnel for Metro's contract.

TMPartners, LLC

Strengths - The offeror has been in business for 44 years. The offeror demonstrated experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach and provided specific projects they performed services on that used the CMAR delivery approach. The offeror adequately demonstrated that they had at least one (1) key personnel on the team (prime consultant and subconsultants) who has experience in designing and constructing LEED certified buildings at the Gold level. The offeror provided an adequate description of the number of LEED certified projects for which their firm has provided design services, and the offeror's proposal adequately described the firm's involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. The offeror's reference projects were of similar size, scope, and complexity as to what Metro is seeking in the resulting contract. The offeror provided an adequate description of the quality control procedures they would employ on this project during both design and construction phases . The offeror provided adequate information pertaining to their approach to dispute and claims resolution. The offeror adequately demonstrated their largest contracts currently in progress, along with identifying the team members included on those contracts that would be identified as key personnel for Metro's contract. The offeror adequately demonstrated the time dedicated to this project for the key personnel broken down by phase of work. The offeror identified project specific risks that their firm would anticipate on this type of project and provided countermeasures for those risks. The offeror provided an adequate description of the key activities associated with this type of project. The offeror provided a detailed description of their plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives provided by Metro.

Weaknesses - The offeror's organizational chart was limited to the Principal-in-Charge and lacked information on the key individuals, including key individuals of subconsultants that will be utilized. The Senior Project Architect and Senior Interior Designer were missing from the organizational chart. The difference in roles on the resumes for the electrical and mechanical engineers' conflict with their title and role on this project. The offeror failed to reference the LEED certification status achieved on The Williamson County Public Safety Center reference project . The proposed team members involved on the reference projects were noted as the firms and not the individual team members and their tasks performed. The offeror's description of their role and participation in the value engineering process lacked specific detail; specifically, the offeror's response lacked information of their understanding of the budget and their expectation to design to Metro's budget.



Statement of M/WBE Utilization **A&E ONLY**

Proposer's/Firm's Name: Smith Gee Studio	Proposer's Phone #: (615) 739-5555
Solicitation Title: Southeast Police Precinct Design Services (A&E)	Proposer's Email Address: hgee@smithgeestudio.com
Solicitation #: 131220	Total Bid Amount: n/a
EBO Goal (%) : <u>7.00</u> MBE% <u>7.00</u> WBE%	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) Y

The following MWBE* subcontractor(s)/supplier(s) will be utilized for the performance of this project:

	MBE/WBE Firm Name	MBE/WBE Firm Address	Phone/E-Mail	Certificate Type (MBE or WBE)	* MBE/WBE Group Type *	Code # UNSPS/NAICS	Description of Work
1	Logan Patri Engineering	630-C Southgate Avenue, Nashville, TN 37203	615-726-2902, rpatri@loganpatrie	MBE	4	81101505	Structural Engineering
2	Win Engineering	2 International Plaza, Suite 410, Nashville, TN 37217	615-400-8371, lwalters@winengin	WBE	5	81101701	Electrical Engineering
3	McCoy Design (formerly Tolleson McCoy)	615 Main Street, Suite 103, Nashville, TN 37206	615-403-6509, laura@mccoynash	WBE	5	82141600	Signage & Wayfinding
4				Select	Select		
5				Select	Select		
6				Select	Select		
7				Select	Select		

I am the duly authorized representative and certify the facts and representations contained in this form and supporting documents are true and correct.

Authorized Representative (Printed Name/Title/Signature) R. Hunter Gee, Principal		Date 08/11/2021
---	--	---------------------------

*Note: MWBE is defined as business enterprise maintaining a significant business presence in the Program Area & performing a commercial useful function that is owned by one or more of the following: (1) African Americans (2) Native Americans, (3) Hispanic Americans, (4) Asian Americans, and (5) Women.

Prime acknowledged EBO Goals? Yes	For Internal Office Use ONLY If No, Good Faith Efforts Met?	BAO Only
---	---	----------

BAO Representative: Evans Cline

Metro Buyer: Brad Wall

BAO Notes:

Prime acknowledge they can achieve both M/WBE subcontracting goals. Consistent with the procurement code actual dollar amounts and percentages will confirmed during contract negotiations.

Date: 10/18/2021

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Evans Cline
Contract Specialist: Brad Wall
Date: 10/18/2021
Department Name: General Services
RFP/ITB Number: 131220
Project Name: South Police Precinct Design Services (A&E)

SBE/SDV Requirement		
Primary Contractor	Acknowledged?	Comments
Smith Gee Studio, LLC	Yes	Proposer acknowledged the 19% 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 Barge Cauthen & Associates, Logan Patri Engineering, Win Engineering, HDLA, BuildingsGreened, and McCoy Design.