



### Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	96213	Award Date	12/7/2021   2:29 PM CST
Solicitation Title	Stormwater Engineering Services (A&E)		
Buyer Name	Brad Wall	Buyer Email	brad.wall@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Evans Cline	BAO Email	evans.cline@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	Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc.	Company Contact	Liza Carpenter		
Street Address	6606 Charlotte Pike Suite 210				
City	Nashville	State	TN	Zipcode	37209

Company Name	Civic Engineering and Information Technologies, Inc.	Company Contact	Jennifer Ogden		
Street Address	25 Lindsley Ave				
City	Nashville	State	TN	Zipcode	37210

Company Name	Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, Inc.	Company Contact	Cindy Popplewell		
Street Address	3800 Ezell Road Suite 100				
City	Nashville	State	TN	Zipcode	37211

### 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.

Sandra Walker  
Supervisor

Michelle Hernandez Lane  
Purchasing Agent

RFQ #96213 - Stormwater Engineering Services (A&E)					
	Alfred Benesch & Company	Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc.	Brown and Caldwell	Civic Engineering and Information Technologies, Inc.	Collier Engineering Co Inc.
Contract Acceptance	Contract exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions
Firm Qualifications (35 points) Round #1	15.00	35.00	30.00	35.00	30.00
Team Qualifications (30 Points) Round #1	17.00	30.00	22.00	30.00	27.00
Reference Projects and Capacity to Perform (35 Points) Round #1	15.00	30.00	19.00	25.00	30.00
<b>Total Points for Round #1 (100 Points)</b>	<b>47.00</b>	<b>95.00</b>	<b>71.00</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>87.00</b>
Interviews (100 Points) Round #2	Did not advance to Round #2	92.00	Did not advance to Round #2	95.00	76.00
<b>Overall Total Points for Rounds #1 and 2</b>	<b>47.00</b>	<b>187.00</b>	<b>71.00</b>	<b>185.00</b>	<b>163.00</b>

#### Alfred Benesch & Company

**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror provided an adequate project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror provided adequate community engagement information. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation lacked detail. In the firm qualifications section, the offeror failed to adequately demonstrate related project experience performing the requested services. The offeror's description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team lacked detail. The offeror didn't provide all of the requested information for all of their subcontractors/sub-consultants qualifications to produce the required outcomes. The offeror failed to provide a specific description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project. Several of the offeror's reference projects were not of similar size, scope, and complexity. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. The offeror didn't clearly identify potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

#### Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc.

**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror provided thorough knowledge in the provision of services related to the solicitation. The offeror provided a detailed description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team. The offeror provided a detailed description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project. The offeror's reference projects were of similar size, scope, and complexity. The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance was detailed. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror demonstrated advanced knowledge nonevasive construction technicians. Offeror demonstrated adequate time dedication to Metro Water Services (MWS) program. The offeror adequately demonstrated their willingness to provide monetary compensation for any design errors. The offeror described a detailed QA/QC process that their firm currently has in place.

**Round #1 Weaknesses** - The offeror failed to provide the original proposal amounts and final construction costs for their reference projects. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror lacked specific information on the Program Manager and lead design members. The offeror lacked detail on how they would provide status updates and the frequency of those updates.

#### Brown and Caldwell

**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance was detailed. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of related project experience performing the requested services lacked detail. The offeror's description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team lacked detail. The offeror's documentation for their subcontractors/sub-consultants qualifications lacked detail. The offeror's description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project lacked specific examples to demonstrate the unique team experience. Several of the engineering support programs referenced lacked specific individual projects for Metro to verify them of being of similar size, scope, and complexity. The offeror's proposed project manager was not listed on any of the five (5) reference projects as a proposed team member involved in the projects. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. The offeror's description of how work will be prioritized for Metro lacked detail. The offeror's project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished lacked detail. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

#### Civic Engineering and Information Technologies, Inc.

**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror's related project experience performing the requested services was detailed. The offeror provided a detailed description of their subcontractors/sub-consultants ability, capacity, skill, and number of years of experience in providing the required services. The offeror provided information and project specific examples of their unique approach and experience implementing sustainable designs. The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance was detailed. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror demonstrated adequate information regarding the Program Manager and lead design members. Offeror demonstrated adequate time dedication to Metro Water Services (MWS) program. The offeror adequately demonstrated their willingness to provide monetary compensation for any design errors. The offeror demonstrated familiarity communicating with property owners early in the design phase.

**Round #1 Weaknesses** - Several of the engineering support programs referenced lacked specific individual projects for Metro to verify them of being of similar size, scope, and complexity. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror lacked detail on their QA/QC process.

#### Collier Engineering Co Inc.

**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror's reference projects were of similar size, scope, and complexity. The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. **Round #2 Strengths** - No strengths.

**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation lacked detail. The offeror's documentation for their subcontractors/sub-consultants qualifications lacked detail. The offeror failed to provide the original proposal amounts and final construction costs for their reference projects. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror lacked specific information on the Program Manager and lead design members. The offeror lacked detail on how they would provide status updates and the frequency of those updates. The offeror demonstrated inadequate time dedication of the Program Manager to the Metro Water Services (MWS) program. The offeror lacked detail on their QA/QC process. The offeror lacked information on their willingness to rectify design errors. The offeror lacked detail on how to reduce impact on property owners.

	Gresham Smith	Hazen and Sawyer	HMB Professional Engineers, Inc.	James+Associates, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Contract Acceptance	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions
Firm Qualifications (35 points) Round #1	15.00	20.00	13.00	13.00	25.00
Team Qualifications (30 Points) Round #1	17.00	14.00	12.00	10.00	30.00
Reference Projects and Capacity to Perform (35 Points) Round #1	20.00	20.00	15.00	15.00	20.00
<b>Total Points for Round #1 (100 Points)</b>	<b>52.00</b>	<b>54.00</b>	<b>40.00</b>	<b>38.00</b>	<b>75.00</b>
Interviews (100 Points) Round #2	Did not advance to Round #2	Did not advance to Round #2	Did not advance to Round #2	Did not advance to Round #2	Did not advance to Round #2
<b>Overall Total Points for Rounds #1 and 2</b>	<b>52.00</b>	<b>54.00</b>	<b>40.00</b>	<b>38.00</b>	<b>75.00</b>

#### Gresham Smith

**Round #1 Strengths** - No strengths. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation lacked detail. In the firm qualifications section, the offeror failed to adequately demonstrate related project experience performing the requested services. The offeror's description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team lacked detail. The offeror failed to provide a specific description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project. Not all of the reference projects submitted accurately show the original proposed construction amounts and final construction costs. The offeror failed to provide the specific team members involved on several of the reference projects. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. The offeror's project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished lacked detail. The offeror failed to specifically identify potential issues/challenges and provide their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

#### Hazen and Sawyer

**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror demonstrated experience coordinating public outreach. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation lacked specific detail. In the firm qualifications section, the offeror failed to provide sufficient scope of work descriptions for their related project experience. The offeror's description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team lacked detail. The offeror's documentation for their subcontractors/sub-consultants qualifications lacked detail. The offeror failed to provide a specific description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project. Not all of the reference projects submitted accurately show the original proposed construction amounts and final construction costs. Several of the offeror's reference projects were not of similar size, scope, and complexity. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. The offeror didn't specifically identify and address potential issues/challenges and provide their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance. The offeror didn't specifically address how work will be prioritized for Metro within their company's current capacity. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**HMB Professional Engineers, Inc.**  
**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror will have an individual available for any public involvement, community update meetings, or other special requests. The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror provided a detailed breakdown of hours anticipated for the key individual team members to perform the services being requested by Metro based on their current workload. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.  
**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation lacked detail. The offeror lacked detail and project specific detail when demonstrating their related project experience performing the requested services. The offeror's description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team lacked detail. The schedule of existing assigned projects was omitted. The offeror failed to provide a specific description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project. Several of the offeror's reference projects were not of similar size, scope, and complexity. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance lacked project specific detail. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**James+Associates, Inc.**  
**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance was detailed. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.  
**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation lacked detail. In the firm qualifications section, the offeror failed to adequately demonstrate related project experience performing the requested services. The offeror's description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team lacked detail. The offeror's organizational chart didn't clearly identify the positions/roles of the subconsultants. The offeror didn't clearly provide the schedule of existing assigned projects. The offeror failed to provide a specific description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project. Several of the offeror's reference projects were not of similar size, scope, and complexity. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. The offeror didn't specifically address how work will be prioritized for Metro within their company's current capacity. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.**  
**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror provided a well-diversified team in their proposal. The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance was detailed. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.  
**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror's demonstration of their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation lacked detail. Several of the offeror's reference projects were not of similar size, scope, and complexity. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

	S&ME, Inc.	Stantec	Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, Inc.
Contract Acceptance	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions	Accepted with no exceptions
Firm Qualifications (35 points) Round #1	35.00	27.00	35.00
Team Qualifications (30 Points) Round #1	23.00	20.00	28.00
Reference Projects and Capacity to Perform (35 Points) Round #1	25.00	25.00	33.00
<b>Total Points for Round #1 (100 Points)</b>	<b>83.00</b>	<b>72.00</b>	<b>96.00</b>
Interviews (100 Points) Round #2	80.00	Did not advance to Round #2	95.00
<b>Overall Total Points for Rounds #1 and 2</b>	<b>163.00</b>	<b>72.00</b>	<b>191.00</b>

**S&ME, Inc.**  
**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance was detailed. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror plans to keep a continuous in the cloud project status spreadsheet and update it weekly.  
**Round #1 Weaknesses** - The offeror's description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team lacked detail. The offeror's description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project lacked detail. Several of the offeror's reference projects were not of similar size, scope, and complexity. Several of the offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not completed as requested. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror failed to clearly describe a direct or main point of contact. The offeror demonstrated inadequate time dedication of the Program Manager to the Metro Water Services (MWS) program. The offeror lacked information on their willingness to rectify design errors. The offeror lacked detail on their QA/QC process.

**Stantec**  
**Round #1 Strengths** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror demonstrated experience with large stormwater management programs. The offeror provided a detailed description on why their team is best suited for this project and the specific benefits Metro can expect by selecting their team. The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.  
**Round #1 Weaknesses** - In the firm qualifications section, the offeror didn't provide sufficient detail to demonstrate their knowledge in the services related to this solicitation. The schedule of existing assigned projects was omitted. The offeror's description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project was not included in the team qualifications section as requested; instead, it was listed within the firm qualifications section. The offeror's reference projects were ongoing and not one (1) was completed as requested. Several of the engineering support programs referenced lacked specific individual projects for Metro to verify them of being of similar size, scope, and complexity. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror did not advance to round #2.

**Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, Inc.**  
**Round #1 Strengths** - The offeror provided thorough knowledge in the provision of services related to the solicitation. The offeror provided a detailed description of their subcontractors/sub-consultants ability, capacity, skill, and number of years of experience in providing the required services. The offeror provided a detailed description of their unique team experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing the project. The offeror's reference projects were of similar size, scope, and complexity. The offeror provided a detailed project approach that included major tasks and sub-tasks to be accomplished. The offeror's identification of potential issues/challenges and their approach to minimizing disruptions to performance was detailed. **Round #2 Strengths** - The offeror clearly detailed the Program Manager and lead design members. The offeror adequately demonstrated their willingness to provide monetary compensation for any design errors. Offeror demonstrated adequate time dedication to Metro Water Services (MWS) program. The offeror clearly described their policies regarding client responsiveness and provided subconsultants with deadlines to prevent nonresponsiveness. The offeror described a detailed QA/QC process that their firm currently has in place.  
**Round #1 Weaknesses** - The anticipated percentage of time to be dedicated to the scope of services was not included in the team qualifications section as requested. The schedule of existing assigned projects was omitted. One (1) of the offeror's reference projects was ongoing and not completed as requested. **Round #2 Weaknesses** - The offeror lacked detail on how a transition would be handled without any disruption if the Program Manager happened to be reassigned.



## Statement of M/WBE Utilization

Proposer's/Firm's Name: <b>Barge Cauthen &amp; Associates, Inc.</b>	Proposer's Phone #: 615.356.9911
Solicitation Title: <b>Stormwater Engineering Services (A&amp;E)</b>	Proposer's Email Address: <b>rwilliams@bargecauthen.com</b>
Solicitation #: <b>96213</b>	Amount Self-performed : <b>0% M/WBE performed by Self</b>
Proposer's/Firm's Ownership: <b>Non-M/WBE</b>	Total Bid Amount: <b>NA</b>
<b>Proposed EBO Goal (%)</b> : 0 <u>    </u> MBE%    6 <u>    </u> WBE%	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) <b>YES</b>

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	Code # UNSPS/NAICS	Description of Work	MBE/WBE Dollars (\$)	Percent of Total Contract
						Type (MBE or WBE)				
1	Civic Engineering & Information Technologies, Inc.	25 Lindsley Avenue, Nashville TN 37210	615.425.2000	WBE	5	81101505,80170000, 81151604	Structural design, public relations, land surveying	TBD	2%	
2	<b>Civil Infrastructure Assoc</b>	307 Hickerson Dr, Murfreesboro TN 37219	615.663.7678	WBE	5	81151604	Land Surveying	TBD	4%	
3				Select	Select					
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) <b>Richard Williams, P.E., Sr. Civil Engineer</b>	Date <b>01/18/2021</b>
---	---------------------------

\*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.

Has Prime Complied with EBO Goal? <b>YES</b>	<b>For Internal Office Use ONLY</b>	If No, Good Faith Efforts Met? <b>BAO Only</b>
--	-------------------------------------	--

**BAO Representative:** Evans Cline **Date:** 12/01/21

<b>Total MBE Subcontracting</b>	<u>                    </u> %	\$ <u>                    </u>
<b>Total WBE Subcontracting</b>	<u>                    </u> %	\$ <u>                    </u>
<b>Total MBE/WBE Participation:</b>	<u>                    </u> %	\$ <u>                    </u>



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

Proposer's/Firm's Name: Civic Engineering and Information Technologies, Inc.	Proposer's Phone #: 615-425-2000
Solicitation Title: Stormwater Engineering Services (A&E)	Proposer's Email Address: info@civicinc.com
Solicitation #: 96213	Total Bid Amount: N/A
<b>EBO Goal (%)</b> : 0.00 MBE% <u>6</u> WBE%	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) Yes

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	Civil Infrastructure Associates	307 Hickerson Drive, Murfreesboro, TN 37129	615-483-4840/spudio@cia-engine	WBE	5	81101500	Surveying and Stormwater Design Services
2	KS Ware and Associates	52 Lindsley Avenue, Nashville, TN 37210	615-255-0702/ntong@kswarellc.cc	WBE	5	81101500	Geotechnical Services, Materials Testing and Construction Administration and Inspection Services
3				Select	Select		
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) <b>Philip Nelson/Director of Engineering</b>		Date <b>01/19/2021</b>
--	--	---------------------------

\*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.

Has Prime Complied with EBO Goal?	BAO Only	<b>For Internal Office Use ONLY</b> If No, Good Faith Efforts Met?	BAO Only
-----------------------------------	----------	---	----------

**BAO Representative:** \_\_\_\_\_



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

Proposer's/Firm's Name: Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, Inc.	Proposer's Phone #: 615-333-0630
Solicitation Title: Stormwater Engineering Services (A&E)	Proposer's Email Address: cindy.popplewell@woodplc.com
Solicitation #: 96213	Total Bid Amount: N/A
<b>EBO Goal (%)</b> : 0.00 MBE% <b>6</b> WBE%	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) <b>Y</b>

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	CIA, Civil Infrastructure Associates, LLC	307 Hickerson Drive, Murfreesboro, TN 37129	615-516-2852 / lsullivan@cia-engl	WBE	5	81101528; 81151604	Stormwater engineering; survey; CADD Support
2	K.S. Ware & Associates, LLC	52 Lindsley Avenue, Suite 101, Nashville TN 37210	615-742-7476 /nloug@kswarel.c	WBE	5	<b>81101514</b>	Geotechnical engineering; construction services
3				Select	Select		
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) <b>Cindy Popplewell, Assistant Program Manager</b>	Date
--	------

\*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.

Has Prime Complied with EBO Goal?	Yes	<b>For Internal Office Use ONLY</b> If No, Good Faith Efforts Met?	BAO Only
-----------------------------------	-----	---	----------

**BAO Representative:** Evans Cline



**BAO SBE Assessment Sheet**

<b>BAO Specialist: Evans Cline</b>
<b>Contract Specialist: Brad Wall</b>
<b>Date: 12/1/21</b>
<b>Department Name: Water</b>
<b>RFP/ITB Number: 96213</b>
<b>Project Name: Stormwater Engineering Services (A&amp;E)</b>

<b>SBE/SDV Requirement</b>		
<b>Primary Contractor</b>	<b>Requirement Acknowledged?</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Barge Cauthen & 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 an approved SBE and proposed the engagement of SBE firms Civil Infrastructure Assoc., LI Smith and Assoc., Hawkins Partners, Inc., Pennington and Assoc., Inc., and Griggs and Maloney, Inc.
Civic Engineering and Information Technologies, 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 Civil Infrastructure Assoc., BDY Environmental, Croft and Associates, Apps Pipeline Video Inspection
Wood Environment and Infrastructure Solutions, 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 Civil Infrastructure Assoc., Inc., Heibert + Ball Land Design, LLC, and LI Smith and Assoc, Inc.