### **Notice of Intent to Award**

Solicitation Number	285248	Award Date	9/18/2023   2:11 PM CDT			
Solicitation Title	Automated License Plate Reader/Recognition (ALPR) system - Vehicle Based LPRs Portion					
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov			
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@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	Motorola Solutions, Inc	Company Contact		Rick Carter					
Street Address	105 Westpark Drive, Bldg 3, Suite 200	105 Westpark Drive, Bldg 3, Suite 200							
City	Brentwood	State	Tennessee	Zipcode	37027				
Company Name		Company Contact							
Street Address									
City		State		Zipcode					
Company Name		Compa	ny Contact						
Street Address									
City		State		Zipcode					

#### **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.

	Monthly Reporting
Yes, the EBO Program is applicable.	No, the EBO Program is not applicable.
after the referenced award date.	

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.

mal	Supervisor	(Initial)
-----	------------	-----------

## **Vehicle Based Mobile Solution Scoring Summary**

			Round 2 (1	00 Points)				
	Round 1 (50 Points)	Product Information (40 Points)	Methodology and Business Plan (30 Points)	Service and Maintenance (30 Points)	Round 2 Total (100 Points)	Round 3 (150 Points)	Round 4 (50 Points)	Total Round 1-4 (350 Points)
Insight LPR, LLC	30	30	30	30	90	115	29.4	264.4
Motorola Solutions, Inc	50	40	30	30	100	130	50	330
Jenoptoik Smart Mobility Solutions	33	25	25	20	70	Shortlisted b Submit in		103
Selex-ES Inc	33	25	10	15	50	Deemed not unacceptable, therefore, not shortlisted to Round 3		83
Eye in the Sky, LLC	40		Shortli	sted but Failed to	o Submit in Rour	nd 2		40
Genetec Inc	5		Deemed not unad	cceptable, theref	ore, not shortlis	ted to Round 2		5
NDI Technologies Inc	30		Shortlisted but Failed to Submit in Round 2					
Utility Associates Inc	10		Deemed not unac	cceptable, theref	ore, not shortlis	ted to Round 2		10

### **ROUND 1 – VEHICLE BASED**

Proposed Solution/Offeror Name	Eye in the Sky, LLC	Genetec Inc	Insight LPR, LLC	Jenoptoik Smart Mobility Solutions	Motorola Solutions, Inc	NDI Technologies Inc	Selex-ES Inc	Utility Associates Inc
Project Experience (Max 50 Pts)	40	5	30	33	50	30	33	10

### Eye in the Sky, LLC

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated an understanding of scope by providing detailed information related to camera installation, garages of entry and exit points, and mounting angles based on project experiences. Proposal demonstrated twenty plus years' experience on projects of similar scope and complexity.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal lacked specific qualifications, including an item-by-item disclosure outlining how the team meets or exceeds the requirements of this solicitation. Proposal demonstrated limited experience with specific municipals law enforcement agencies as a prime.

## **Genetec Inc**

Strengths – N/A

**Weaknesses** -Proposal demonstrated prime as a manufacture that would offer products through re-seller. Proposal failed to demonstrate project experience of a full-turnkey solution of similar size, scope, and complexity.

## **Insight LPR, LLC**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated project experience of similar size and complexity.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal demonstrated limited experience with municipals law enforcement agencies. Proposal demonstrated project experience is limited compared to other offerors. Proposal lacked specific qualifications, including an item-by-item disclosure outlining how the team meets or exceeds the requirements of this solicitation.

### **ROUND 1 – VEHICLE BASED**

Propose	d Solution/Offeror Name	Eye in the Sky, LLC	Genetec Inc	Insight LPR, LLC	Jenoptoik Smart Mobility Solutions	Motorola Solutions, Inc	NDI Technologies Inc	Selex-ES Inc	Utility Associates Inc
Projec	t Experience (Max 50 Pts)	40	5	30	33	50	30	33	10

## **JENOPTIK SMART MOBILITY SOLUTIONS**

Strengths - Proposal demonstrated project experience of similar size and complexity for the prime.

**Weaknesses** - Proposal lacked details regarding subcontractors and experience perform certain roles to be performed as part of the scope. Proposal lacked specific qualifications, including an item-by-item disclosure outlining how the team meets or exceeds the requirements of this solicitation.

### **Motorola Solutions, Inc**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated detailed project experience for a full turn-key solution of similar size, scope, and complexity. Proposal demonstrated detailed qualifications, including an item-by-item disclosure outlining how the team meets or exceeds the requirements of this solicitation. Proposal outlined detailed explanation related to project experience solution being linked to the scope details, including on-staff implementation team.

Weaknesses – N/A

## **NDI Technologies Inc**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated project experience of similar size and complexity.

**Weaknesses** – Proposal contains limited information related to the background of the company. Proposal demonstrated project experience is limited compared to other offerors.

### **ROUND 1 – VEHICLE BASED**

Proposed Solution/Offeror Name	Eye in the Sky, LLC	Genetec Inc	Insight LPR, LLC	Jenoptoik Smart Mobility Solutions	Motorola Solutions, Inc	NDI Technologies Inc	Selex-ES Inc	Utility Associates Inc
Project Experience (Max 50 Pts)	40	5	30	33	50	30	33	10

## **Selex-ES Inc**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated project experience at the federal level and for large municipals. Proposal demonstrated data exchange project experience across various agencies.

**Weaknesses** - Proposal lacked specific qualifications, including an item-by-item disclosure outlining how the team meets or exceeds the requirements of this solicitation.

### **Utility Associates Inc**

Strengths -N/A

**Weaknesses** - Proposal failed to demonstrate project experience for just LPRs. Project Experience demonstrated in car camera system that can do LPR and not stand alone. Proposal demonstrated limited years of experience in LPR field/industry for the one LPR technology. Proposal failed to demonstrate project experience of similar size, scope, and complexity. Proposal lacked specific qualifications, including an item-by-item disclosure outlining how the team meets or exceeds the requirements of this solicitation.

#### **ROUND 2 – VEHICLE BASED**

Proposed Solution/Offeror Name	Insight LPR, LLC	Jenoptoik Smart Mobility Solutions	Motorola Solutions, Inc	Selex-ES Inc
Methodology & Business Plan (30 Pts Max)	30	20	30	15
Service and Maintenance (30 Pts Max)	30	25	30	10
Product Information (40 Pts Max)	30	25	40	25
Total Round 2 Points (100 Pts Max)	90	70	100	50

- Genetec Inc & Utility Associates Inc were deemed not qualified from Round 1.
- Eye in the Sky, LLC, NDI Technologies Inc, and Upstate Wholesale Supply Inc dba Brite Computers failed to submit response to Round 2.
- Flock Group, Inc not submitting vehicle-based solution.

### Insight LPR, LLC

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated detailed methodology and business plan which included a good description of implementation plan. Proposal clearly defined team members roles. Proposal demonstrated response times to be 1 hour or less for resolution.

**Weaknesses** – Failed to provide systems administration, user manual, and implementation documentation.

## **Jenoptik Smart Mobility Solutions**

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated response times were 30 minutes for urgent and high related issues with 2 hours or less for urgent work around solution.

Weaknesses – Methodology and business plan proposal was generic and not specific to Metro's scope of services. Proposal failed to address risk management plan strategy and out-of-scope process(es). Overall proposal was difficult to follow due to formatting. Product information response stated compliance with specifications but failed to provide additional description details. Failed to provide systems administration, user manual, and implementation documentation. Proposal demonstrated that licensing would only support the first 50 users then there would be additional costs for more licenses.

### **ROUND 2 – VEHICLE BASED**

Proposed Solution/Offeror Name	Insight LPR, LLC	Jenoptoik Smart Mobility Solutions	Motorola Solutions, Inc	Selex-ES Inc
Methodology & Business Plan (30 Pts Max)	30	20	30	15
Service and Maintenance (30 Pts Max)	30	25	30	10
Product Information (40 Pts Max)	30	25	40	25
Total Round 2 Points (100 Pts Max)	90	70	100	50

- Genetec Inc & Utility Associates Inc were deemed not qualified from Round 1.
- Eye in the Sky, LLC, NDI Technologies Inc, and Upstate Wholesale Supply Inc dba Brite Computers failed to submit response to Round 2.
- Flock Group, Inc not submitting vehicle-based solution.

### **Motorola Solutions, Inc**

**Strengths** - Proposal demonstrated detailed and well-organized methodology and business plan which included project management plan and implementation plan. Proposal demonstrated response times to be 1 hour or less for resolution. Proposal demonstrated detailed site preparation plan as part of product information response.

Weaknesses - N/A

Scoring to be added once clarification response is received and evaluation team determines consensus score accordingly.

## Selex-ES Inc

**Strengths** – Proposal demonstrated versatility of proposed solutions.

Weaknesses - Methodology and business plan proposal was generic and not specific to Metro's scope of services. Proposal included an organization chart but failed to provide description and role for individuals on organizational chart. Risk management plan included with proposal focused on COVID and weather. Proposal failed to provide response time for issues. Proposal demonstrated that there is the potential for risk data and that would be completely the responsibility of the customer and Offeror would not be held responsible. Proposal also demonstrated that the Offeror would make a best effort to notify if a breach took place. Proposal included a copy and paste of license agreement rather than providing response to providing description how all licensing and/or subscriptions work for all components. Product information response stated compliance with specifications but failed to provide additional description details. Proposal included a 2018 manual.

#### **ROUND 3 – VEHICLE BASED**

Proposed Solution/Offeror Name	Insight LPR, LLC	Motorola Solutions, Inc
Vehicle-Based Mobile LPR Field Trial (150 Points)	115	130
Total Round 3 Points (150 Pts Max)	115	130

## **Insight LPR, LLC**

Strengths – Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated good dashboard with device status overview. Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated detailed hit reports with options to categorize by National Crime Information Center (NCIC) alert type by camera. Exceptional end user training provided throughout Vehicle Based LPR field trial. Direct Lightweight Directory Access Protocol Active Directory integration supported and documented as part of the Vehicle Based LPR field trial. Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated device status information accurate.

Weaknesses – Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated the inability to schedule reports. Proposed solution for Vehicle Based LPR demonstrated that date/time parameters cannot be adjusted for read reports. Vehicle Based LPR field trial showed single sign-on through Azure not supported. During the Vehicle Based LPR field trial several cameras, cables, and switches changed. Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated that user permissions do not provide granular access control.

## **Motorola Solutions, Inc**

**Strengths** - Vehicle Based LPR demonstration resulted in acceptable day and nighttime reads on blue plates. Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated exceptional reporting interface that allows scheduled and customizable reports. Proposed solution for Vehicle Based LPR demonstrated as part of the field trial a single sign-on with Azure active directory supported and documented. Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated granular user permissions.

Weaknesses – Inconsistent reading of blue plates throughout Vehicle Based LPR field trial. As part of the Vehicle Based LPR field trial the system status available through series of menus but no overall status dashboard available. Local processor hotlist periodically out of date or incomplete throughout Vehicle Based LPR field trial. Vehicle Based LPR field trial demonstrated device status information inaccurate.

## **ROUND 4 – VEHICLE BASED**

			RFP Cost Point
		Evaluation	Distribution
Offeror's Name	Bids	Amount	(50 Points Max)
Insight LPR, LLC	\$ 411,119.17	\$411,119	29.40
Motorola Solutions, Inc	\$ 241,778.04	\$241,778	50.00

Round 4 Scoring					
Proposed Solution/Offeror Name	Insight LPR, LLC	Motorola Solutions, Inc			
Vehicle-Based Mobile LPR Cost (50 Points)	29.4	50			
Total Round 4 Points (50 Pts Max)	29.4	50			

## Notice Unacceptable Offers

Solicitation Number	285248	Date	12/8/2022   4:11 PM CST		
Solicitation Title	Automated License Plate Reader/Recognition (ALPR) system				
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	Email terri.ray@nashville.gov		
BAO Rep	N/A	BAO Email	N/A		

### **Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer for Fixed LPR, Vehicle Based Mobile, and Trailer-Based Mobile that is unacceptable:

Company Name	Genetec Inc	Compar	ny Contact	t Stefania D'Alessandro		
Street Address	2280 Alfred-Nobel Blvd					
City	Montreal H4S 2A4 Canada	State	N/A	Zipcode	N/A	

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

### **Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the Procurement Record.

### **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.

Mal

## Notice Unacceptable Offers

Solicitation Number	285248	Date	12/8/2022   4:10 PM CST		
Solicitation Title	Automated License Plate Reader/Recognition (ALPR) system				
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	mail terri.ray@nashville.gov		
BAO Rep	N/A	BAO Email	N/A		

### **Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer for Fixed LPR, Vehicle Based Mobile, and Trailer-Based Mobile that is unacceptable:

Company Name	Utility Associates Inc	Associates Inc Company Contact Joyce			Joyce Trotter	
Street Address	250 E Ponce de Leon Ave, Suite 700					
City	Decatur	State	GA	Zipcode	30030	

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

## **Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the Procurement Record.

### **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.

Mal

## Notice Unacceptable Offers

Solicitation Number	285248	Date	1/9/2023   4:53 PM CST		
Solicitation Title	Automated License Plate Reader/Recognition (ALPR) system				
Buyer Name	Terri Ray	Buyer Email	terri.ray@nashville.gov		
BAO Rep	N/A	BAO Email	N/A		

### **Unacceptable Offer**

The following supplier has submitted an offer for Fixed LPR, Vehicle Based Mobile, and Trailer-Based Mobile that is unacceptable:

Company Name	Selex-ES Inc Company Contact			Craig Duncan		
Street Address	4221 Tudor Lane					
City	Greensboro	State	NC	Zipcode	27410	

Suppliers with unacceptable offers will not be considered for award.

## **Public Information and Records Retention**

Solicitation and award documentation will be available upon request after the intent to award is issued. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the Procurement Record.

### **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 & Hernandez lane