



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

April 25, 2018

Mr. Jonathan Kirby
Level 3 Communications, Inc.
2530 Perimeter Place
Nashville, TN 37214

Re: **RFQ # 1020705, Provision of Telecommunication Services**

Dear Mr. Kirby:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 1020705, Provision of Telecommunication Services. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award a contract to Level 3 Communications for Managed Services and Unmanaged Services, contingent upon successful contract negotiations.

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 Troup by email at terri.troup@nashville.gov Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

If the Procurement Nondiscrimination 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. Should you have any questions concerning this requirement, please contact Bryan Gleason, BAO Representative, at 615-862-6710 or at bryan.gleason@nashville.gov.

Thank you for participating in Metro's competitive procurement process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "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.

RFQ # 1020705 - Provision of Telecommunication Services

Scoring and Justifications

UN-MANAGED SERVICES

	Qualifications & Experience (30 Points)	Capacity & Approach (35 Points)	Cost (35 Points)	Total (100 Points)
AT&T	30	35	10.21	75.21
Comcast	25	25	24.22	74.22
Level 3	30	35	28.00	93.00
Verizon	10	10	9.86	29.86
Windstream	24	30	12.45	66.45
Zayo Group	24	30	3.61	57.61

Offeror's Name	Bids	SBE	Cost Evaluation (28 Pt Max)	SBE/SDV	Total Cost Points (35 Pt)
				Evaluation (7 Pt Max)	
AT&T	\$65,750.00	\$0	10.21	0.00	10.21
Comcast	\$27,716.40	\$0	24.22	0.00	24.22
Level 3	\$23,973.48	\$0	28.00	0.00	28.00
Verizon	\$68,104.64	\$0	9.86	0.00	9.86
Windstream	\$53,929.00	\$0	12.45	0.00	12.45
Zayo Group	\$186,000.00	\$0	3.61	0.00	3.61

***Note: Longway Broadband submitted a response; however, was deemed non-responsive**

AT&T

Strengths – Demonstrated in detail the company’s experience providing a variety of telecommunication services available to Metro. Demonstrated experience with other Tennessee government agencies. “AT&T is recognized as the leading provider of IP-based communications services to businesses and the leading U.S. provider of wireless, high speed Internet access, local and long distance voice, and directory publishing and advertising services”. Proposal included a clearly defined team structure. “With monthly meetings and daily interaction between members of the team and Metro personnel we are able to bring the right resources together to meet Metro’s requirements”. Resources are pulled together and escalated accordingly to meet Metro’s deadlines. Proposal included a detailed escalation process for services issues, including interval times between each level. Eleven person account team provided.

Weaknesses – Resumes included as a linked word document rather than within the PDF document submitted. Bios provided of key personnel but not resumes.

Comcast

Strengths – Proposal included a detailed escalation process for services issues, including interval times between each level. Proposal included a 60-90 day implementation plan.

Weaknesses – Three account team members list and no resumes provided.

Level 3

Strengths – Detailed capacity and approach section that clearly details. Proposal provided a clear understanding of the organizational structure.

**RFQ # 1020705 - Provision of Telecommunication Services
Scoring and Justifications**

UN-MANAGED SERVICES

	Qualifications & Experience (30 Points)	Capacity & Approach (35 Points)	Cost (35 Points)	Total (100 Points)
AT&T	30	35	10.21	75.21
Comcast	25	25	24.22	74.22
Level 3	30	35	28.00	93.00
Verizon	10	10	9.86	29.86
Windstream	24	30	12.45	66.45
Zayo Group	24	30	3.61	57.61

Offeror's Name	Bids	SBE	Cost Evaluation (28 Pt Max)	SBE/SDV Evaluation (7 Pt Max)	Total Cost Points (35 Pt)
AT&T	\$65,750.00	\$0	10.21	0.00	10.21
Comcast	\$27,716.40	\$0	24.22	0.00	24.22
Level 3	\$23,973.48	\$0	28.00	0.00	28.00
Verizon	\$68,104.64	\$0	9.86	0.00	9.86
Windstream	\$53,929.00	\$0	12.45	0.00	12.45
Zayo Group	\$186,000.00	\$0	3.61	0.00	3.61

***Note: Longway Broadband submitted a response; however, was deemed non-responsive**

Weaknesses – Escalation policy did not provide interval times between each level. Appendix A – Master Service Agreement and Service Schedules PDF documents incorporated into the submitted PDF response are not accessible. Proposal failed to include details about the companies experience to government agencies. Proposal references resumes of key personnel but no resume were accessible in the submitted response.

Verizon

Strengths – N/A

Weaknesses – Proposal was generic and lack requested details. Proposal did not provide information about the account team.

Windstream

Strengths – Proposed account team resumes outline detailed experience providing the responsible role of each member. Provided detailed implementation outline and timeline. “The Windstream project team members will work with the METRO project team to identify project actions and potential risks in the planning phase, and develop action and risk mitigation plans prior to starting service implementations. The Windstream project manager will track and monitor all project actions, issues and risks on the form shown below to ensure the actions are completed on time and the risk mitigation plan has been effective, and the risks have truly been mitigated.”

**RFQ # 1020705 - Provision of Telecommunication Services
Scoring and Justifications**

UN-MANAGED SERVICES

	Qualifications & Experience (30 Points)	Capacity & Approach (35 Points)	Cost (35 Points)	Total (100 Points)
AT&T	30	35	10.21	75.21
Comcast	25	25	24.22	74.22
Level 3	30	35	28.00	93.00
Verizon	10	10	9.86	29.86
Windstream	24	30	12.45	66.45
Zayo Group	24	30	3.61	57.61

Offeror's Name	Bids	SBE	Cost Evaluation (28 Pt Max)	SBE/SDV Evaluation (7 Pt Max)	Total Cost Points (35 Pt)
AT&T	\$65,750.00	\$0	10.21	0.00	10.21
Comcast	\$27,716.40	\$0	24.22	0.00	24.22
Level 3	\$23,973.48	\$0	28.00	0.00	28.00
Verizon	\$68,104.64	\$0	9.86	0.00	9.86
Windstream	\$53,929.00	\$0	12.45	0.00	12.45
Zayo Group	\$186,000.00	\$0	3.61	0.00	3.61

***Note: Longway Broadband submitted a response; however, was deemed non-responsive**

Weaknesses – Provided escalation process lacked detail compared to other offerors. Demonstrated experience with other government agencies lack specific details.

Zayo Group

Strengths – Proposal provided a detailed explanation of single point of contact’s role for account management, service, and billing issues. Provided a descriptive ordering process along with customer access to orders via on-line portal.

Weaknesses - Escalation policy did not provide interval times between each level. Bios provided of key personnel but not resumes.

**RFQ # 1020705 - Provision of Telecommunication Services
Scoring and Justifications**

MANAGED SERVICES

	Qualifications & Experience (30 Points)	Capacity & Approach (35 Points)	Cost (35 Points)	Total (100 Points)
AT&T	30	35	28.00	93.00
Level 3	30	35	26.59	91.59
Verizon	10	10	9.78	29.78
Windstream	24	30	11.82	65.82
Zayo Group	24	30	3.43	57.43

Offeror's Name	Bids	SBE	Cost Evaluation (28 Pt Max)	SBE/SDV Evaluation (7 Pt Max)	Total Cost Points (35 Pt)
AT&T	\$22,766.40	\$0.00	28.00	0.00	28.00
Level 3	\$23,973.48	\$0.00	26.59	0.00	26.59
Verizon	\$65,187.36	\$0.00	9.78	0.00	9.78
Windstream	\$53,929.00	\$0.00	11.82	0.00	11.82
Zayo Group	\$186,000.00	\$0.00	3.43	0.00	3.43

***Note: Longway Broadband submitted a response; however, was deemed non-responsive**

AT&T

Strengths – Demonstrated in detail the company’s experience providing a variety of telecommunication services available to Metro. Demonstrated experience with other Tennessee government agencies. “AT&T is recognized as the leading provider of IP-based communications services to businesses and the leading U.S. provider of wireless, high speed Internet access, local and long distance voice, and directory publishing and advertising services”. Proposal included a clearly defined team structure. “With monthly meetings and daily interaction between members of the team and Metro personnel we are able to bring the right resources together to meet Metro’s requirements”. Resources are pulled together and escalated accordingly to meet Metro’s deadlines. Proposal included a detailed escalation process for services issues, including interval times between each level. Eleven person account team provided.

Weaknesses – Resumes included as a linked word document rather than within the PDF document submitted. Bios provided of key personnel but not resumes.

Level 3

Strengths – Detailed capacity and approach section that clearly details. Proposal provided a clear understanding of the organizational structure.

Weaknesses – Escalation policy did not provide interval times between each level. Appendix A – Master Service Agreement and Service Schedules PDF documents incorporated into the submitted PDF response are not accessible. Proposal failed to include details about the companies experience to government agencies. Proposal references resumes of key personnel but no resume were accessible in the submitted response.

**RFQ # 1020705 - Provision of Telecommunication Services
Scoring and Justifications**

MANAGED SERVICES

	Qualifications & Experience (30 Points)	Capacity & Approach (35 Points)	Cost (35 Points)	Total (100 Points)
AT&T	30	35	28.00	93.00
Level 3	30	35	26.59	91.59
Verizon	10	10	9.78	29.78
Windstream	24	30	11.82	65.82
Zayo Group	24	30	3.43	57.43

Offeror's Name	Bids	SBE	Cost Evaluation	SBE/SDV	Total Cost
			(28 Pt Max)	Evaluation (7 Pt Max)	Points (35 Pt)
AT&T	\$22,766.40	\$0.00	28.00	0.00	28.00
Level 3	\$23,973.48	\$0.00	26.59	0.00	26.59
Verizon	\$65,187.36	\$0.00	9.78	0.00	9.78
Windstream	\$53,929.00	\$0.00	11.82	0.00	11.82
Zayo Group	\$186,000.00	\$0.00	3.43	0.00	3.43

***Note: Longway Broadband submitted a response; however, was deemed non-responsive**

Verizon

Strengths – N/A

Weaknesses – Proposal was generic and lack requested details. Proposal did not provide information about the account team.

Windstream

Strengths –Proposed account team resumes outline detailed experience providing the responsible role of each member. Provided detailed implementation outline and timeline. “The Windstream project team members will work with the METRO project team to identify project actions and potential risks in the planning phase, and develop action and risk mitigation plans prior to starting service implementations. The Windstream project manager will track and monitor all project actions, issues and risks on the form shown below to ensure the actions are completed on time and the risk mitigation plan has been effective, and the risks have truly been mitigated.”

Weaknesses – Provided escalation process lacked detail compared to other offerors. Demonstrated experience with other government agencies lack specific details.

Zayo Group

Strengths – Proposal provided a detailed explanation of single point of contact’s role for account management, service, and billing issues. Provided a descriptive ordering process along with customer access to orders via on-line portal.

Weaknesses - Escalation policy did not provide interval times between each level. Bios provided of key personnel but not resumes.



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

March 6, 2018

Mr. Joseph C. Longway, PMP
President & Lead Consultant
Longway Broadband Services
PO Box 1604
Mount Juliet, TN 37121-1604
jlongway@longwaybroadband.com

SENT VIA EMAIL

Re: RFQ 1020705 Telecommunications Services

Mr. Longway:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County has received your submitted response to the above solicitation and upon review, has determined that your submission was non-responsive.

Specifically, the submitted proposal was non-responsive due to a failure to comply with M.C.L. § 4.48.080 Prohibition Against Contingent Fees.

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Michelle A. Hernandez Lane".

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Chief Procurement/Purchasing Agent
Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County

Cc: Solicitation Files