



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

April 18, 2019

Gina Ford
Agency Landscape + Planning LLC
45 Lawn Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Re: **RFQ # 1035681, Wharf Park Planning and Design Services (A&E)**

Dear Ms. Ford:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 1035681 for Wharf Park Planning and Design Services (A&E). This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to Agency Landscape + Planning 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 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.

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 Tina Burt, BAO Representative, at 615-880-2783 or at Tina.Burt@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 Matt Taylor by email at Matthew.Taylor@nashville.gov Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "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

**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY****Request for Mayoral Selection of A&E Firm
RFQ 1035681, Wharf Park Planning and Design Services (A&E)**

Metro received 17 proposals for the A&E Review Board to consider. The Review Board submits for review and selection by the Mayor the top 2 evaluated firms listed below in alphabetical order, accompanied by the Review Board's summary.

While it is acknowledged that the selection is solely that of the Mayor, it is the Review Board's recommendation that **Agency Landscape + Planning LLC** be selected for this project.

A&E Firm: Agency Landscape + Planning LLC

Strengths: Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided detail of firm's experience with park master planning and waterfront projects. Described in detail firm's narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process. Provided detailed schedule for completion of proposed park master planning. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members and project roles. Provided a detailed design.

Weaknesses: Public engagement lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Design phase lacked detail.

MWBE Plan: Proposed the engagement of Tolleson McCoy (WBE), for Signage Consultant, Wilmot Inc. (WBE), for Low impact design, community engagement, cost-benefit analysis, SITES certification, and government coordination, KS Ware & Associates (WBE), for Geotechnical Engineering, and Connico (WBE), for Cost Estimating.

SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc. for Civil Engineering, BDY Environmental, LLC for Environmental Consulting & Permitting Assistance, Connico Inc. for Cost Estimating, EMC Structural Engineers, P.C. for Structural engineering/consulting, Encore Interpretive Design, LLC for Historic Research, Hodgson Douglas, LLC for Landscape Architecture and Planning, and Wilmot Inc. for Low impact design, community engagement, cost-benefit analysis, SITES certification, and government coordination.

A&E Firm: Field Operations

Strengths: Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members and project roles. Provided a detailed design. Described in detail firm's narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process. Clearly defined firm's project team structure.

- Weaknesses: Firm submitted contract exceptions. Public engagement lacked detail. Experience on similar projects lacked detail. Sustainability and communications lacked detail.
- MWBE Plan: Proposed the engagement of Wilmot Inc. (WBE), for Sustainability and Green Infrastructure, Connico (WBE), for Cost Estimating, and KS Ware & Associates (WBE), for Geotechnical Engineering/Environmental.
- SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms EOA Architects for local advisory and local Architecture, Barge Cauthern & Associates for Civil Engineering, Wilmot, Inc. for Sustainability/Green Infrastructure, Sims Strategic Diversity Consultants for Public Relations/Community Engagement, and Connico for Cost Estimating.

RFQ# - 1035681 Wharf Park Planning and Design Services (A&E)

Evaluation Team/Review Board Score Sheet

Offeror	Agency Landscape + Planning LLC	COEN+PARTNERS	Dialog Design LP	EDSA	Field Operations
Contract Acceptance (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Qualifications and Experience (35 Points)	33.00	23.00	25.00	23.00	32.00
Experience on Similar Projects (30 Points)	26.00	20.00	20.00	19.00	26.00
Project Approach and Process (30 Points)	29.00	21.00	21.00	20.00	29.00
Small Business/Service Disable Veteran Owned Plan (5 Points)	2.50	1.00	1.25	1.12	2.75
Total Evaluation Scores (maximum points 100)	90.50	65.00	67.25	63.12	89.75

Offeror	HAWKINS PARTNERS, INC	Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	LOSE DESIGN
Contract Acceptance (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Qualifications and Experience (35 Points)	30.00	22.00	27.00	26.00
Experience on Similar Projects (30 Points)	25.00	19.00	20.00	22.00
Project Approach and Process (30 Points)	26.00	19.00	22.00	21.00
Small Business/Service Disable Veteran Owned Plan (5 Points)	3.50	3.00	3.25	1.12
Total Evaluation Scores (maximum points 100)	84.50	63.00	72.25	70.12

Offeror	MSK2, LLC (dba MKSK)	Mikyoung Kim Design	Nelson Byrd Woltz LLC	OJB Landscape Architecture
Contract Acceptance (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Qualifications and Experience (35 Points)	29.00	26.00	29.00	30.00
Experience on Similar Projects (30 Points)	25.00	26.00	24.00	24.00
Project Approach and Process (30 Points)	29.00	23.00	23.00	24.00
Small Business/Service Disable Veteran Owned Plan (5 Points)	3.00	0.50	0.50	1.12
Total Evaluation Scores (maximum points 100)	86.00	75.50	76.50	79.12

Offeror	PORT Architecture and Urbanism LLC	Stoss Landscape Urbanism	Tunnell-Spangler & Associates, Inc., d/b/a TSW	Wallace Roberts & Todd, LLC
Contract Acceptance (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Qualifications and Experience (35 Points)	28.00	32.00	23.00	29.00

Experience on Similar Projects (30 Points)	23.00	28.00	17.00	22.00
Project Approach and Process (30 Points)	24.00	26.00	20.00	24.00
Small Business/Service Disable Veteran Owned Plan (5 Points)	1.25	0.62	0.37	0.68
Total Evaluation Scores (maximum points 100)	76.25	86.62	60.37	75.68

Agency Landscape + Planning LLC (90.50 Points)				
Strengths				
Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided detail of firm's experience with park master planning and waterfront projects. Described in detail firm's narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process. Provided detailed schedule for completion of proposed park master planning. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members and project roles. Provided a detailed design.				
Weaknesses				
Public engagement lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Design phase lacked detail. Lacked details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, and strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.				
COEN+PARTNERS (65.00 Points)				
Strengths				
Provided detail of firm's waterfront experience. Provided a detailed schedule for completion of proposed park master planning.				
Weaknesses				
Park master planning experience lacked detail. Utilization of team members lacked detail. Project approach and process lacks detail. Understanding of Metro's overall mission and goals for a enhanced waterfront lacked detail. Project team structure lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Design phase lacked detail. Lacked details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.				
Dialog Design LP (67.25 Points)				
Provided firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided firm's qualifications with park master planning.				
Weaknesses				
Organizational chart lacked detail. Structure of team members lacked detail. Experience on similar projects lacked detail. Project team structure lacked detail. Design phase lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Lacking details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.				
EDSA (63.12 Points)				
Strengths				
Provided firm's experience with park master planning and waterfront projects. Clearly defined firm's project team structure.				
Weaknesses				
Understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced waterfront lacked detail. Collaborative design lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Schedule for completion of proposed park master planning lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Utilization of team members lacked detail. Lacked details regarding past performance, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.				
Field Operations (89.75 Points)				
Strengths				
Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members and project roles. Provided a detailed design. Described in detail firm's narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process. Clearly defined firm's project team structure.				
Weaknesses				
Firm submitted contract exceptions. Public engagement lacked detail. Experience on similar projects lacked detail. Sustainability and communications lacked detail. Lacked details regarding past performance, utilization, and strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.				
HAWKINS PARTNERS, INC (84.50 Points)				
Strengths				
Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members and project roles. Provided detail of public engagement. Provided a detailed design. Provided park master planning experience. Provided detail of firm's commitment to utilizing SBE/SDVs from past performance and provided methods to ensure prompt payments to SBE/SDVs.				
Weaknesses				
Organizational chart lacked detail. Experience on similar projects lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.				

Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan, Inc. (63.00 Points)	
Strengths	Provided a detailed design.
Weaknesses	Understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced waterfront lacked detail. Public engagement lacked detail. Experience on similar projects lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Implementation/design phase process lacked detail. Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs and efforts to ensure prompt pay.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (72.25 Points)	
Strengths	Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided detail of firm's commitment to utilizing SBE/SDVs from past performance.
Weaknesses	Public engagement lacked detail. Collaborative design lacked detail. Sustainability and communications lacked detail. Experience on similar projects lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs and efforts to ensure prompt pay.
LOSE DESIGN (70.12 Points)	
Strengths	Provided park master planning experience. Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront.
Weaknesses	Collaborative design lacked detailed. Public engagement lacked detail. Natural and cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Utilization of team members lacked detail. Schedule for completion of proposed park master planning lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Lacked details regarding past performance, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
MSK2, LLC (dba MKSK) (86.00 Points)	
Strengths	Provided detail of firm's proposed team members and project roles. Provided detail of public engagement. Provided park master planning experience. Described in detail firm's narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process.
Weaknesses	Collaborative design lacked detailed. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Implementation/design phase process lacked detail. Utilization of team members lacked detail. Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.
Mikyung Kim Design (75.50 Points)	
Strengths	Provided a detailed design. Provided detail of public engagement. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members.
Weaknesses	Resumes lacked detail. Understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced waterfront lacked detail. Park master planning projects lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Schedule for completion of proposed park master planning lacked detail. Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.
Nelson Byrd Woltz LLC (76.50 Points)	
Strengths	Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided a detailed design.
Weaknesses	Public engagement lacked detail. Park master planning projects lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Schedule for completion of proposed park master planning lacked detail. Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.
OJB Landscape Architecture (79.12 Points)	
Strengths	Provided a detailed design. Provided detail of waterfront projects. Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront.
Weaknesses	Public engagement lacked detail. Park master planning experience lacked detail. Sustainability and communications lacked detail. Implementation/design phase process lacked detail. Lacked details regarding past performance, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
PORT Architecture and Urbanism LLC (76.25 Points)	
Strengths	Provided park master planning experience. Provided detail of public engagement.

<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced waterfront lacked detail. Team structure lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Utilization of team members lacked detail. Schedule for completion of proposed park master planning lacked detail. Lacked details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, and methods to ensure prompt payment.</p>
<p>Stoss Landscape Urbanism (86.62 Points)</p>
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Provided detail of firm's understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced urban waterfront. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members and project roles. Described in detail firm's narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process. Provided a detailed design.</p>
<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Public engagement lacked detail. Park master planning experience lacked detail. Implementation/design phase process lacked detail. Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.</p>
<p>Tunnell-Spangler & Associates, Inc., d/b/a TSW (60.37 Points)</p>
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Provided detail of public engagement.</p>
<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Understanding of overall mission and goals for an enhanced waterfront lacked detail. Team structure lacked detail. Park master planning experience lacked detail. Cultural resource preservation lacked detail. Utilization of team members lacked detail. Schedule for completion of proposed park master planning lacked detail. Narrative of the proposed park master planning approach and process lacked detail. Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.</p>
<p>Wallace Roberts & Todd, LLC (75.68 Points)</p>
<p>Strengths</p> <p>Provided detail on large waterfront projects. Provided detail of firm's proposed team members.</p>
<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Public engagement lacked detail. Park master planning projects lacked detail. Sustainability and communications lacked detail. Narrative of project approach and process lacked detail. Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.</p>

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Tina R. Burt

Contract Specialist: Matthew Taylor

Revised Date: 04/15/2019

Department Name: Parks

RFP/ITB Number: 1035681

Project Name: Wharf Park Planning and Design Services (A&E)

SBE/SDV Requirement Acknowledged?

Primary Contractor	SBE/SDV Requirement Acknowledged?	Comments
Agency Landscape + Planning LLC	Yes	SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc., BDY Environmental, LLC, Connico Inc., EMC Structural Engineers, P.C., Encore Interpretive Design, LLC, Hodgson Douglas, LLC, and Wilmot Inc.
James Corner Field Operations	Yes	SBE/SDV Plan: Proposer acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV participation expectation over the life of the project as required by the solicitation. Proposed the engagement of SBE firms EOA Architects, Barge Cauthen & Associates, Wilmot Inc., Sims Strategic Diversity Consultants, and Connico.

PNP Compliance Results Form

Department Name: Parks

RFP/ITB Number: 1035681

Wharf Park Planning and Design Services (A&E)

Primary Contractor	PNP Compliant (Yes/No)	Determination Comments/% of Participation Proposed or Bid
Agency Landscape + Planning LLC	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements having reached out to four certified MWBE firms as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of TollesonMcCoy (WBE) - Accepted, Wilmot Inc. (WBE) - Accepted, KS Ware & Associates (WBE) - Accepted, and Connico (WBE)- Accepted. Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.
James Corner Field Operations	Yes	Proposer is compliant with the Procurement Nondiscrimination Program requirements having reached out to three certified MWBE firms as required by the Procurement Code. Proposed the engagement of Wilmot Inc. (WBE) - Accepted, Connico (WBE) - Accepted, and KS Ware & Associates (WBE) - Accepted. Consistent with the Procurement Code, actual dollar amounts will be confirmed upon contract award.

*Denotes Contractor with whom follow up was required

Date: 01/18/2019

Revised Date 04/15/2019

Metro Buyer: Matthew Taylor

BAO Rep: Tina R. Burt

Proposer	Commitment to SBE/SDV Participation on the Project (2 pts)	Strategic Approach to Maximizing SBE/SDV (1.5 pts)	Efforts Ensure Prompt Payment (1 pt)	Monitoring and Reporting of SBE/SDV Participation (0.5 pts)	Total	Strength	Weakness
Agency Landscape + Planning LLC	1	0	1	0.5	2.5		Lacked details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, and strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.
COENPARTNERS	0.75	0	0.25	0	1		Lacked details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
Dialing Design LP	1	0	0	0.25	2		Lacked details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
EDBA	0.5	0	0.5	0.125	1.125		Lacked details regarding past performance, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
James Corner Field Operations	0.5	1	0.75	0.5	2.75		Lacked details regarding past performance, utilization, and strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.
Hawkins Partners, Inc.	2	0	1	0.5	3.5	Commitment to SBE/SDVs and past performance and utilization of SBE/SDVs and efforts to ensure prompt pay.	Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.
Hughes, Good, O'Leary & Ryan, Inc.	2	0	0.5	0.5	3		Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs and efforts to ensure prompt pay.
Kinsley Horn and Associates, Inc.	2	0.75	0.25	0.25	3.25	Commitment to SBE/SDVs and past performance and utilization of SBE/SDVs.	Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs and efforts to ensure prompt pay.
Less Design	0.5	0	0.125	0.5	1.125		Lacked details regarding past performance, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
MSKL LLC dba MRLK	1	0.75	0.75	0.5	3		Lacked details of strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs.
Minyoung Kim Design	0.5	0	0	0	0.5		Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.
Nelson Byrd Wolfe LLC	0.5	0	0	0	0.5		Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.
OJB Landscape Architecture	0.5	0	0.375	0.25	1.125		Lacked details regarding past performance, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, monthly reporting, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
PORT Architecture and Urbanism LLC	0.75	0	0	0.5	1.25		Lacked details regarding past SBE/SDV utilization, strategic approach to maximizing SBE/SDVs, and methods to ensure prompt payment.
Sloss Landscape Urbanism	0.5	0	0.125	0	0.625		Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.
Turner-Spangler & Associates, Inc., dba TSW	0.125	0	0	0.25	0.375		Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.
Wallace Roberts & Todd, LLC	0.5	0	0	0.1875	0.6875		Overall SBE/SDV strategy plan lacked details and key components not addressed.