

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

April 15, 2019

Amy Masterton Ameresco, Inc. 306 Starling Lane Franklin, TN 37064 Re: **RFQ # 1043778, Energy Management System**

Dear Ms. Masterton:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 1043778 for Energy Management System. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to Ameresco, Inc., 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 Jerval Watson, BAO Representative, at 615-862-5461 or at jerval.watson@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 Scott Ghee by email at scott.ghee@nashville.gov Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

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

Sincerely,

Michelle O. Herrardy Jane

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

Award Justification for RFQ 1043778 - Energy Management System

Solicitation Title & Number			RFP Cost Points	RFP SBE/SDV Points	Total Cost Points
RFQ 1043778 - Energy Management System			32	8	40
					•
Offeror's Name	Total Bid Amount	SBE/SDV Participation Amount	RFP Cost Points	RFP SBE/SDV Points	Total Cost Points
Ameresco, Inc.	\$141,950.00	\$0.00	18.61	0.00	18.61
Applied Data Systems, Inc.	\$226,200.00	\$226,200.00	11.68	1.50	13.18
EnergyCAP, Inc.	\$197,415.35	\$0.00	13.38	0.00	13.38
JadeTrack, Inc.	\$203,128.89	\$0.00	13.01	0.00	13.01
Lucid Design Group	\$279,214.26	\$0.00	9.46	0.00	9.46
Measurabl, Inc.	\$222,000.00	\$0.00	11.90	0.00	11.90
NuOrigin Systems, Inc.	\$1,204,840.22	\$1,204,840.22	2.19	8.00	10.19
WegoWise, Inc.	\$82,568.52	\$0.00	32.00	0.00	32.00

Danual 4

Round 1								
	Ameresco, Inc.	Applied Data Systems, Inc.	EnergyCAP, Inc.	JadeTrack, Inc.	Lucid Design Group	Measurabl, Inc.	NuOrigin Systems, Inc	WegoWise, Inc.
Cost Criteria (40 points)	18.61	13.18	13.38	13.01	9.46	11.9	10.19	32
Qualifications and Experience (30 points)	26	10	24	6	27	5	15	28
Project Approach (30 points)	26	8	30	5	20	5	5	20
Total (100 points)	70.61	31.18	67.38	24.01	56.46	21.9	30.19	80

Round 1 and 2 Scores					
	Ameresco, Inc.	EnergyCAP, Inc.	WegoWise, Inc.		
Round 1 (100 points)	70.61	67.38	80		
Demonstration (100 points)	100	95	0		
Tetel (200 meinte)	170.01	102.20	00		

*WegoWise did not submit a response in Round 2

Ameresco, Inc.

Strengths – Firm demonstrated their qualifications to produce the required outcomes and services for this RFP. Firm described in detail their implementation team, responsibilities, locations and interrelationships within the team and listed who will be the primary contact for the implementation process. Firm described their neinnum of four (4) projects. Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm described their relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects. Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm described their preception of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementing this EMS. Firm described their spicet will be implemented and included a Gantt chart. Firm described their standard services level agreement. Firm had a strong demonstration that covered all information requested. Firm stated in their demonstration that Metro has access to the activity log. Firm stated that Metro has access to the activity log. Firm stated that Metro has access to the activity log. Firm stated services and their standard services and their standard.

Weaknesses -Firm failed to provide the resumes for the implementation team. Firm's response to any plans or to make significant changes to the proposed solution lacked specific detail.

Applied Data Systems, Inc.

Strengths – Firm demonstrated their qualifications to produce the required outcomes and services for this RFP. Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm outlined their approach and plan for training Metro staff that will be using the EMS.

Weaknesses – Firm failed to describe their implementation team, including their resumes. Firm failed to demonstrate the number of years the firm has been in business providing services of similar scope and complexity. Firm failed to describe relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects of similar scope and provide services of similar scope and complexity. Firm failed to describe relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects of similar scope and complexity. The description of their perception of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementing this EMS was not clear. Firm's description of how the scope of this project will be implemented lacked specific detail. Firm failed to provide their standard service level agreement.

EnergyCAP, Inc.

Strengths – Firm demonstrated their qualifications to produce the required outcomes and services for this RP. Firm described in detail their implementation team, responsibilities, locations and interrelationships within the team. Firm demonstrated the number of years the firm has been in business providing services of similar size, scope, and complexity. Firm described their relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects. Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm described their perception of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementation team, responsibilities, locations and interrelationships within the team of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementing this EMS. Firm estimated the number of FTEs and the duration needed for implementation. Firm described how the scope of this project will be implemented and included a Gant chart. Firm described how the EMS will be hosted. Firm provided a strong response as to whether users are obligated to upgrade, or if older versions of their solution will be supported if newer versions are released. Firm provided their standard services level agreement. Firm outlined their approach and plan for training Metro staff that will be using the EMS. Firm provided their standard service level agreement. Firm had a strong demonstration.

Weaknesses – Firm failed to include the resumes of the implementation team and include who will be the primary contact for the implementation process. Firms dashboard presented in their demonstration was not as user friendly as other proposed solutions. EnergyCAP is a post consumption tool, therefore they do not provide real-time consumption options.

JadeTrack, Inc

Strengths -Firm described in detail their implementation team, responsibilities, locations and interrelationships within the team and listed who will be the primary contact for the implementation process. Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm outlined their approach and plan for training Metro staff that will be using the EMS.

Weaknesses - Qualification and Experience section lacked detail. Firm dial not follow the RFP formatting instructions. Firm failed to include the resumes of their implementation team. Firm's description of relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects of similar size, scope, and complexity lacked specific detail. Firm failed to describe their perception of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementing this EMS. Firm failed to provide the estimated the number of FTEs and the duration needed for implementation. Firm failed to specify the estimated resources required by Metro during setup of the system, and for what duration these resources would be needed. Firm failed to describe how the scope of this project will be implemented. Firm failed to state how Metro would be kept informed of software updates that take place every two weeks. Firm failed to provide their service level agreement.

Lucid Design Group

Strengths – Firm demonstrated their qualifications to produce the required outcomes and services for this RFP. Firm described in who will be the primary contact for the implementation process. Firm demonstrated the number of years the firm has been in business providing services of similar size, scope, and complexity. Firm described in detail their relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects. Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm described in detail hor the scope of this project will be implemented and included a Gantt chart. Firm described how the TMS will be howed bound business provided. Firm described in detail how the reader the their or their weater of the scope of their vendors.

Weaknesses - Firm did not follow the RPP formatting instructions. Firm failed to provide the resumes for the implementation team. Firm's description of their perception of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementing this EMS lacked specific detail. Firm failed to address whether their bill processing solution. Firm asket is provide their solution of the roles of their perception of the roles of their bill processing solution. Firm asket is provide their solution are detail firm failed to address whether there are any plans to make significant changes to the proposed solution. Firm failed to provide their standard services level agreement.

Measurabl, Inc.

Strengths - Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm stated that they conduct enhancements every two weeks.

Weaknesses - Qualifications and Experience section lacked detail. Firm failed to describe the implementation team, including resumes, responsibilities, locations and interrelationships within the team. Failed to address who will be the primary contact for implementation. Firm failed to describe relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. Firm's Project Approach section lacked detail. Firm failed to describe their perception of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementing this EMS. Firm failed to describe their bill processing solution. Firm failed to provide the estimated the number of FTEs and the duration needed for implementation. Firm failed to specify the estimated outring setup of the system, and for what duration these resources would be needed. Firm failed to describe their perception outring setup of the system, and for what duration these resources would be needed. Firm failed to describe their standard service level agreement.

NuOrigin Systems, Inc

Strengths --Firm demonstrate their qualifications to produce the required outcomes and services for this RFP. Firm completed and attached their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm described how the EMS will be hosted.

Weaknesses - Firm did not follow the RFP formatting instructions. Projects listed were not of similar size, scope, and complexity. Firm failed to describe their perception of the roles of their firm and Metro's in implementing this EMS. Firm failed to provide the estimated the number of FTEs and the duration needed for implementation. Firm failed to specify the estimated resources required by Metro during setup of the system, and for what duration these resources would be needed. Firm failed to describe how the scope of this project will be implemented. Firm failed to outline their approach and plan for training Metro staff that will be using EMS. Firm failed to provide the is standard scenement.

WegoWise, Inc.

Strengths – Firm demonstrate their qualifications to produce the required outcomes and services for this RFP. Firm described in detail their implementation team, responsibilities, locations and interrelationships within the team. Firm provided the resumes and listed who will be the primary point of contact for the implementation. Firm demonstrated the number of years the firm has been in business providing services of similar size, scope, and complexity. Firm described their relevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects. Firm completed and tatched their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm described their prevant experience on a minimum of four (4) projects. Firm completed and tatched their minimum requirements document in the excel format provided. Firm described in detail hold their project will be implemented and included a Gantt chart. Firm described their provided a strong response as to whether users are obligated to upgrade, or if older versions of their solution will be usported if newer versions are released. Firm provided their standard service level agreement. Firm outlined their approach and plan for training MEto staff that will be using the EMS. Firm described their standard service level agreement.

Weaknesses - Proposal did not follow the RFP formatting instructions. Firm failed to provide the estimated the number of FTEs and the duration needed for implementation. Firm failed to specify the estimated resources required by Metro during setup of the system, and for what duration these resources would be needed. Firm failed to provide two years of metrics on SE adherence related to problem resolution. Firm failed to interfix on service measures. Firms training and implementation plan as presented in their demonstration lacked specific detail. Firm stated that Metro would not have access to the activity log and would have to request information from alson for worker easilities and integrity and and implementation plan as presented in their demonstration lacked specific detail. Firm stated that Metro would not have access to the activity log and would have to request information from Web/Web. Firm does not provide real-time alerts. Firms system was lacking a public facing dashboard.

BAO SBE Assessment Sheet							
BAO Specialist: Jerval Watson							
Contract Specialist: Scott Ghee							
Date: 3/04/2019							
Department Name: General Servi	Department Name: General Services						
RFP/ITB Number: 1043778							
Project Name: Energy Managem	ent System						
Primary Contractor*	Prime Bid Amount	Total Offered SBE (\$)	SBEs approved?	Tot	al Approved SBE (\$)	SBE (%)	Comments
			YES				
Ameresco, Inc.	\$141,950.00	\$0.00	125	\$	-	0.00%	There is no SBE participation.
Applied Data Systems, Inc.	\$226,200.00	\$226,200.00	YES	\$	226,200.00	100.00%	There is SBE participation via the Primary Contractor
EnergyCAP, Inc.	\$196,367.42	\$196,367.42	NO	\$	-	0.00%	There is no SBE participation.
JadeTrack, Inc.	\$330,548.15	\$0.00	NO	\$	-	0.00%	There is no SBE participation.
Lucid Design Group	\$279,214.26	\$0.00	NO	\$	-	0.00%	There is no SBE participation.
Measurable, Inc.	\$222,000.00	\$0.00	NO	\$	-	0.00%	There is no SBE participation.
NuOrigin Systems, Inc.	\$1,204,840.22	\$1,204,840.22	YES	\$	1,204,840.22	100.00%	There is SBE participation via the Primary Contractor who is also a Metro approved MBE
WegoWise, Inc.	\$120,068.95	\$0.00	NO	\$	-	0.00%	There is no SBE participation.

*For ITBs, only apparent low bidder will be listed.