

JOHN COOPER, MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

**METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY**

4/9/2021 | 4:24 PM CDT

Lloyd Soeters  
Blakley Construction Services, LLC  
500 Arlington Avenue  
Nashville, TN 37210

**Re: RFQ # 72165, Stormwater Administration Building and Garage Construction**

Dear Mr. Lloyd Soeters:

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Metro) has completed the evaluation of submitted solicitation offer(s) to the above RFQ # 72165 for Stormwater Administration Building and Garage Construction. This letter hereby notifies you of Metro's intent to award to Blakley Construction Services, 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 Equal Business Opportunity (EBO) 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 Cierra Rowe, BAO Representative, at (615) 862-6136 or at [cierra.rowe@nashville.gov](mailto:cierra.rowe@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 Jonathan Meadows by email at [jonathan.meadows@nashville.gov](mailto:jonathan.meadows@nashville.gov) Monday through Friday between 8:30am and 3:30pm.

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

Sincerely,

*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](http://www.Nashville.gov)  
Phone: 615-862-6180  
Fax: 615-862-6179

RFQ #72165 - Stormwater Adminstration Building and Garage Construction Evaluation Team/Review Board Score Sheet						
Offeror	American Constructors, Inc.	Bell & Associates Construction	Blakely Construction Services, LLC	Orion Building Corporation	R.G. Anderson Company, Inc	Rock City Constuction
Qualifications and Experience (35 points)	24.50	31.50	34.50	21.50	30.50	23.00
Methodology and Approach (35 points)	22.00	32.00	33.50	23.50	30.50	19.00
Round 1- Total (70 Points)	Did not proceed to Round 2	63.50	68.00	Did not proceed to Round 2	61.00	Did not proceed to Round 2
Round 2- Cost (30 Points)		24.00	28.27		22.82	
Total Evaluation Scores (100 Points)	46.50	87.50	96.27	45.00	83.82	42.00

### Evaluation Comments

American Constructors, Inc.
Strengths
Proposal demonstrated experience with LEED components. Proposal demonstrated experience with scope of building design. Demonstrated good site-work projects and listed relevant office building experience. Proposal demonstrated experience with installation of cistern and green roof. Proposal demonstrated understanding of site work logistics, and associated risk. Provided a detailed phasing map.
Weaknesses
Proposal lacked detailed explanation with approach to this project for safety, phasing, and coordination. Proposal did not provide a schedule for this project. Organization of project included only one key employee dedicated to project. Construction phases demonstrated were not tailored to Metro. Proposal lacked detail if previous work performed was at Prime or Subcontractor level. Proposal did not demonstrate examples of medium or large commercial sites. Proposal lacked original schedules and costs. Proposal did not demonstrate LEED responsibility within their organization. Proposal did not exhibit cost control options. Proposal did not detail value engineering processes. Proposal lacked detail of occupied campus experience. Proposal did not include pre-planning meetings with subcontractors. Proposal's preconstruction services lacked details. General approach lacked detail, including standard project management language. Proposal did not include LID goals or objectives.

Bell & Associates Construction
Strengths
Proposal provided detailed LEED documentation and staff assigned to LEED work. Proposal provided detailed organizational chart including list of key staff with relevant experience dedicated project engineer and superintendent. Proposal included a detailed schedule. Proposal included many Metro-specific details in planning. Quality Control processes were very detailed. Proposal acknowledged project risks. Proposal demonstrated self-performance of major portions of work. Proposal included a detailed written phasing plan, including annotations on provided architectural plans. Proposal demonstrated a detailed approach to preconstruction. Proposal included detailed value engineering and constructability reviews.

Weaknesses
Proposal lacked details on subcontractor involvement for previous projects. Submitted projects size was not of similar scope, but the work was of similar scope. Proposal lacked details for LEED and LID projects and certification. Proposal did not demonstrate prioritization of Metro. Proposal did not identify major subcontractors for this project. Proposal's included phasing map lacked details on multiple stages. Proposal lacked details in describing day-today project management process.

Blakely Construction Services, LLC
Strengths
Proposal included detailed Metro-specific plans and information. Proposal provided projects of relevant scope and demonstrated prioritization of Metro. Demonstrated previous experience in cistern installation and multiple green roof contractors. A detailed schedule was provided. Proposal showed numerous specific and key staff members that are 100% dedicated to Metro project. Proposal highlighted early planning measures for project savings and detailed quality control plans. Proposal demonstrated a detailed phasing plan with key traffic control. Proposal detailed project management practices such as daily meetings for project, requiring subcontractors to attend weekly meetings. Presented good LEED and LID projects. Self-performance of many work items to increase cost savings.
Weaknesses
One project schedule provided was an in-progress project. Tree inventory, preservation, and removal process lacked details. Proposal did not demonstrate how Metro would be prioritized. Value engineering lacked details.

Orion Building Corporation
Strengths
Proposal demonstrated a project-dedicated Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent. Submitted projects demonstrate experience with an occupied campus. Proposal demonstrated well communicated phasing plan, including key staff their assigned work. Proposal highlighted specific software being used for this project.
Weaknesses
Organization chart lacked detail. Submitted projects did not exhibit experience in vehicle bay or office construction. LEED and LID consultant information lacked detail. Proposal did not identify major project risks. Proposal lacked detail of project procedure and/or capabilities to manage projects or process control. Proposal did not mention daily project management. Proposal did not mention LID. Proposal was missing 1 schedule. Responses to site management were not tailored to Metro. Proposal did not mention prioritization of Metro work. Submitted safety information was generic and not specific to Metro.

R.G. Anderson Company, Inc
Strengths
Proposal included a project-dedicated project manager and superintendent with long-term experience with the company. Provided photos of projects. Proposal included experienced LEED consultant. Proposal exhibited experience of cistern and green roof installation. Proposal provided very detailed safety information. Quality Control processes were strong and detailed. Proposed value engineering details to saving potential. Risks assessments were detailed including owner, architect, and subcontractor delays. Proposal included detailed preconstruction processes. Submitted phasing had elaborate tree protection plan.
Weaknesses

Proposal wasn't tailored to site. Staffing hours and included security consultant shows lack of understanding for Metro’s needs. Projects were similar in size, scope, and complexity but did not include office buildings in examples. LEED accreditation lacked details. Project management for daily meetings and responding to day-to-day was generalized. No erosion prevention and sediment control mention in LID. Stormwater permitting not addressed. Prioritization of Metro was not addressed.

Rock City Constuction
Strengths
Proposal provided LEED projects of all designations. Proposal demonstrated detailed subcontractor information and strong subcontractor relationships. Proposal contained detailed safety information. Proposal demonstrated use of Procore and dedication to LEED goals. Provided aggressive schedule and good LEED discussion with specific points. Provided a strong jobs site recycling plan.
Weaknesses
Proposal deferred many answers to be provided in Round 2 for major details. Proposal did not provide details on key staff committed to project. Provided examples do not align with scope of the solicitation. LEED projects lack details how LID was achieved. Proposal provided only 1 schedule. Organization chart does not show Bully Andrews staff or how they are integrated. Projects provided for examples were over budget by large margin. Out-of-state experience provided was not relevant with needs of local regulation. No project photos provided. Schedule provided did not mention phases from scope. Proposal did not provide details for daily project management process. Process controls lacked details. No mention of prioritization of Metro projects. Proposal did not mention constructability reviews. Proposal did not address process controls for performing work in a timely manner. Proposal lacked detail on value engineering or change order minimization processes.

Solicitation Title & Number		SBE/SDV Participation Threshold	RFP Cost Points	SBE/SDV Participation Points	Total Cost Points
RFQ 72165; Stormwater Administration Building and Garage Construction		15%	24	6	30
Offeror's Name	Total Bid Amount	SBE/SDV Participation Amount	RFP Cost Points	RFP SBE/SDV Points	Total Cost Points
Bell & Associates Construction, LLC	\$12,370,783.13	\$1,025,330.00	24.00	0.00	24.00
Blakely Construction Services	\$13,331,000.00	\$5,660,000.00	22.27	6.00	28.27
R.G. Anderson Company, LLC	\$13,012,087.00	\$474,883.00	22.82	0.00	22.82



## Statement of M/WBE Utilization

Proposer's/Firm's Name: <b>Blakley Construction Services, LLC</b>	Proposer's Phone #: <b>615-642-8981</b>
Solicitation Title: <b>Stormwater Administration Building and Garage Construction</b>	Proposer's Email Address: <b>LSoeters@blakleyservices.com</b>
Solicitation #: <b>72165</b>	Amount Self-performed : <b>N/A</b>
Proposer's/Firm's Ownership: <b>Non-M/WBE</b>	Total Bid Amount: <b>\$13,344,000.00</b>
<b>Proposed EBO Goal (%)</b> : <u>5</u> <b>MBE%</b> <u>4</u> <b>WBE%</b>	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) <b>YES</b>

The following MWBE\* subcontractor(s)/supplier(s) will be utilized for the performance of this project:

			Certificate						
MBE/WBE Firm Name	MBE/WBE Firm Address	Phone/E-Mail	Type (MBE or WBE)	* MBE/WBE Group Type *	Code # UNSPS/NAICS	Description of Work	MBE/WBE Dollars (\$)	Percent of Total Contract	
1 Jen-Hill Construction	145 Old Shackle Island Road; Hendersonville, TN 37075	615-824-1200	WBE	5	72100000	Pavers	\$400,000	3.00%	
2 A&H Construction	2595 S. Mt. Juliet Road, Mt. Juliet, TN 37122	615-500-8568	WBE	5	31330000	Steel Erection	\$140,000	1.05%	
3 Utopia Building Group	13707 Old Hickory Blvd; Antioch, TN 37013	615-642-6435	MBE	1	31330000	Equipment Install	\$175,000	1.31%	
4 Volunteer Rebar	110 North 1st Street, Nashville, TN 37213	615-256-3152	MBE	1	30000000	Rebar Supply	\$59,000	0.44%	
5 Commercial Installation	1513 Vista Lane, Suite B, Clarksville, TN 37043	931-233-8530	MBE	1	72152400	Doors & Windows	\$435,000	3.26%	
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>Lloyd Soeters / Owner /</b>	Date <b>03/10/2021</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>	<b>BAO Only</b>
		<i>If No, Good Faith Efforts Met?</i>	

**BAO Representative:** Cierra Rowe

**Date:** 04/05/21

Total MBE Subcontracting	5.01	%	\$ 669,000
Total WBE Subcontracting	4.05	%	\$ 540,000
Total MBE/WBE Participation:	9.06	%	\$ 1,209,000

## BAO Small Business Assessment Sheet

**BAO Specialist:** Cierra Rowe

**Contract Specialist:** Jonathan Meadows

**Date:** 4/5/2021

**Department Name:** Water Services

**RFP/ITB Number:** 72165

**Project Name:** Stormwater Administration Building and Garage Construction

Primary Contractor*	Prime Bid Amount	Total Proposed SBE (\$)	SBE Subs approved?	SBE (%)	Comments
Blakely Construction Services, LLC	\$13,344,000	\$5,660,000	Yes	42.42%	The prime is an approved SBE and will utilize SBE subcontractors D&L Associates, Inc \$1,250,000/9.37%, Jen-Hill Construction \$400,000/3% & Alexander Metals, Inc \$60,000/0.45%.