METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

11/20/2020 | 3:57 PM CST

Jon Plumlee
LightWave Solar Electric, LLC
3026 Owen Drive, Suite 104
Antioch, TN 37013

Re: RFQ 88160 Solar Energy Management for Metro Water Services

Dear Jon,

Based on evaluation of the submitted offers, I am pleased to inform you that it is the intent of the Metropolitan Government to award the contract resulting from the above referenced solicitation to LightWave Solar Electric, LLC.

The final award is contingent upon successful contract negotiations and legislative approval from the Metropolitan Council. Our office will be in touch over the next 10-days to schedule negotiations and discuss next steps.

Documents related to this solicitation are available upon request. You may contact Zak Kelley (Zak.Kelley@Nashville.gov) for further information.

We thank all suppliers for their interest in doing business with the Metropolitan Government and look forward to working with your firm on this project.

Best,

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

CC: Tracy Noel, Ameresco, INC
Adam Ness, Entegrity Energy
Charlie Herrig, Inman Solar Holdings LLC
Matt Beasley, Silicon Ranch Corporation

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 88160 - Solar Energy Management for Metro Water Services

Company	Qualifications & Experience (35 Points)	Technical Narrative (35 Points)	Cost Criteria (30 Points)	Total
Ameresco	27	20.25	30	77.25
Entegrity	25	18	1.4	44.4
Inman	29.5	26.5	.02	56.02
Light Wave	33.25	32	19.07	84.32
Silicon Ranch	33	29.25	15.84	78.09

Ameresco

Strengths

- Demonstrated qualifications to perform scope of work.
- Provided a detailed response relative to the monitoring and control system.
- Provided a detailed analysis of tax lease option.
- Documented safety practices.
- Provided an acceptable timeline.

Weaknesses

- Organizational chart did not include biographic info for subcontractors.
- Experience with similar projects was indirect via proposed subcontractor.
- Project narrative lacked detail relative to meeting minimum technical requirements.
- Approach to optimizing system performance was vague.
- Did not provide a plan for scheduling outages.
- Indicated pile driving at Omohundro, which is prohibited as noted in Appendix -1.
- Unclear approach to operations and maintenance if contract term were to stretch beyond 15-years.
- Unclear approach to financing if contract term were to stretch beyond 15/20 years.

Entegrity

Strengths

- Demonstrated past solar work at both water and wastewater facilities.
- Emphasized importance of operations and maintenance as part of project narrative.
- Documented safety practices.
- Provided an acceptable timeline.

Weaknesses

- Did not provide organizational chart in the appropriate format.
- Did not provide contractors license or cut sheets in the appropriate format.
- Project narrative lacked detail relative to meeting minimum technical requirements.
- Did not provide schematics in appropriate format.
- Weak approach to operations and maintenance, specifically lacked detail relative to inspections, testing, and planning for outages.
- Did not address monitoring of environmental conditions.
- Analysis of third party ownership financing mechanisms lacked detail.

Inman	
Strengths • Provided strong examples of utility or commercial solar instillations, specifically relative to airports and other projects within the Tennessee Valley. • Provided detailed summary of project challenges and risks, specifically relative to soil bearing capacity. • Provided detailed worksheets for operations and maintenance, except as noted. • Documented safety practices. • Provided an acceptable timeline.	**Weaknesses** • Did not provide specific examples relative to behind the grid energy production. • Organizational chart did not include subcontractors or previous experience on similar projects for some key individuals. • Did not address opportunities for innovation. • Approach to optimizing system performance includes pushing electricity into the grid, which is specifically prohibited in the solicitation. • Lowest generated energy production relative to other offers. • Did not provide plan for scheduling outages. • Analysis of third party ownership financing mechanisms lacked detail. • Highest experience modification-rating (EMR) score relative to other offers.

Light Wave	
Strengths • Provided strong examples of utility or commercial solar installations, specifically projects with ballasted mounts and behind the meter production similar to what will be used for this project. • Project narrative included detailed plan for communications and outreach relative to MWS solar projects. • Provided a detailed approach to operations and maintenance, except as noted. • Documented safety practices. • Provided an acceptable timeline.	**Weaknesses** • Organizational chart lacked detail relative to years of experience and work on similar projects. • Approach to optimizing system performance did not address time of use. • Did not provide a plan for scheduling outages.

Silicon Ranch	
Strengths • Provided a detailed summary of project challenges relative to investor tax credits (ITC) and possible alternatives. • Identified outreach and education relative to MWS solar projects as a method of embracing innovation. • Documented safety practices. • Provided an acceptable timeline.	**Weaknesses** • Examples of utility or commercial solar installations did not address ballasted mounts or behind the meter production. • Organizational chart did not include previous experience on similar projects for all individuals. • Summary of project challenges did not address soil/environment. • Approach to optimizing performance did not address time of use; unclear if offeror understand how MWS utilizes energy on sites. • Technical narrative did not include anticipated energy production. • Approach to operations and maintenance was vague and did not include a plan for project coordination with MWS.

Offeror	Financial Offer	RFP Cost Points
Ameresco	0.0467	30
Entegrity	1	1.4
Inman	75.2	0.02
Lightwave	0.073447	19.07
Silicon	0.08844909	15.84