



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Request for Mayoral Selection of A&E Firm RFQ 843317, Storm Water Engineering Services-A&E

Metro received twelve (12) proposals for the A&E Review Board to consider. The Review Board submits for review and selection by the Mayor, all three (3) 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 all three firms: **AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc, Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc, and Collier Engineering Co, Inc** be considered for contracting. The work will be rotated across the three firms.

Recommendation to award to all three: DocuSigned by:
Talia Lomax O'dneal

Award to three A&E firms is approved: DS-EC3EA21F849C67C
DocuSigned by:
RMR DocuSigned by:
[Signature]
D40C3369D77547C...

- A&E Firm:** **AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc**
- Strengths:** Strong detailed firm qualifications that demonstrated the firms understanding of the provision of services, related project experience and firm’s capacity to perform the scope of services; strong detailed project approach that included an implementation plan and understanding of project objective/goals while using efficient use of team members; clearly defined firm's organizational structure; strong detailed team qualifications that demonstrated relevant and unique experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing project; firm's approach to maintaining a positive daily working experience with Metro; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; strong interview that effectively demonstrated the understanding of the scope of services and supported submitted proposal; strong communication plan that demonstrates responsiveness to the client; clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff; clearly communicated the procedures for conducting in house QA/QC review process and how mistakes on plans would be addressed and/ or avoided.
- Weaknesses:** N/A
- MWBE Plan:** Proposed the engagement of K.S. Ware and Associates (WBE) for Geotechnical/Structural Design and Hawkins Partners, Inc.(WBE) for Water Quality/ Green Infrastructure Design

SBE/SDV Plan: Pledged 20% participation of SBE/SDV over life of the project as required by the solicitation; Proposed the engagement of SBE subcontractors; Hawkins Partners, Inc. for Water Quality-Green Infrastructure Design , and K.S. Ware & Associates, Inc. for Geotechnical/Structural Design, Adams & Company Surveyors, LLC. for land surveying, Paradigm Environmental, Inc. for Water Quality-Green Infrastructure Design, and Walker Building Group, LLC. for Televising Culvert/Storm Sewer Lines to determine routing of storm water systems; Hawkins Partners and K.S. Ware & Associates are MWBEs

A&E Firm: **Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc**

Strengths: Detailed firm qualifications that demonstrated the firms understanding of related project experience and firm's capacity to perform the scope of services; detailed project approach that included an understanding of project objective/goals; Detailed team qualifications that demonstrated relevant and unique experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing project; firm's approach to maintaining a positive daily working experience with Metro; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; clearly detailed the responsibility of the team and each team member during the interview; interview included a strong communication plan that demonstrated responsiveness to the client; interview clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff

Weaknesses: Firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; unclear organizational structure; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; ineffectively demonstrated firm's QA/QC procedures for review process; ineffectively described the uniqueness of the proposed team members; did not clearly communicate the firm's plans on how mistakes would be addressed and/or avoided

MWBE Plan: Proposed the engagement of K.S. Ware and Associates (WBE) for Geotechnical/Structural Design and Construction Administration and Civil Infrastructure Associates, LLC (WBE) for Surveying Services and Morgan & Morgan (MBE) for Public Relations/Technical Services support

SBE/SDV Plan: Pledged 20% participation of SBE/SDV over life of the project as required by the solicitation; Proposed the engagement of SBE subcontractors; Civil Infrastructure Associates, LLC for Surveying services, Brown Land Surveying, LLC for surveying services, Apps Pipeline Video Inspection, Inc. for pipeline televising services, Morgan & Morgan, Inc. for Public relations/technical services, Griggs & Maloney for stream determinations/environmental investigations, K.S. Ware and Associates, LLC for geotechnical, structural and construction administration; Barge Cauthen & Associates is an SBE/ SDV firm; Civil Infrastructure, Morgan & Morgan, and K.S. Ware & Associates are MWBEs

A&E Firm: Collier Engineering Co, Inc

Strengths: Firm qualifications demonstrated related project experience; implementation plan; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; clearly described the responsibility of the team and each team member during the interview; interview clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff; effectively described a strong communication plan that included new ideas and that demonstrated responsiveness to the client; clearly communicated the procedures for conducting in house QA/QC review process and how mistakes on plans would be addressed and/ or avoided; effectively described the uniqueness of the proposed team members

Weaknesses: Capacity to perform work lacked detail; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome not clearly defined; did not clearly communicate the firm's plans on how mistakes would be addressed and/or avoided

MWBE Plan: Proposed the engagement of NuOrigin(MBE) for IT and applications development and Geotek Engineering Co., Inc. (MBE) for Geotechnical Engineering Services

SBE/SDV Plan: Pledged 20% participation of SBE/SDV over life of the project as required by the solicitation; Proposed the engagement of SBE subcontractors; NuOrigin for IT and applications development, GeoTek Engineering Co., Inc. for geotechnical engineering services, and CNT Enterprises, LLC for construction engineering inspection services; Collier Engineering is a SBE/SDV firm; NuOrigin and GeoTek Engineering Co, Inc. are MWBEs

RFQ# 843317 -Storm Water Engineering Services-A&E (Round 1)			
Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc	Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc	Collier Engineering Co, Inc
Firm Qualifications (35 Points)	35	32	30
Project Approach and Process (33 points)	33	30	27
Team Qualifications (30 points)	30	25	28
Sustainability Requirements (2 Points)	2	2	2
Round 1 Total (100 Points)	100.00	89.00	87.00
RFQ# 843317 -Storm Water Engineering Services-A&E (Round 2)			
Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc	Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc	Collier Engineering Co, Inc
Interview Session (100 Points)	100	75	91.66
Round 2 Total (100 Points)	100	75	91.66
Cumulative Total Score	200.00	164.00	178.66

Strengths & Weaknesses

AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc (200 Points)

Strengths: Strong detailed firm qualifications that demonstrated the firms understanding of the provision of services, related project experience and firm's capacity to perform the scope of services; strong detailed project approach that included an implementation plan and understanding of project objective/goals while using efficient use of team members; clearly defined firm's organizational structure; strong detailed team qualifications that demonstrated relevant and unique experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing project; firm's approach to maintaining a positive daily working experience with Metro; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; strong interview that effectively demonstrated the understanding of the scope of services and supported submitted proposal; strong communication plan that demonstrates responsiveness to the client; clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff; clearly communicated the procedures for conducting in house QA/QC review process and how mistakes on plans would be addressed and/ or avoided

Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc (164 Points)

Strengths: Detailed firm qualifications that demonstrated the firms understanding of related project experience and firm's capacity to perform the scope of services; detailed project approach that included an understanding of project objective/goals; Detailed team qualifications that demonstrated relevant and unique experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing project; firm's approach to maintaining a positive daily working experience with Metro; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; clearly detailed the responsibility of the team and each team member during the interview; interview included a strong communication plan that demonstrated responsiveness to the client; interview clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff

Weaknesses: Firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; unclear organizational structure; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; ineffectively demonstrated firm's QA/QC procedures for review process; ineffectively described the uniqueness of the proposed team members; did not clearly communicate the firm's plans on how mistakes would be addressed and/or avoided

Collier Engineering Co, Inc (178.66 Points)

Strengths: Firm qualifications demonstrated related project experience; implementation plan; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; clearly described the responsibility of the team and each team member during the interview; interview clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff; effectively described a strong communication plan that included new ideas and that demonstrated responsiveness to the client; clearly communicated the procedures for conducting in house QA/QC review process and how mistakes on plans would be addressed and/ or avoided; effectively described the uniqueness of the proposed team members

Weaknesses: Capacity to perform work lacked detail; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome not clearly defined; did not clearly communicate the firm's plans on how mistakes would be addressed and/or avoided

RFQ# 843317 -Storm Water Engineering Services-A&E (Round 1)

	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc	Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc	Collier Engineering Co, Inc	AECOM Technical Services
Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)				
Firm Qualifications (35 Points)	35	32	30	25
Project Approach and Process (33 points)	33	30	27	26
Team Qualifications (30 points)	30	25	28	25
Sustainability Requirements (2 Points)	2	2	2	2
Round 1 Total (100 Points)	100.00	89.00	87.00	78.00

RFQ# 843317 -Storm Water Engineering Services-A&E (Round 2)

	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc	Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc	Collier Engineering Co, Inc	AECOM Technical Services
Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)				
Interview Session (100 Points)	100	75	91.66	68.33
Round 2 Total (100 Points)	100	75	91.66	68.33
Cumulative Total Score	200.00	164.00	178.66	146.33

Strengths & Weaknesses

AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc (200 Points)

Strengths: Strong detailed firm qualifications that demonstrated the firms understanding of the provision of services, related project experience and firm’s capacity to perform the scope of services; strong detailed project approach that included an implementation plan and understanding of project objective/goals while using efficient use of team members; clearly defined firm's organizational structure; strong detailed team qualifications that demonstrated relevant and unique experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing project; firm's approach to maintaining a positive daily working experience with Metro; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; strong interview that effectively demonstrated the understanding of the scope of services and supported submitted proposal; strong communication plan that demonstrates responsiveness to the client; clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff; clearly communicated the procedures for conducting in house QA/QC review process and how mistakes on plans would be addressed and/ or avoided.

Barge Cauthen & Associates, Inc (164 Points)

Strengths: Detailed firm qualifications that demonstrated the firms understanding of related project experience and firm’s capacity to perform the scope of services; detailed project approach that included an understanding of project objective/goals; Detailed team qualifications that demonstrated relevant and unique experience, expertise, and/or approach for completing project; firm's approach to maintaining a positive daily working experience with Metro; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; clearly detailed the responsibility of the team and each team member during the interview; interview included a strong communication plan that demonstrated responsiveness to the client; interview clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff.

Weaknesses: Firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; unclear organizational structure; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; ineffectively demonstrated firm's QA/QC procedures for review process; ineffectively described the uniqueness of the proposed team members; did not clearly communicate the firm's plans on how mistakes would be addressed and/or avoided.

Collier Engineering Co, Inc (178.66 Points)

Strengths: Firm qualifications demonstrated related project experience; implementation plan; policy for ensuring the project will be environmentally friendly; clearly described the responsibility of the team and each team member during the interview; interview clearly stated the availability of the Project Manager and other staff; effectively described a strong communication plan that included new ideas and that demonstrated responsiveness to the client; clearly communicated the procedures for conducting in house QA/QC review process and how mistakes on plans would be addressed and/ or avoided; effectively described the uniqueness of the proposed team members.

Weaknesses: Capacity to perform work lacked detail; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; firm’s knowledge of objectives/goal lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome not clearly defined; did not clearly communicate the firm's plans on how mistakes would be addressed and/or avoided.

AECOM Technical Services (146.33 points)

Strengths: clearly described the responsibility of the team and each team member during the interview.

Weaknesses: Firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work lacked detail; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal lacked detail; related project experience lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; failed to provide sufficient Project Manager availability; ineffectively described the uniqueness of the proposed team members; did not clearly explain how mistakes would be addressed and/or avoided.

RFQ# 843317 -Storm Water Engineering Services-A&E (Round 1)

	Civic Engineering & Information Technologies, Inc	Stantec	Littlejohn Engineering Associates, Inc	Neel-Schaffer, Inc
Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)				
Firm Qualifications (35 Points)	27	27	25	20
Project Approach and Process (33 points)	25	25	25	23
Team Qualifications (30 points)	20	20	20	20
Sustainability Requirements (2 Points)	2	2	2	2
Total (100 Points)	74.00	74.00	72.00	65.00

Strengths & Weaknesses

Civic Engineering and Information Technologies, Inc (74.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work lacked detail; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal lacked detail; related project experience lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome not clearly defined

Stantec (74.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work lacked detail; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal lacked detail; comprehensive plan for completing the scope of work lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome lacked detail; unique team experience for completing project lacked detail.

Littlejohn Engineering Associates, Inc (72.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Capacity to perform work lacked detail; failed to provide completed project; approach to minimize disruptions to performance lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome lacked detail; unique team experience for completing project lacked detail.

Neel-Schaffer, Inc (65.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Project experience not of similar size, scope, and complexity; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work not clearly defined; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal and existing conditions/assumptions lacked detail; implementation plan lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome lacked detail; unique team experience for completing project lacked detail.

RFQ# 843317 -Storm Water Engineering Services-A&E (Round 1)

Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	James and Associates, Inc	Orchard, Hiltz and McCliment, Inc	Poskas Engineering	Fulghum, MacIndoe & Associates, Inc
Firm Qualifications (35 Points)	21	25	17	20
Project Approach and Process (33 points)	20	17	21	15
Team Qualifications (30 points)	20	15	15	15
Sustainability Requirements (2 Points)	2	2	2	2
Total (100 Points)	63.00	59.00	55.00	52.00

Strengths & Weaknesses

James and Associates, Inc (63.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Project experience not of similar size, scope, and complexity; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work not clearly defined; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal and existing conditions/assumptions lacked detail; implementation plan lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome lacked detail; unique team experience for completing project lacked detail.

Orchard, Hiltz and McCliment, Inc (59.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Project experience not of similar size, scope, and complexity; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work not clearly defined; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal and existing conditions/assumptions lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome lacked detail; unique team experience for completing project lacked detail; key individuals lacked relevant experience.

Poskas Engineering (55.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Project experience not of similar size, scope, and complexity; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work not clearly defined; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal and existing conditions/assumptions lacked detail; implementation plan lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome lacked detail; unique team experience for completing project lacked detail; key individuals lacked relevant experience.

Fulghum, MacIndoe & Associates, Inc (52.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Project experience lacked detail; firm qualifications lacked detail when demonstrating the firm's knowledge in the provision of services; capacity to perform work not clearly defined; firm's knowledge of objectives/goal and existing conditions/assumptions; potential issues/challenges lacked detail; implementation plan lacked detail; efficient use of firm's proposed team members lacked detail; approach to maintaining a positive daily work experience with Metro lacked detail; organizational structure lacked detail; sub-consultants' qualifications to produce the required outcome lacked detail; unique team experience for completing project lacked detail; key individuals lacked relevant experience; comprehensive plan for major tasks and subtasks lacked detail.