



Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	380377	Award Date	1/27/2025 9:40 AM CST
Solicitation Title	Emergency Communications Center Architectural and Engineering Design Service		
Buyer Name	Daniel Drumwright	Buyer Email	Daniel.Drumwright2@nashville.gov
BAO Rep	Angie Martin	BAO Email	Angie.Martin@nashville.gov

Awarded Supplier(s)

In reference to the above solicitation and contingent upon successful contract negotiation, it is the intent of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County to award to the following supplier(s):

Company Name	TMPartners, PLLC	Company Contact	Barbara Jordan
Street Address	211 Franklin Road Suite 200		
City	Brentwood	State	TN
		Zipcode	37027

Company Name		Company Contact	
Street Address			
City		State	
		Zipcode	

Company Name		Company Contact	
Street Address			
City		State	
		Zipcode	

Certificate of Insurance

The awarded supplier(s) must submit a certificate of insurance (COI) indicating all applicable coverage required by the referenced solicitation. The COI should be emailed to the referenced buyer no more than 15 days after the referenced award date.

Equal Business Opportunity Program

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) must submit a signed copy of the letter of intent to perform for any and all minority-owned (MBE) or woman-owned (WBE) subcontractors included in the solicitation response. The letter(s) should be emailed to the referenced business assistance office (BAO) rep no more than two business days after the referenced award date.

☒ Yes, the EBO Program is applicable.

☐ No, the EBO Program is not applicable.

Monthly Reporting

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) will be required monthly to submit evidence of participation and payment to all small (SBE), minority-owned (MBE), women-owned (WBE), LGBT-owned (LGBTBE), and service disabled veteran owned (SDV) subcontractors. Sufficient evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to copies of subcontracts, purchase orders, applications for payment, invoices, and cancelled checks.

Questions related to contract compliance may be directed to the referenced BAO rep.

☒ Yes, monthly reporting is applicable.

☐ No, monthly reporting is not applicable.

Public Information and Records Retention

Solicitation and award documentation are available upon request. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

Right to Protest

Per MCL 4.36.010 – 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.

 Supervisor (Initial)

Dennis Rowland
Dennis Rowland
Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

RFQ 380377 Emergency Communications Center Architectural and Engineering Design Service Evaluation Team/Review Board Score Sheet			
Offeror	TMPartners, PLLC	Anecdote, PLC	Baker Barrios Architects, Inc
Contract Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes
General Management Plan (50 points)	46.00	35.00	25.00
Experience and Qualifications (50 points)	44.00	25.00	21.00
Total Evaluation Scores	90.00	60.00	46.00

** Inventure was deemed non-responsive to the Equal Business Opportunity (EBO) Programing requirements.

Evaluation Comments

TMPartners, PLLC
Strengths Described in detail the firm's background, experience and qualifications to accomplish this project. Included the number of years your company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals and consultants that will be utilized in providing the management and services. Included a resume for key individual that demonstrates their educational background an years’ experience. Indicated key personnel that are LEED accredited professionals. Provided roles and responsibilities on similar projects performed within the last five years. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Summarized team’s specific, direct involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. Provided list of projects completed for METRO within the past ten years of similar size and scope. Provided a minimum of three completed projects within the past ten years of a similar size, scope, and complexity. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Proportion of time dedicated to this project for all key personnel and subcontractors suitable for Metro's need. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant, list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years, and if there are any license violations in past 5 years.
Weaknesses Lack of detail on key individual's resume on contribution to specific projects. One project completed for Metro not of a similar size. Value engineering plan does not detail architect's role. Lack clarity related to plan achieve the energy performance. Current projects still in progress. Vague information related to potential risks.
Anecdote, PLC
Strengths Described in detail the firm's background, experience and qualifications to accomplish this project. Included the number of years your company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Included a resume for each key individual that demonstrates their educational background, years’ experience, and roles and responsibilities specific to this project. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Summarized team’s specific, direct involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. Provided list of projects completed for Metro within the past ten years of similar size and scope. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Described in detail firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives listed within the solicitation. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses Lack of experience with the development of public safety facility projects. Work Chart unclear on the point-of -contact for this project. Lack of information on Technology Operations Consultant in Work Chart. No resumes from structural engineering consultant firm. Lack of direct experience towards the integration of sustainable design strategies. Lack of experience with the implementation of call center consoles and specialty equipment. Lack of LEED accredited staff. Technology Consultant lacked experience related to the required needs for public safety facilities. Two of referenced projects not completed within the past 10 years. Two referenced project not of a similar size, scope and complexity. Proposal address incorrect Metro entity department. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by Primary Design Project Manager and other team members. Lack of details on risks related to project. Failed to include number of staff. Technology and Emergency Operations consultant has limited local presence. Lack direct experience in public safety projects. No correct public safety projects referenced in current projects completed by firm. Lack of detail of value engineering process.
Baker Barrios Architects, Inc
Strengths Included the number of years company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals and consultants. Provided roles and responsibilities for each resume, including project size, description, and owner contacts with phone numbers. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Provided completed projects within the past ten years of a similar scope. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses Lack of detail related Experience and Qualification of personnel in Work Chart. Lack of clarity on experience in development of public safety facility projects. Lack of information provided for firm's experience with LEED accredited projects. Prime firm have limited previous experience on Metro projects. Provided limited project experience of prime. Project experience provided is that of consultants. Resumes of personnel lacked experience on similar projects. Resumes lacked roles and responsibilities specific to this project. No key personnel with LEED Accreditation. Conflicting information related to roles on resumes and work chart. Failed to include resume of all key personnel. Failed to include all project's size, duration, email, and final cost for completed projects. Lack of detail related to quality control procedures the firm would employ on this project. Lack of detail related to energy performance requirements and energy saving strategy. All five of largest contracts referenced were not characterized to detail substantial size. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members. Lack of information for firm's dispute and claims resolution. Vague information provided for potential risk identified for this project.

RFQ 380377 Emergency Communications Center Architectural and Engineering Design Service Evaluation Team/Review Board Score Sheet			
Offeror	Barge Design Solutions, Inc	Bauer Askew Architecture, PLLC	DLR Group Inc, a Tennessee Corporation
Contract Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes
General Management Plan (50 points)	38.00	35.00	38.00
Experience and Qualifications (50 points)	30.00	33.00	42.00
Total Evaluation Scores	68.00	68.00	80.00

** Inventure was deemed non-responsive to the Equal Business Opportunity (EBO) Programing requirements.

Evaluation Comments

Barge Design Solutions, Inc
Strengths Included the number of years company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Included a resume for each key individual that demonstrates their educational background, years’ experience, and roles and responsibilities specific to this project. Indicated key personnel that are LEED accredited professionals. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Provided list of projects completed for METRO within the past ten years of similar size and scope. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Described in detail firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives listed within the solicitation. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses Qualifications and Experience provided is not adequate to scope of this project. Work Chart unclear on how subject matter experts would be involved in the project. Lack of information related to firm's direct involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. All referenced projects not of a similar size, scope, and complexity. Lack of experience with the development of public safety facility projects. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by Primary Design Project Manager and other team members. Lack of information provided on potential risk and how risks would be mitigated. Failed to include location and presence in Nashville. Multiple litigations detailed in proposal.
Bauer Askew Architecture, PLLC
Included the number of years company has been in business under the current name. Indicated key personnel that are LEED accredited professionals. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Provided list of projects completed for METRO within the past ten years of similar size and scope. Provided a minimum of three completed projects within the past ten years of a similar scope. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses Failed to convey how experience and qualifications align with the development of public safety facility projects. Lack of experience related to CMAR projects. Work Chart not clear on how project will be managed and executed by personnel. Resumes do not outline key personnel's roles with this project and/or responsibilities in referenced projects. Concerns about design team's proportion of time dedicated to this project. Role of prime firm on LEED certified projects not defined and lacks clarity. Lack of information on roles and responsibilities of team members on similar projects. Referenced completed projects not of a similar size. Lack of clarity of architect's and Construction Manager's role in the value engineering process. Failed to provide firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members. Lack of clarity on how firm would manage risks and mitigate potential risks.
DLR Group Inc, a Tennessee Corporation
Strengths Described in detail the firm's background, experience and qualifications to accomplish this project. Included the number of years company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals and consultants that will be utilized in providing the management and services. Indicated key personnel that are LEED accredited professionals. Summarized team’s specific, direct involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. Provided list of projects completed for METRO within the past ten years of similar size and scope. Provided a minimum of three completed projects within the past ten years of a similar size, scope, and complexity. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Described in detail firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives listed within the solicitation. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses Resumes for key individuals vague related to roles and responsibilities specific to this project. Pending certification for referenced LEED certified projects. Lack of clarity on roles for referenced projects. Completion status of referenced projects still pending. Firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements not specific to this project. Lack of detail related to approach to dispute and claims resolution. Potential risk and mitigation plan not specific to this project. One pending litigation. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members. Lack of detail related individual’s roles in the value engineering process.

RFQ 380377 Emergency Communications Center Architectural and Engineering Design Service Evaluation Team/Review Board Score Sheet			
Offeror	DLZ National Inc	Earl Swensson Associates, Inc	FGM Architects Inc
Contract Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes
General Management Plan (50 points)	35.00	38.00	38.00
Experience and Qualifications (50 points)	26.00	33.00	32.00
Total Evaluation Scores	61.00	71.00	70.00

** Inventure was deemed non-responsive to the Equal Business Opportunity (EBO) Programing requirements.

Evaluation Comments

DLZ National Inc
Strengths
Described in detail the firm's background. Included the number of years company has been in business under the current name. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals and consultants that will be utilized in providing the management and services. Included a resume for each key individual that demonstrates their educational background and years’ experience. Provided roles and responsibilities Provided a minimum of three completed projects within the past ten years of a similar size, scope, and complexity. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), and contract dollar values. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Described in detail firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives listed within the solicitation. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses
Failed to convey how experience and qualifications align with the development of public safety facility projects. Vague information provided for approach to CMAR projects. Work Chart is unclear on team organizational structure. No previous experience working with Metro. Lack of detail related to potential risk and risk mitigation plan. Two of the three referenced projects not of a similar scope. List of LEED certified projects fails to identify firm's specific role. Failed to include dates of the referenced LEED certified projects. Construction delivery method of referenced projects not of same scope of this project. Failed to include the duration and contact information for referenced projects. One of the referenced projects completed more than 10 years ago. One of the five largest project no longer in progress. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members. No projected completion dates provided for five largest projects. Lack of detail related to potential risk and mitigation plan for this project. Lack of detail on value engineering process.

Earl Swensson Associates, Inc
Strengths
Described in detail the firm's background. Included the number of years your company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals and consultants. Provided a resume for each key individual that demonstrates their educational background, years’ experience. Indicated key personnel that are LEED accredited professionals. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Provided team’s specific, direct involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses
Vague information provided for firm's experience and qualification to manage this project. Roles of key personnel for previous projects lacked detail. Lead Project Manager and Interior Designer lacks experience with similar projects. Two of three referenced completed projects not of a similar scope. No previous experience on Metro projects. Firm's business location was not clear from proposal. Vague response to availability to attend local meetings. Lack of clarity on potential risks an mitigation plan for this project. Lack of early involvement and time dedicated to this project by prime contractor's key personnel. Lack of detail related to firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements. Multiple litigations detailed in proposal. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members.
FGM Architects Inc
Strengths
Described in detail the firm's background. Included the number of years company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals and consultants that will be utilized in providing the management and services. Included a resume for each key individual that demonstrates their educational background and years’ experience. Provided roles and responsibilities Provided a minimum of three completed projects within the past ten years of a similar size, scope, and complexity. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Described in detail firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives listed within the solicitation. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses
Limited prime experience related to scope. Lack of clarity of key individual roles on previous projects provided on resumes. Lack of detail on contribution on LEED certified projects. Failed to provide year certification achieved for LEED certified projects. Referenced projects completed for Metro not of a similar size and scope. Lack of detail for schedule duration for refenced completed projects. Referenced completed projects not of a similar size and scope. Conflicting project information referenced project details. Lack of detail on potential risks an mitigation plan for this project. Multiple litigations detailed. Capacity concerns related to ability to attend in-person meetings. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members.

RFQ 380377 Emergency Communications Center Architectural and Engineering Design Service Evaluation Team/Review Board Score Sheet			
Offeror	Kline Swinney Associates	Moody Nolan, Inc	Wold Architects Incorporated
Contract Acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes
General Management Plan (50 points)	35.00	40.00	43.00
Experience and Qualifications (50 points)	39.00	41.00	45.00
Total Evaluation Scores	74.00	81.00	88.00

** Inventure was deemed non-responsive to the Equal Business Opportunity (EBO) Programing requirements.

Evaluation Comments

Kline Swinney Associates
Strengths Described in detail the firm's background, experience and qualifications to accomplish this project. Included the number tears company has been in business. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals that will be utilized in providing the management and services. Included a resume for key individual that demonstrates their educational background, years’ experience, and roles and responsibilities specific to this project. Provided roles and responsibilities on similar projects performed within the last five years for each resume. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Summarized your team’s specific, direct involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Described in detail firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives listed within the solicitation. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses Architect has no LEED accreditation. Lack of clarity of the role subcontractor plays on similar projects performed within the last five years. One project completed for Metro not of a similar size and scope. Failed to submit duration for completed projects. Referenced completed project still in progress. Lack of participation of prime firm participation in the process to achieve the energy performance. Lack of detail in approach to dispute and claims resolution. Lack of early involvement and time dedicated to this project by prime contractor's key personnel. Lack of detail provided on potential risk. Majority of reference projects are less that half completed. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members. Lack of capacity to attend in-person meetings. Lack of information related to value engineering process.

Moody Nolan, Inc
Described in detail the firm's background, experience and qualifications to accomplish this project. Included the number of years company has been in business under the current name. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Included a resume for each key individual that demonstrates their educational background and years’ experience. Indicated key personnel that are LEED accredited professionals. Provided roles and responsibilities on similar projects performed within the last five years for each resume, including project size, description, and owner contacts with phone numbers. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Provided list of projects completed for METRO within the past ten years of similar size and scope. Provided a minimum of three completed projects within the past ten years of a similar size, scope, and complexity. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Described in detail firm's plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements, including goals and objectives listed within the solicitation. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant settled in the past 5 years.
Weaknesses Lack of clarity on hierarchy and team organization on Work Chart. Resumes for key individuals lack details on roles and responsibilities on related projects. Lack of clarity on direct involvement and contribution to LEED certification. Lack of direct experience with the development of public safety facility projects. Missing information for list of errors and omissions claims. Lack of information related to potential risks and mitigation plan. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members.

Wold Architects Incorporated
Strengths Described in detail the firm's background, experience and qualifications to accomplish this project. Included the number tears company has been in business. Described experience with the Construction Management at Risk (CMAR) delivery approach. Provided an project organizational chart identify key individuals and consultants that will be utilized in providing the management and services. Included a resume for key individual that demonstrates their educational background, years’ experience, and roles and responsibilities specific to this project. Indicated key personnel that are LEED accredited professionals. Provided roles and responsibilities on similar projects performed within the last five years for each resume. Indicated the number of LEED certified projects for which company has provided design services. Included the owner name, level of LEED certification achieved, and the year certification achieved. Summarized your team’s specific, direct involvement and contribution toward the integration of sustainable design strategies leading to LEED certification. Provided a minimum of three (3) completed projects within the past ten (10) years of a similar size, scope, and complexity. Described quality control procedures firm would employ on this project during both design and construction phases. Described individual’s role(s) and participation in the value engineering process. Described approach to dispute and claims resolution. Provided local office location and number of staff. Provided company’s five largest contracts currently in progress, including the name of the project, owner name(s) and phone number(s), contract dollar values, percentage complete, and anticipated completion dates. Provided the team members and explain their roles for this project. Explained firm’s availability to attend in person impromptu or frequent meetings that may be required to maintain project schedule or resolve design issues. Provided current litigation in which a proposer is a defendant and list of errors and omissions claims settled in
Weaknesses Limited contribution on projects completed for Metro. Projects completed for Metro still in progress. Limited involvement in pre-design phase for this project. Lack of detail related to potential risks. Multiple litigations detailed. Lack of detail related to value engineering process. Lack of detail related to plan and process to achieve the energy performance requirements. Low proportion of time dedicated to this project by proposed project team members.

BAO Small Business Assessment Sheet

BAO Specialist: Angie Martin

Contract Specialist: Daniel Drumwright

Date: 1/14/25

Department Name: General Services

RFQ#: 380377

Project Name: Emergency Communications Center Architectural and Engineering Design Services

Primary Contractor*	Acknowledged SBE Requirement ?	Comments
TMPartners, PLLC	Yes	The prime is not an approved SBE and acknowledged the 20% SBE/SDV requirement over the life of the contract. Proposed SBE subs Compass Partners, LLC, EMC Structural Engineers, P.C., Hawkins Partners Inc., and Logan Patri Engineering Inc. Consistent with the procurement code, actual dollar amounts and percentages will confirmed during contract negotiations.



Statement of M/WBE Utilization **A&E ONLY**

Proposer's/Firm's Name: TMP	Proposer's Phone #: 615-377-9773
Solicitation Title: EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING DESIGN	Proposer's Email Address: jearwood@tmpartners.com
Solicitation #: 380377	Total Bid Amount: TBD
EBO Goal (%) : <u>9.00</u> MBE% <u>8</u> WBE%	EBO Goal Met? (Y/N) Y

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

	MBE/WBE Firm Name	MBE/WBE Firm Address	Phone/E-Mail	Certificate Type (MBE or WBE)	* MBE/WBE Group Type *	Code # UNSPS/NAICS	Description of Work
1	Compass Partners	6606 Charlotte Pike, #210, Nashville, Tennessee 37209	615-356-9911/bridget@compassp	WBE	5	7213, 721316	Cost Estimating
2	Culture Architecture	41 Peabody Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37210	615-243-1200/joseph.cole@cultun	MBE	1	541310	Associate Architect
3	DF&H Services, PLLC	P.O. Box 120371, Nashville, Tennessee 37212	615-390-6131/ageria@dfhservice	WBE	5	8110	Plumbing Engineer
4	Hawkins Partners	110 South 10th Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37206	615-255-9218/k.copeland@hawki	WBE	5	81101517	Landscape Architecture
5	Logan Patri Engineering	630 Southgate Avenue, Suite C, Nashville, Tennessee 37203	615-726-2902/rpatri@loganpatri	MBE	1	81100000	Structural Engineering
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)

Jeff Earwood/Principal

Date

10/22/2024

*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 Acknowledged EBO Goals
Achievement? Yes



For Internal Office Use ONLY

If No, Good Faith Efforts Met?

BAO Only

BAO Representative : Angie Martin

Metro Buyer: Daniel Drumwright

Project Manager: Ava Elsaghir

Date: 01/14/25

BAO Notes:

Prime acknowledges they can achieve both M/WBE subcontracting goals. Consistent with the procurement code, actual dollar amounts, and percentages will be confirmed during contract negotiations.