



# **ALACHUA COUNTY**

## ***Budget and Fiscal Services***

### ***Procurement***

Theodore “TJ” White, Jr. CPPB  
Procurement Manager

Thomas J. Rouse  
Contracts Supervisor

Darryl R. Kight, CPPB  
Procurement Supervisor

August 1, 2023

### **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Theodore “TJ” White, Jr. CPPB, Procurement Manager

**FROM:** Darryl R. Kight, CPPB, Procurement Supervisor 

Darryl Kight (Aug 1, 2023 12:20 EDT)

**SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD**  
**RFP 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown**  
**Gainesville, Alachua County Florida**

<u>Solicitation Opening Date:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, June 28, 2023
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	1171 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Downloaded by:</u>	77 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Submissions:</u>	3 Vendors

### **Firms:**

DLR Group, Inc.  
Orlando, FL 32801

Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum, Inc.  
Tampa, FL 33602

Walker Architects, Inc.  
Gainesville, FL 32653

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The board approve the Evaluation Committee’s award ranking below for RFP 23- 22-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

1. DLR Group, Inc.
2. Walker Architects, Inc.
3. Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum, Inc.

Approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate agreement with top ranked firm, DLR Group, Inc. Should staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the top ranked firm, negotiations with that firm be terminated and staff will then negotiate with the second ranked firm, Walker Architects, Inc., and then third ranked firm Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum, Inc.

The actual RFP award is subject to the appropriate signature authority identified in the Procurement Code.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved  
Theodore “TJ” White, Jr., CPPB  
Procurement Manager

Aug 1, 2023

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Disapproved  
Theodore “TJ” White, Jr., CPPB  
Procurement Manager

MM

### **Vendor Complaints or Grievances; Right to Protest**

Unless otherwise governed by state or Federal law, this part shall govern the protest and appeal of Procurement decisions by the County. As used in Part A of Article 9 of the Procurement Code, the term "Bidder" includes anyone that submits a response to an invitation to bid or one who makes an offer in response to a solicitation (e.g., ITB, RFP, ITN), and is not limited solely to one that submits a bid in response to an Invitation to Bid (ITB).

- (1) *Notice of Solicitations and Awards.* The County shall provide notice of all solicitations and awards by electronic posting in accordance with the procedures and Florida law.
- (2) *Solicitation Protest.* Any prospective Bidder may file a solicitation protest concerning a solicitation.
  - (a) *Basis of the Solicitation Protest:* The alleged basis for a solicitation protest shall be limited to the following:
    - i. The terms, conditions or specifications of the solicitation are in violation of, or are inconsistent with this Code, Florida Statutes, County procedures and policies, or the terms of the solicitation at issue, including but not limited to the method of evaluating, ranking or awarding of the solicitation, reserving rights of further negotiations, or modifying or amending any resulting contract; or
    - ii. The solicitation instructions are unclear or contradictory.
  - (b) *Timing and Content of the Solicitation Protest:* The solicitation protest must be in writing and must be received by the Procurement Manager, [twhite@alachuacounty.us](mailto:twhite@alachuacounty.us) by no later than the solicitation's question submission deadline. Failure to timely file a solicitation protest shall constitute a total and complete waiver of the Bidder's right to protest or appeal any solicitation defects, and shall bar the Bidder from subsequently raising such solicitation defects in any subsequent Award Protest, if any, or any other administrative or legal proceeding. In the event a solicitation protest is timely filed, the protesting party shall be deemed to have waived any and all solicitation defects that were not timely alleged in the protesting party's solicitation protest, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said solicitation defects in a subsequent award protest, if any, or any other administrative or legal proceeding. The solicitation protest must include, at a minimum, the following information:
    - i. The name, address, e-mail and telephone number of the protesting party;
    - ii. The solicitation number and title;
    - iii. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party has legal standing to file the solicitation Protest because:
      1. It has a substantial interest in and is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation; and
      2. That the protesting party is responsive, in accordance with the criteria set forth in the solicitation, unless the basis for the Solicitation Protest alleges that the criteria set forth in the solicitation is defective, in which case the protesting party must demonstrate that it is responsible in accordance with the criteria that the protesting party alleges should be used;
    - iv. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest;
    - v. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;
    - vi. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party's alleged basis for the protest; and
    - vii. The form of the relief requested.
  - (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Solicitation Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Solicitation Protest is untimely and, therefore, rejected. The Procurement Manager shall consider all timely Solicitation Protests and may conduct any inquiry that the Procurement Manager deems necessary to make a determination regarding a protest. The Procurement Manager shall issue a written determination granting or denying the protest. The written determination shall contain a concise statement of the basis for the determination.

- (d) *Appeal*: If the protesting party is not satisfied with the Procurement Manager's determination, the protesting party may appeal the determination to the County Manager by filing a written appeal, which sets forth the basis upon which the appeal is based, including all supporting documentation. The scope of the appeal shall be limited to the basis alleged in the Solicitation Protest. The appeal must be filed with the Procurement Manager within five business days of the date on which the Procurement Manager's written determination was sent to the protesting party. Failure to timely file an appeal shall constitute a waiver of the protesting party's rights to an appeal of the Procurement Manager's determination, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said Solicitation defects in a subsequent award protest, if any, or any other administrative or legal proceeding. After considering the appeal, the County Manager must determine whether the solicitation should stand, be revised, or be cancelled, and issue a written determination and provide copies of the determination to the protesting party. The determination of the County Manager shall be final and not subject to further appeal under this code.
- (3) *Award Protest*. Any Bidder who is not the intended awardee and who claims to be the rightful awardee may file an award protest. However, an award protest is not valid and shall be rejected for lack of standing if it does not demonstrate that the protesting party would be awarded the Solicitation if its protest is upheld.
- (a) *Basis of the Award Protest*: The alleged basis for an Award Protest shall be limited to the following:
- i. The protesting party was incorrectly deemed non-responsive due to an incorrect assessment of fact or law;
  - ii. The County failed to substantively follow the procedures or requirements specified in the solicitation documents, except for minor irregularities that were waived by the County in accordance with this Code, which resulted in a competitive disadvantage to the protesting party; and
  - iii. The County made a mathematical error in evaluating the responses to the solicitation, resulting in an incorrect score and not *protesting party not being selected for award*.
- (b) *Timing and Content of the Award Protest*: The Award Protest must be in writing and must be received by the Procurement Manager, [twhite@alachuacounty.us](mailto:twhite@alachuacounty.us) by no later than 3:00 PM on the third business day after the County's proposed Award decision was posted by the County. Failure to timely file an Award Protest shall constitute a total and complete waiver of the Bidder's right to protest or appeal the County's proposed Award decision in any administrative or legal proceeding. In the event an Award Protest is timely filed, the protesting party shall be deemed to have waived any and all proposed Award defects that were not timely alleged in the protesting party's Award Protest, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said Award defects in any administrative or legal proceeding. The Award Protest must include, at a minimum, the following information:
- i. The name, address, e-mail and telephone number of the protesting party;
  - ii. The Solicitation number and title;
  - iii. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party's response was responsive to the Solicitation;
  - iv. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party has legal standing to file the Solicitation Protest because:
    1. The protesting party submitted a response to the Solicitation or other basis for establishing legal standing;
    2. The protesting party has a substantial interest in and is aggrieved in connection with the proposed Award decision; and
    3. The protesting party, and not any other bidder, should be awarded the Solicitation if the protesting party's Award Protest is upheld.
  - v. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest;
  - vi. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;

- vii. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party's alleged basis for the protest; and
  - viii. The form of the relief requested.
- (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Award Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Award Protest is untimely and, therefore, rejected. The Procurement Manager shall consider all timely Award Protests and may conduct any inquiry that the county Procurement Manager deems necessary to resolve the protest by mutual agreement or to make a determination regarding the protests. The Procurement Manager shall issue a written determination granting or denying each protest. The written determination shall contain a concise statement of the basis for the determination.
- (d) *Appeal:*
- i. If the protesting party is not satisfied with the Procurement Manager's determination, the protesting party may appeal the determination to the County Manager by filing a written appeal, which sets forth the basis upon which the appeal is based. The scope of the appeal shall be limited to the basis alleged in the award protest. The appeal must be filed with the Procurement Manager within five business days of the date on which the Procurement Manager's written determination was mailed to the protesting party. Failure to timely file an appeal shall constitute a waiver of the protesting party's rights to an appeal of the Procurement Manager's determination, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said award defects in any administrative or legal proceeding.
  - ii. After reviewing the appeal, the County Manager will issue a written final determination and provide copies of the determination to the protesting party. Prior to issuing a final determination, the County Manager, in his or her discretion, may direct a hearing officer, or magistrate, to conduct an administrative hearing in connection with the protest and issue findings and recommendations to the County Manager. Prior to a hearing, if held, the Procurement Manager must file with the hearing officer the protest, any background information, and his or her written determination. The protesting party and the County shall equally share the cost of conducting any hearing, including the services of the hearing officer. If applicable, the County Manager may wait to issue a written final determination until after receipt of the findings and recommendations of the hearing officer. The determination of the County Manager shall be final and not subject to further appeal under this code.
- (4) *Burden of Proof:* Unless otherwise provide by Florida law, the burden of proof shall rest with the protesting party.
- (5) *Stay of Procurements during Protests.* In the event of a timely protest, the County shall not proceed further with the solicitation or with the award of the contract until the Procurement Manager, after consultation with the head of the using department, makes a written determination that the award of the solicitation without delay is:
- (a) Necessary to avoid an immediate and serious danger to the public health, safety, or welfare;
  - (b) Necessary to avoid or substantial reduce significant damage to County property;
  - (c) Necessary to *avoid or substantially reduce interruption of essential County Services; or;*
  - (d) Otherwise in the best interest of the public.

## Public Meeting Minutes (Record)

### Ranking for RFP 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Date: July 31, 2023

Start Time: 11:45 am

Location: Facilities Management

915 SE 5th Street,

Gainesville, FL 32601

#### 1. Call Meeting to Order

#### 2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

- 2.1. Good afternoon, I am Leira Cruz Cáliz with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Daniel Whitcraft (Leader), Jeffrey Hays, and Patrick Thomas, and Danny Moore.
- 2.2. Thank you, committee for taking the time out of your busy schedule to evaluate these proposals. Welcome to the citizen attending this Public Meeting; this meeting is open to the public, and you will have an announced time (3 minutes; no response required) for public comments. Please review the agenda that is on the screen.
- 2.3. The RFP team will be evaluating vendors' proposal, discussing their scores, and approving the Team's Ranking. This Team's final ranking will be submitted to the BoCC for their approval and authorization to negotiate a contract.

#### 3. RFP Committee Members Process Instructions

- 3.1. **First**, I have collected all signed Disclosure Forms (Conflict of Interest), and I will show them on screen, discuss if necessary.
- 3.2. **Second**, provide procurement points to members for VOW.
- 3.3. Due to the cone-of-silence imposed on the committee members, this is the first occasion members have been able to talk and work together as a committee.
- 3.4. *As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.*
- 3.5. **Third**, Record and Discuss the preliminary scores on the screen. Call for validation of scores to ensure they have been transposed correctly and that they match the scores on your individual score sheets.

Export to CSV					
Vendor	Jeffrey Hays	Danny Moore	Patrick Thomas	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 375)
DLR Group	313	360	338	355	341.5
Walker Architects	325	357	348	331	340.25
HOK	278	361	341	339	329.75

- 3.6. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals alphabetical one by one. You have your proposal evaluation forms so now we can start discussions with the first vendor. (**Encourage dialog**)
  - 3.6.1. Discuss scores and make Changes if pertinent.
  - 3.6.2. Discussion record and Update: **Proposal Score Evaluation**
    - 3.6.2.1. Encourage discussion on the proposals, scoring and until all members are satisfied.
    - 3.6.2.2. NOTE: Agents will monitor the discussion, keep it on track; keep it on topic.
  - 3.6.3. Call for validation of RFP team **Proposal Scores** for the Team's Final Ranking.
4. Motion to Award Rankings: **Jeff Hays** motioned to recommend the final rankings be approved and sent to the BOCC for Approval. Then start contract negotiations the with the top ranked firm DLR Group, and with the second ranked vendor Walker Architects, with the third ranked vendor HOK if negotiations with the top ranked

vendor fail. seconded by **Dan Whitcraft**.

Vote 4-0 in favor. unanimous

5. Public Comments (3 minutes):
6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Dan Whitcraft moved to approve the Minutes; Jeffrey Hays seconded the motion.  
Vote 4-0 in favor.
7. Meeting Adjourn at – 12:09 pm.



Alachua County, Florida  
**Procurement**  
Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB, Procurement Manager  
County Administration Building, Gainesville, FL 32601  
(352) 374-5202

**EVALUATION TABULATION**

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville,  
Alachua County Florida

RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 28, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Tuesday, August 1, 2023

**VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL**

Question Title	DLR Group	East Coast CDB Inc.	HOK	Network Craze	Southern Roofing Co., Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Acknowledge that you have reviewed all Addendum(s) issued with this solicitation.	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
State Compliance	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
State Compliance	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response

**EVALUATION TABULATION**

Request For Proposal - A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida



## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Question Title	DLR Group	East Coast CDB Inc.	HOK	Network Craze	Southern Roofing Co., Inc.
Conflict of Interest	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements..	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Question Title			Walker Architects		
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature			Pass		
Acknowledge that you have reviewed all Addendum(s) issued with this solicitation.			Pass		
State Compliance			Pass		
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request			Pass		
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request			Pass		
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request			No Response		
Drug Free Workplace			Pass		
State Compliance			Pass		
Vendor Eligibility			Pass		
NON-SBE Subcontractors			Pass		
Responsible Agent Designation			Pass		
Conflict of Interest			Pass		
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation			Pass		
You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements..			Pass		

## PHASE 2

### EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Jeffrey Hays	Acting Director	Jul 5, 2023 2:20 PM
Danny Moore	Project Coordinator	Jul 5, 2023 1:01 PM
Patrick Thomas	Facilities Data Management Coordinator	Jul 6, 2023 2:53 PM
Daniel Whitcraft	Director of Facilities	Jul 5, 2023 9:53 AM

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability of Professional Personnel	Points Based	50 (13.3% of Total)

Description:

- A. Resumes of the key staff support the firm's Competency in doing this type of work? Key staff includes the Project Manager, and other project team professionals.
- B. Has the firm done this type of work in the past?
- C. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?
- D. Based on questions above, award points as follows:
  1. 21-30 points - Exceptional Experience
  2. 11-20 points - Average Experience
  3. 0-10 points - Minimal Experience
- E. Has the company or key staff recently done this type of work for the County, the State, or for local government in the past?
  1. If the work was acceptable, award up to ten (10) points.
  2. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
  3. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.
- F. Are there factors, such as unique abilities, which would make a noticeable (positive) impact on the project?
  1. If the answer is yes, award from one (1) to ten (10) points and note reasons.
  2. If the answer is no, award zero (0) points.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements	Points Based	20 (5.3% of Total)

Description:

- A. Does the level of key staffing and their percentage of involvement, the use of subcontractors (if any), office location, and/or information contained in the transmittal letter indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time and budget requirements?
- B. To your knowledge, has the firm met or had trouble meeting time and budget requirements on similar projects?
- C. Have proof of insurability and other measures of financial stability been provided?

# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

- D. Are time schedules reasonable?
- E. Current Workload.
- F. This factor is designed to determine how busy a firm is by comparing all Florida work against Florida personnel.
  - 1. If the work was acceptable, award up to ten (20) points.
  - 2. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
  - 3. **If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County	Points Based	5 (1.3% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	25 (6.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project?
- B. Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?
  - 1. If the work was acceptable, award up to twenty-five (25) points.
  - 2. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
  - 3. **If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Approach	Points Based	25 (6.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?
- B. Does the proposal specifically address the County's needs or is it "generic" in content?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Manager	Points Based	10 (2.7% of Total)

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

### Description:

- A. Does the project manager have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?
- B. Does the Project Manager have a stable job history? Have they been with the firm long, or have there been frequent job changes?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Team	Points Based	20 (5.3% of Total)

### Description:

- A. Was a project team identified?
- B. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?
- C. Do the team members have experience with comparable projects?
- D. Are there any sub contracted firms involved? Will this enhance the project team?
- E. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Schedule	Points Based	10 (2.7% of Total)

### Description:

- A. Is the proposed schedule reasonable based on quantity of personnel assigned to the project?
- B. Are individual tasks staged properly and in proper sequence?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Proposal Organization	Points Based	10 (2.7% of Total)

### Description:

- A. Was proposal organization per the RFP?
- B. Was all required paperwork submitted and completed appropriately?
- C. Did the proposal contain an excessive amount of generic boilerplate, resumes, pages per resume, photographs, etc.?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	50 (13.3% of Total)

### Description:

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

- A. Did the presentation indicate a thorough understanding of the project? Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?
- B. Was the presentation more specific to the County's project or a "generic" presentation?
- C. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Responsiveness to Questions	Points Based	40 (10.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Were questions answered directly or evasively?
- B. Were answers to questions clear and concise or scrambled and verbose?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Team	Points Based	50 (13.3% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the project team participate?
- B. Was project team plan of action presented and how specifically did it address the project?
- C. Was there participation from any subcontracted firms? What was the impact of their participation?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Manager	Points Based	50 (13.3% of Total)

Description:

- A. Does the project manager have experience with responsibility for projects of comparable size and scope? Did he/she have a good understanding of this project?
- B. Did the project manager participate in the presentation? How effectively did he/she communicate ideas and respond to questions?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Other	Points Based	10 (2.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Award additional points for unique experience or abilities; organization of approach; understanding of "why it is to be done", as well as, "what is to be done," etc. Do not award

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

points for excessive boilerplate, excessive participation by "business development", and use of "professional" presenters.

- B. The Other Factors to be considered, but not limited to, are those items, such as Small Business Enterprise status, past performance, and previous amount of work for Alachua County. Fee proposals, when requested and deemed appropriate, are also to be considered in the evaluation process, where the request for such fees is in accordance with the County's Procurement Code.

## AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Jeffrey Hays	Danny Moore	Patrick Thomas	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 375)
DLR Group	313	360	338	355	<b>341.5</b>
Walker Architects	325	357	348	331	<b>340.25</b>
HOK	278	361	341	339	<b>329.75</b>

## VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
DLR Group	46.3	15.8	1	23.3	22.3
Walker Architects	45.8	17.8	4	23.5	23.5
HOK	44.8	14.5	5	22.3	23
Vendor	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
DLR Group	7.5	18.3	7.3	8.8	47.5
Walker Architects	6	17.3	8	8.8	48
HOK	8.3	17.5	7.3	9	43.5
Vendor	Responsiveness to Questions Points Based 40 Points (10.7%)	Project Team Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	Project Manager Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	Other Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 375)
DLR Group	38.5	48.5	48	8.8	<b>341.5</b>
Walker Architects	37.8	46	45.5	8.5	<b>340.25</b>
HOK	36	44.8	45	9	<b>329.75</b>

## INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

### DLR Group

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Danny Moore: 49

F:5 points awarded for specialization and 4 points for Alachua County experience

Patrick Thomas: 45

Resumes of key staff are exceptional. Firm has completed many jobs like this in the past. Only one subcontractor listed, subcontractor experience is relevant and exceptional. Recent experience with this type of work. Unique ability - developed the downtown master plan, has historical knowledge and continued involvement with the Courthouse complex.

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

### Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 12

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 15

Showed history of meeting time and budget requirements on most projects. Stated they have the resources to meet the schedule.

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

A/E under one roof. Believe this might allow for better control..

### Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (1.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 1

\$383,546.77

Danny Moore: 1

\$383,546.77

Patrick Thomas: 1

\$383,546.77

Daniel Whitcraft: 1

\$383,546.77

### Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

Thorough understanding of project.

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

### Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 21

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 20

Plan specific to this project, seems like a reasonable and methodical approach.

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

### Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 7

Patrick Thomas: 8

Large amount of experience, good length of time with company.

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

### Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

Strong team, large amount of experience.

Daniel Whitcraft: 19

Appears all but "Cost Estimator is in-house staff.

### Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

Schedule seems reasonable.

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

### Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9



# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Patrick Thomas: 10
Excellent proposal.
Daniel Whitcraft: 9
<b>Understanding of Project   Points Based   50 Points (13.3%)</b>
Jeffrey Hays: 45
Danny Moore: 50
Patrick Thomas: 45
Daniel Whitcraft: 50
<b>Responsiveness to Questions   Points Based   40 Points (10.7%)</b>
Jeffrey Hays: 38
Danny Moore: 40
Patrick Thomas: 38
Daniel Whitcraft: 38
<b>Project Team   Points Based   50 Points (13.3%)</b>
Jeffrey Hays: 46
Danny Moore: 50
Patrick Thomas: 48
Daniel Whitcraft: 50
<b>Project Manager   Points Based   50 Points (13.3%)</b>
Jeffrey Hays: 44
Danny Moore: 50
Patrick Thomas: 48
Daniel Whitcraft: 50
<b>Other   Points Based   10 Points (2.7%)</b>
Jeffrey Hays: 8
Danny Moore: 10
Patrick Thomas: 7

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

### HOK

#### Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Danny Moore: 46

6 points awarded for specialized experience..

Patrick Thomas: 45

Key staff and company have experience with similar projects. Multiple subcontractors listed. Competent staff, outstanding resumes. Much experience with this type of work. Six subcontractors, good experience. Landscape Design is a unique ability

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

#### Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 10

Design schedule seems reasonable, did not see current workload

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Somewhat generic on both Time and Budget.

#### Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (1.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

Patrick Thomas: 5

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

\$0

#### Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 20

# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 20

well thought out proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

## Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

systematic approach

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

## Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 8

good stability with firm, similar project experience

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

## Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

well rounded team of experts, six sub contractors may provide specialties not available at the average A&E firm.

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

## Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

schedule seems reasonable

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Task are fine, schedule is long.

### Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 10

excellent proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

### Understanding of Project | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 35

Danny Moore: 49

Patrick Thomas: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 42

### Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 40 Points (10.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 30

Danny Moore: 39

Patrick Thomas: 37

Daniel Whitcraft: 38

### Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 37

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 47

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

### Project Manager | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 37

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

## Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 10

Patrick Thomas: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

## Walker Architects

### Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Danny Moore: 45

Patrick Thomas: 48

Partner firm has extensive experience, specialize in justice facilities

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Appears Silling has the Courthouse design experience. Member of their team worked on the design of the existing Criminal Courthouse early 2000's.

### Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

showed proof of insurability and financial stability

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Timeline is acceptable, would have liked to see the Team Member with the most courthouse design experience have a larger role in the SD/DD stages.

### Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (1.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 4

\$61,791.80

Danny Moore: 4

\$61,791.80

Patrick Thomas: 4

\$61,791.80

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Daniel Whitcraft: 4  
\$61,791.80

### Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

thorough understanding, visionary

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

### Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

proposal specific to the needs of the County

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

The courtroom mock-up might be a bit of an over-reach (cost/reward).

### Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 7

Patrick Thomas: 4

good experience, large projects but no judicial

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Again, would have liked the team member with the most courthouse experience to have the largest role based on percentage.

### Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 17

Patrick Thomas: 20

4 sub contractors, reputable and local

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Project Schedule   Points Based   10 Points (2.7%)	
Jeffrey Hays: 9	
Danny Moore: 8	
Patrick Thomas: 5	
project timeline seems compressed	
Daniel Whitcraft: 10	
Proposal Organization   Points Based   10 Points (2.7%)	
Jeffrey Hays: 8	
Danny Moore: 8	
Patrick Thomas: 10	
excellent proposal, a lot of photographs	
Daniel Whitcraft: 9	
Understanding of Project   Points Based   50 Points (13.3%)	
Jeffrey Hays: 45	
Danny Moore: 50	
Patrick Thomas: 49	
Daniel Whitcraft: 48	
Responsiveness to Questions   Points Based   40 Points (10.7%)	
Jeffrey Hays: 35	
Danny Moore: 40	
Patrick Thomas: 38	
Daniel Whitcraft: 38	
Project Team   Points Based   50 Points (13.3%)	
Jeffrey Hays: 45	
Danny Moore: 50	
Patrick Thomas: 46	
Daniel Whitcraft: 43	

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Project Manager   Points Based   50 Points (13.3%)	
Jeffrey Hays: 43	
Danny Moore: 50	
Patrick Thomas: 46	
Daniel Whitcraft: 43	
Other   Points Based   10 Points (2.7%)	
Jeffrey Hays: 8	
Danny Moore: 10	
Patrick Thomas: 8	
Daniel Whitcraft: 8	

## PHASE 1

### EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Jeffrey Hays	Acting Director	Jul 5, 2023 2:20 PM
Danny Moore	Project Coordinator	Jul 5, 2023 1:01 PM
Patrick Thomas	Facilities Data Management Coordinator	Jul 6, 2023 2:53 PM
Daniel Whitcraft	Director of Facilities	Jul 5, 2023 9:53 AM

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability of Professional Personnel	Points Based	50 (28.6% of Total)

Description:

- A. Resumes of the key staff support the firm's Competency in doing this type of work? Key staff includes the Project Manager, and other project team professionals.
- B. Has the firm done this type of work in the past?
- C. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?
- D. Based on questions above, award points as follows:
  - 1. 21-30 points - Exceptional Experience
  - 2. 11-20 points - Average Experience



# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

## 3. 0-10 points - Minimal Experience

- E. Has the company or key staff recently done this type of work for the County, the State, or for local government in the past?
  - 1. If the work was acceptable, award up to ten (10) points.
  - 2. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
  - 3. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.
- F. Are there factors, such as unique abilities, which would make a noticeable (positive) impact on the project?
  - 1. If the answer is yes, award from one (1) to ten (10) points and note reasons.
  - 2. If the answer is no, award zero (0) points.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements	Points Based	20 (11.4% of Total)

Description:

- A. Does the level of key staffing and their percentage of involvement, the use of subcontractors (if any), office location, and/or information contained in the transmittal letter indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time and budget requirements?
- B. To your knowledge, has the firm met or had trouble meeting time and budget requirements on similar projects?
- C. Have proof of insurability and other measures of financial stability been provided?
- D. Are time schedules reasonable?
- E. Current Workload.
- F. This factor is designed to determine how busy a firm is by comparing all Florida work against Florida personnel.
  - 1. If the work was acceptable, award up to ten (20) points.
  - 2. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
  - 3. **If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County	Points Based	5 (2.9% of Total)

Description:

# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	25 (14.3% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project?
- B. Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?
  1. If the work was acceptable, award up to twenty-five (25) points.
  2. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
  3. **If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Approach	Points Based	25 (14.3% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?
- B. Does the proposal specifically address the County's needs or is it "generic" in content?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Manager	Points Based	10 (5.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Does the project manager have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?
- B. Does the Project Manager have a stable job history? Have they been with the firm long, or have there been frequent job changes?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Team	Points Based	20 (11.4% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was a project team identified?
- B. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?
- C. Do the team members have experience with comparable projects?
- D. Are there any sub contracted firms involved? Will this enhance the project team?

# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

E. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Schedule	Points Based	10 (5.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Is the proposed schedule reasonable based on quantity of personnel assigned to the project?
- B. Are individual tasks staged properly and in proper sequence?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Proposal Organization	Points Based	10 (5.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was proposal organization per the RFP?
- B. Was all required paperwork submitted and completed appropriately?
- C. Did the proposal contain an excessive amount of generic boilerplate, resumes, pages per resume, photographs, etc.?

## AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Jeffrey Hays	Danny Moore	Patrick Thomas	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Walker Architects	149	157	161	151	154.5
HOK	133	163	151	159	151.5
DLR Group	132	160	152	157	150.25

## VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Walker Architects	45.8	17.8	4	23.5	23.5
HOK	44.8	14.5	5	22.3	23
DLR Group	46.3	15.8	1	23.3	22.3
Vendor	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Walker Architects	6	17.3	8	8.8	154.5
HOK	8.3	17.5	7.3	9	151.5
DLR Group	7.5	18.3	7.3	8.8	150.25

## INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

### DLR Group

#### Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Danny Moore: 49

F:5 points awarded for specialization and 4 points for Alachua County experience

Patrick Thomas: 45

Resumes of key staff are exceptional. Firm has completed many jobs like this in the past. Only one subcontractor listed, subcontractor experience is relevant and exceptional. Recent experience with this type of work. Unique ability - developed the downtown master plan, has historical knowledge and continued involvement with the Courthouse complex.

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

#### Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 12

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 15

Showed history of meeting time and budget requirements on most projects. Stated they have the resources to meet the schedule.

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

A/E under one roof. Believe this might allow for better control..

#### Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (1.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 1

\$383,546.77

Danny Moore: 1

\$383,546.77

Patrick Thomas: 1

\$383,546.77

Daniel Whitcraft: 1

\$383,546.77

#### Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

Thorough understanding of project.

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

### Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 21

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 20

Plan specific to this project, seems like a reasonable and methodical approach.

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

### Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 7

Patrick Thomas: 8

Large amount of experience, good length of time with company.

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

### Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

Strong team, large amount of experience.

Daniel Whitcraft: 19

Appears all but "Cost Estimator is in-house staff.

### Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

Schedule seems reasonable.

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

### Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 10

Excellent proposal.

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

## HOK

### Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Danny Moore: 46

6 points awarded for specialized experience..

Patrick Thomas: 45

Key staff and company have experience with similar projects. Multiple subcontractors listed. Competent staff, outstanding resumes. Much experience with this type of work. Six subcontractors, good experience. Landscape Design is a unique ability

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

### Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 10

Design schedule seems reasonable, did not see current workload

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Somewhat generic on both Time and Budget.

### Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (1.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Patrick Thomas: 5
-------------------

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5
---------------------

\$0

### Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 20
------------------

Danny Moore: 25
-----------------

Patrick Thomas: 20
--------------------

well thought out proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 24
----------------------

### Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 20
------------------

Danny Moore: 25
-----------------

Patrick Thomas: 25
--------------------

systematic approach

Daniel Whitcraft: 22
----------------------

### Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6
-----------------

Danny Moore: 9
----------------

Patrick Thomas: 8
-------------------

good stability with firm, similar project experience

Daniel Whitcraft: 10
----------------------

### Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 14
------------------

Danny Moore: 18
-----------------

Patrick Thomas: 20
--------------------

well rounded team of experts, six sub contractors may provide specialties not available at the average A&E firm.

Daniel Whitcraft: 18
----------------------

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

### Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

schedule seems reasonable

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Task are fine, schedule is long.

### Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 10

excellent proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

## Walker Architects

### Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (13.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Danny Moore: 45

Patrick Thomas: 48

Partner firm has extensive experience, specialize in justice facilities

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Appears Silling has the Courthouse design experience. Member of their team worked on the design of the existing Criminal Courthouse early 2000's.

### Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

showed proof of insurability and financial stability

Daniel Whitcraft: 15



## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Timeline is acceptable, would have liked to see the Team Member with the most courthouse design experience have a larger role in the SD/DD stages.

### Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (1.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 4  
\$61,791.80

Danny Moore: 4  
\$61,791.80

Patrick Thomas: 4  
\$61,791.80

Daniel Whitcraft: 4  
\$61,791.80

### Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

thorough understanding, visionary

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

### Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

proposal specific to the needs of the County

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

The courtroom mock-up might be a bit of an over-reach (cost/reward).

### Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 7

Patrick Thomas: 4

good experience, large projects but no judicial

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

---

Again, would have liked the team member with the most courthouse experience to have the largest role based on percentage.

### Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5.3%)

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 17

Patrick Thomas: 20

4 sub contractors, reputable and local

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

### Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 5

project timeline seems compressed

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

### Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 10

excellent proposal, a lot of photographs

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

# ITA 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville

Final Audit Report

2023-08-01

Created:	2023-08-01
By:	Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAB8XhWMMpsRQAd3YMMrerWV8oggnkAl7X

## "ITA 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)  
2023-08-01 - 3:57:52 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) for signature  
2023-08-01 - 3:58:59 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)  
2023-08-01 - 4:05:33 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)  
Signature Date: 2023-08-01 - 4:20:28 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature  
2023-08-01 - 4:20:29 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)  
2023-08-01 - 4:56:41 PM GMT- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)  
Signature Date: 2023-08-01 - 4:58:03 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Agreement completed.  
2023-08-01 - 4:58:03 PM GMT