

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

October 3, 2023

MEMORANDUM

TO: Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB, Procurement Manager

FROM: Darryl R. Kight, CPPB, Procurement Supervisor

SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD Revised

RFP 24-37-DK Annual Engineering Services for Civil, Structural, Mechanical,

Electrical, Plumbing, and Life Safety

Solicitation Opening Date: 2:00 PM, Wednesday, August 16, 2023

Solicitation Notifications View Count:696 VendorsSolicitations Downloaded by:58 VendorsSolicitations Submissions:14 Vendors

Firms:

Bentley Group, Inc. Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc. EDA Consultants, Inc. Longwood, FL 32750 Gainesville, FL 32607 Gainesville, FL 32601

Graef-USA Inc. H2Engineering, Inc. JBrown Professional Group, Inc.

Maitland, FL 32751 Gainesville, FL 32605 Gainesville, FL 32606

Kimley-Horn and KPI Engineering, Inc. Lebo Engineering LLC Associates, Inc. Tampa, FL 33619 Gainesville, FL 32606

Orlando, FL 32801

Maitland, FL 32751

Matern Professional Mitchell Gulledge Engineering, Inc. Progresíve Engineering, LLC

Engineering, Inc. Gainesville, FL 32601 Gainesville, FL 32605

SGM Engineering, Inc. WGI, Inc.

Orlando, FL 32814 West Palm Beach, FL 33411

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee's award ranking below for RFP 24-37-DK Annual Engineering Services for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Life Safety.

- 1. Mitchell Gulledge Engineering, Inc.
- 2. Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.
- 3. Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.
- 4. EDA Consultants, Inc.
- 5. SGM Engineering, Inc.
- 6. H2Engineering, Inc.
- 7. KPI Engineering, Inc.
- 8. JBrown Professional Group, Inc.
- 9. Graef-USA Inc.
- 10. Bentley Group, Inc.
- 11. WGI, Inc.
- 12. Lebo Engineering LLC
- 13. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
- 14. Progresíve Engineering, LLC

Approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate agreement with top five (5) ranked firms. Should staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the any of the top five (5) ranked firms, negotiations with the unsuccessful firm(s) will be terminated.

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

felis

Approved

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr., CPPB

Procurement Manager

Oct 3, 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 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 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;
 - 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 Protests 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 24-37-DK Annual Engineering Services for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Life Safety

Date: September 11, 2023 Start Time: 11:00 am

Location: County Administration Building, Third Floor Conference Room

12 SE 1st St. 3rd floor, Gainesville, FL 32601

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

- 2.1. Good morning, I am Darryl Kight along with Leira Cruz Cáliz with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Dan Whitcraft (Leader), Danny Moore, and Matt Fultz.
- 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 recorded correctly and that they match the scores on your individual score sheets.

Vendor	Matthew Fultz	Danny Moore	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	166	164	161	163.67
Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	162	163	163	162.67
Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.	167	162	153	160.67
eda consultants, inc.	166	159	153	159.33
SGM Engineering, Inc	163	161	152	158.67
H2Engineering	155	158	151	154.67
KPI Engineering, Inc.	156	154	151	153.67
J <mark>B</mark> Pro	153	157	151	153.67
Graef-USA Inc.	156	149	151	152
Bentley Group, Inc.	158	146	148	150.67
WGI, Inc.	149	145	152	148.67
Lebo Engineering LLC	153	145	143	147
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	151	143	146	146.67
Progresive Engineering	152	104	129	128.33

- 3.6. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals. 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.
 - 3.6.4. Choose **not to have** Oral Presentation
- 4. Motion: Dan Whitcraft motioned to not have Oral Presentations with the top five firms: Danny Moore, seconded. Vote 3-0 in favor.
- 5. Motion: Dan Whitcraft motioned to approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate agreements with the top five (5) ranked firms. Should the staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with any of the top five ranked firms, negotiations with the unsuccessful firm(s) will be terminated.; Matt Fultz seconded.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

- 6. Public Comments (3 minutes): None
- 7. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Matt Fultz moved to approve the Minutes; Dan Whitcraft, seconded the motion.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

8. Meeting Adjourn at 11:29 am.



Alachua County, Florida

Procurement

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-37-DK

Annual Engineering Services for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical,

Plumbing, and Life Safety

RESPONSE DEADLINE: August 16, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Tuesday, September 12, 2023

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Annual Engineering Services for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Life Safety
Project ID	RFP 24-37-DK
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	July 12, 2023
Due Date	August 16, 2023
Procurement Agent	Darryl R Kight
Evaluators	Matthew Fultz, Danny Moore, Daniel Whitcraft
Project Description	

INTRODUCTION

<u>Summary</u>

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners (hereinafter, the "County" or "Alachua County") is seeking proposals from qualified individuals or entities (hereinafter, referred to as "Consultant" or the "proposer") for the provision of RFP 24-37-DK Annual Engineering Services for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Life Safety.

The following apply to this request for proposal: <u>Instruction to Proposers</u>, <u>Terms and Conditions</u>, <u>Insurance</u>, <u>Scope of Work</u>, <u>Proposal Requirements and Organization</u>, <u>Request for Proposal Selection</u> Procedures, Evaluation Phases, Attachments, Submittals and Sample Agreement.

.

Background

Location: Alachua County is located in North Central Florida. The County government seat is situated in Gainesville. Gainesville is located 70 miles southwest of Jacksonville, 129 miles southeast of Tallahassee, 140 miles northeast of Tampa - St. Petersburg and 109 miles northwest of Orlando. Alachua County has a population of over 250,000 and a regional airport. The County itself consists of a total area of 969 square miles.

Form of Government: Alachua County is governed by a Board of five (5) elected County Commissioners and operates under the established County Manager Charter form of government. In addition to the five County Commissioners, there are five elected Constitutional Officers: Supervisor of Elections, Sheriff, Clerk of the Court, Tax Collector, and the Property Appraiser. The Alachua County Attorney also reports to the Board.

Contact Information

Darryl R Kight

Procurement Supervisor, CPPB, CPM Email: drkight@alachuacounty.us

Phone: (352) 374-5202

Department:

Facilities Management

Timeline

OpenGov Release Project Date	July 12, 2023
2nd Advertisement Date	July 19, 2023
Question Submission Deadline	August 6, 2023, 12:00am
Solicitation Submission Deadline	August 16, 2023, 2:00pm

Solicitation Opening – Teams Meeting

August 16, 2023, 2:00pm

The scheduled solicitation opening will occur via Teams Meeting; the information to join is provided below. Attendance (live viewing) of the proposals opening is not required.

Join Microsoft Teams meeting Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

Click here to join the meeting

Meeting ID: 259 625 692 241

Passcode: yX9G3Q

Download Teams | Join on the web

Or call in (audio only)

+1 469-998-7938,,366862554# United States,

Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 366 862 554#

If you have a disability and need an accommodation in order to participate, please contact the Alachua County ADA Coordinator at ADA@alachuacounty.us or Equal Opportunity Office at 352-374-5275 at least 7 business days prior to the event. If you are unable to notify the Office prior to the event, please inform an Alachua County employee that you need assistance. TDD/TTY users, please call 711 (Florida Relay Service).

SOLICITATION STATUS HISTORY

Date	Changed To	Changed By
Jun 22, 2023 11:46 AM	Draft	Markisha Boykin
Jun 23, 2023 3:44 PM	Review	Darryl R Kight
Jul 7, 2023 4:04 PM	Final	Darryl R Kight
Jul 11, 2023 7:59 AM	Post Pending	Darryl R Kight
Jul 12, 2023 2:17 PM	Open	Darryl R Kight
Aug 16, 2023 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Aug 24, 2023 12:37 PM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	Bentley Group, Inc.	Shannon McKenzie marketing@bentleygroupinc.com	Aug 15, 2023 6:22 PM
Submitted	Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.	Kevin Spellicy pursuits@campbellspellicy.com (352) 372-6967	Aug 15, 2023 2:24 PM
Submitted	Graef-USA Inc.	Amy Zimmerman amy.zimmerman@graef-usa.com (407) 659-6500	Aug 9, 2023 4:46 PM
Submitted	H2Engineering	Ryan Chewning rchewning@h2engineering.com (642) 584-4253	Aug 16, 2023 7:58 AM
Submitted	JBPro	Anthony J. Brown Jr. jay.brown@jbpro.com	Aug 16, 2023 10:23 AM
Submitted	KPI Engineering, Inc.	Shawn Jeffrey bids@kpiengineering.com	Aug 16, 2023 1:25 PM
Submitted	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Erin Athas florida.marketing@kimley- horn.com (321) 754-0910	Aug 16, 2023 10:39 AM
Submitted	Lebo Engineering LLC	George Lebo george@leboengineering.com (352) 448-5450	Aug 14, 2023 2:24 PM
Submitted	Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	Ryan Strandquest sgentry@matern.net (407) 740-5020	Aug 16, 2023 10:26 AM
Submitted	Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	Trish Bullock tbullock@mitchellgulledge.com	Aug 15, 2023 2:43 PM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	Jul 12, 2023 2:24 PM
Submitted	Progresíve Engineering	Michael Insua minsua@progresiveeng.com	Aug 16, 2023 1:55 PM
Submitted	SGM Engineering, Inc	Bobby Shahnami bobby@sgmengineering.com (407) 767-5188	Aug 15, 2023 2:55 PM
No Bid	The Peavey Corporation dba Lynn Peavey Company	Maria Muniz mmuniz@peaveycorp.com (913) 495-6642	Jul 12, 2023 2:27 PM

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	WGI, Inc.	WGI Business Development busdev@wginc.com (561) 687-2220	Aug 16, 2023 8:20 AM
Submitted	eda consultants, inc.	Sergio Reyes sreyes@edafl.com (352) 373-3541	Aug 16, 2023 1:59 PM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	Bentley Group, Inc.	Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.	Graef-USA Inc.	H2Engineering
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Question Title	JBPro	KPI Engineering, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Lebo Engineering LLC
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Question Title	Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	Network Craze	Progresíve Engineering
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass

Question Title	Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	Network Craze	Progresíve Engineering
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass

Question Title	SGM Engineering, Inc	The Peavey Corporation dba Lynn Peavey Company	WGI, Inc.	eda consultants, inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass

Question Title	SGM Engineering, Inc	The Peavey Corporation dba Lynn Peavey Company	WGI, Inc.	eda consultants, inc.
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass

Question Title	
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	No Response
State Compliance	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	No Response
Vendor Eligibility	No Response
NON-SBE Subcontractors	No Response
Responsible Agent Designation	No Response
Conflict of Interest	No Response
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	No Response
Acknowledgement of Requirements	No Response

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. Services

Jul 12, 2023 4:30 PM

Question: Are submitting firms required to include all services in proposal?

Jul 12, 2023 4:30 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: No, only what pertains to the service they provide, i.e., Mechanical

Engineering.

Jul 13, 2023 9:37 AM

2. SOW

Jul 13, 2023 12:14 PM

Question: Geotechnical Engineering, Does this include geotechnical engineering as a designated discipline or will that annual engineering service RFP be released at a later date?

Jul 13, 2023 12:14 PM

Answered by Daniel Whitcraft: Geotechnical Engineering will not be part of this RFP.

Jul 13, 2023 3:53 PM

3. Survey

Aug 1, 2023 4:37 PM

Question: Survey is mentioned in the Scope of Services- is surveying & mapping part of this RFP or will there be a separate contract for that at a later date?

Aug 1, 2023 4:37 PM

Answered by Daniel Whitcraft: There is/will continue to be a separate contract for surveying.

Aug 3, 2023 11:16 AM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

No Addenda issued.

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Aug 16, 2023 3:12 PM

Please see the attached document.

Notice #2

Aug 24, 2023 1:39 PM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting:

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 24-37-DK Annual Engineering Services for Civil,

Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Life Safety

Time: Monday, September 11, 2023 @ 11:00 am Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Administration Building

Third Floor Conference Room

12 SE 1st Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

Join Teams Meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

Click here to join the meeting

Meeting ID: 232 232 675 725

Passcode: vC8q6v

Or call in (audio only)

+1 469-998-7938,,356857566# United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 356 857 566#

These meetings are subject to change and/or cancellation. If you have any questions regarding these meetings, please call 352.384.3090. All persons are advised that, if they decide to contest any decision made at any of these meetings, they will need a record of the proceedings and, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that verbatim record of the proceedings is made which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. If any accommodations are needed for persons with disabilities, please contact the County's Equal Opportunity Office at (352)374-5275 or (TTD) (352)-374-5284.

Notice #3

Sep 11, 2023 12:52 PM

Attached are the Agenda, Meeting Minutes and Recording for Public Meeting RFP 24-37-DK Annual ES for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Life Safety

EVALUATION

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Matthew Fultz	Capital Projects Coordinator	Aug 28, 2023 12:26 PM
Danny Moore	Project Coordinator	Sep 10, 2023 11:50 AM
Daniel Whitcraft	Director of Facilities	Sep 8, 2023 12:20 PM

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
 - 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:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method Weight (Point	
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?
- E. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?

Criteria	Scoring Method Weigh	
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	Matthew Fultz	Danny Moore	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	166	164	161	163.67
Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	162	163	163	162.67
Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.	167	162	153	160.67
eda consultants, inc.	166	159	153	159.33
SGM Engineering, Inc	163	161	152	158.67
H2Engineering	155	158	151	154.67
JBPro	153	157	151	153.67
KPI Engineering, Inc.	156	154	151	153.67
Graef-USA Inc.	156	149	151	152
Bentley Group, Inc.	158	146	148	150.67
WGI, Inc.	149	145	152	148.67
Lebo Engineering LLC	153	145	143	147
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	151	143	146	146.67
Progresíve Engineering	152	104	129	128.33

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%)
Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	48.3	18.7	5	24.3
Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	48	18	5	24
Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.	47.3	17.7	5	24.3
eda consultants, inc.	48	18	1	24.3
SGM Engineering, Inc	46.3	17.3	5	24
H2Engineering	45.3	17.3	5	23
JBPro	46.7	17.7	0	23.7
KPI Engineering, Inc.	45	17.3	5	23
Graef-USA Inc.	43.7	17	5	23
Bentley Group, Inc.	42.7	16.7	5	22.7
WGI, Inc.	44	16.7	5	22.7
Lebo Engineering LLC	44	15.7	5	22.7
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	44.3	17	0	22.7
Progresíve Engineering	37.3	14.3	5	20.3

Vendor	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	24	8.3	18.3	8
Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	24	8.3	18.3	8.3
Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.	24	8	18	8
eda consultants, inc.	24.3	8.7	18	8.7
SGM Engineering, Inc	23.3	8	18.3	7.3
H2Engineering	23.3	7.7	17.3	7.7
JBPro	23.7	8	17.7	8

Vendor	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
KPI Engineering, Inc.	23	7.7	17.3	7.7
Graef-USA Inc.	23	7.7	17.3	7.7
Bentley Group, Inc.	23	7.7	17	8
WGI, Inc.	22.3	7.3	16.7	7
Lebo Engineering LLC	22.7	7.3	15.3	6.7
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	22.7	7.7	16.7	8
Progresíve Engineering	19	6.3	14	6.3

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Mitchell Gulledge Engineering	8.7	163.67
Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.	8.7	162.67
Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.	8.3	160.67
eda consultants, inc.	8.3	159.33
SGM Engineering, Inc	9	158.67
H2Engineering	8	154.67
JBPro	8.3	153.67
KPI Engineering, Inc.	7.7	153.67
Graef-USA Inc.	7.7	152
Bentley Group, Inc.	8	150.67
WGI, Inc.	7	148.67
Lebo Engineering LLC	7.7	147
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	7.7	146.67
Progresíve Engineering	5.7	128.33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Bentley Group, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 43

Danny Moore: 40
Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%) Matthew Fultz: 18 Danny Moore: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%) Matthew Fultz: 5 \$0 Danny Moore: 5 \$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 22 Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 24
Danny Moore: 22
Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Matthew Fultz: 9
Danny Moore: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)
Matthew Fultz: 18
Danny Moore: 17
Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Matthew Fultz: 9
Danny Moore: 8
Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9 Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Campbell Spellicy Engineering, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 49 Danny Moore: 47

Daniel Whitcraft: 46

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 18
Danny Moore: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

\$0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 25
Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 24

Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 19

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 10

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

eda consultants, inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 49

Danny Moore: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 47

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 19

Danny Moore: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 1

\$371,241.84

Danny Moore: 1

\$371,241.84

Daniel Whitcraft: 1

\$371,241.84

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 25

Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 25

Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 19

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 10

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Graef-USA Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 46

Danny Moore: 40

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 17

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

\$0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 23

Danny Moore: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 23

Danny Moore: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 18

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

H2Engineering

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 46

Danny Moore: 45

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 17

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 5	
\$0	
Danny Moore: 5	
\$0	
Daniel Whitcraft: 5	
\$0	
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.	20/1
	570)
Matthew Fultz: 22	
Danny Moore: 24	
Daniel Whitcraft: 23	
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	
Matthew Fultz: 23	
Danny Moore: 24	
Daniel Whitcraft: 23	
Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	
Matthew Fultz: 8	
Danny Moore: 8	
Daniel Whitcraft: 7	
Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	
Matthew Fultz: 18	
Danny Moore: 18	
Daniel Whitcraft: 16	
Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	
Matthew Fultz: 8	
Danny Moore: 8	
Daniel Whitcraft: 7	
Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.79	6)
Matthew Fultz: 8	
Danny Moore: 8	

Danie	l Whitcraft: 8
Dariic	i vviiittiait. O

JBPro
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)
Matthew Fultz: 48
Danny Moore: 45
Daniel Whitcraft: 47

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%) Matthew Fultz: 17 Danny Moore: 19 Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matt	hew	Fu	ltz:	0
------	-----	----	------	---

\$846,896.25

Danny Moore: 0

\$846,896.25

Daniel Whitcraft: 0

\$846,896.25

Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 23
Danny Moore: 25
Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 23
Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 18
Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8 Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8
Danny Moore: 9
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 47
Danny Moore: 40
Daniel Whitcraft: 46

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 17
Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 0

\$1,028,924.05

Danny Moore: 0

\$1,028,924.05

			`. ^
Danie	1 1/1/	ロリナヘアつき	+ 1 1
I Jaille	1 WW	וווונומו	

\$1,028,924.05

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 22

Danny Moore: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 23

Danny Moore: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 17

Danny Moore: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

KPI Engineering, Inc.

	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)
	Matthew Fultz: 46
	Danny Moore: 44
	Daniel Whitcraft: 45
	Canability to Most Time and Budget Paguiroments Points Paged 20 Points (11 49/)
	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (11.4%) Matthew Fultz: 18
	Danny Moore: 17
	Daniel Whitcraft: 17
	Damer Willestoff. 17
	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)
ćo	Matthew Fultz: 5
\$0	Danny Moore, E
\$0	Danny Moore: 5
	Daniel Whitcraft: 5
\$0	
	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
	orider startaing of Froject Forits based 25 Forits (14.570)
	Matthew Fultz: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%) Matthew Fultz: 8
	Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%) Matthew Fultz: 23 Danny Moore: 23 Daniel Whitcraft: 23 Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%) Matthew Fultz: 8 Danny Moore: 8

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 7

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Lebo Engineering LLC

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 47

Danny Moore: 40

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 17

Danny Moore: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

\$0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 22

Danny Moore: 24

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 22

Danny Moore: 24

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 7

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 17

Danny Moore: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 7

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 6

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Matern Professional Engineering, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 48

Danny Moore: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)
Matthew Fultz: 18
Danny Moore: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 18
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)
Matthew Fultz: 5
\$10,930.00
Danny Moore: 5
\$10,930.00
Daniel Whitcraft: 5
\$10,930.00
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 23
Danny Moore: 25
Daniel Whitcraft: 24
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 23
Danny Moore: 25
Daniel Whitcraft: 24
Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Matthew Fultz: 8
D 14 0
Danny Moore: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 19
Danny Moore: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

Mitchell Gulledge Engineering

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 50

Danny Moore: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 47

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 19

Danny Moore: 19

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

\$0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 24

Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 23

Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 19

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

Progresive Engineering

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 45

Danny Moore: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 42

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 17

Danny Moore: 12

Daniel Whitcraft: 14
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)
Matthew Fultz: 5
50
Danny Moore: 5
50
Daniel Whitcraft: 5
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 25
Danny Moore: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 21
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 23
Danny Moore: 16
Daniel Whitcraft: 18
Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Matthew Fultz: 7
Danny Moore: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 5
Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)
Matthew Fultz: 16
Danny Moore: 12
Daniel Whitcraft: 14
Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Matthew Fultz: 7
Danny Moore: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 5

Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Matthew Fultz: 7
Danny Moore: 5
Daniel Whitcraft: 5

Daniel Whitcraft: 5
SGM Engineering, Inc
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)
Matthew Fultz: 48
Danny Moore: 46
Daniel Whitcraft: 45
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)
Matthew Fultz: 17
Danny Moore: 19
Daniel Whitcraft: 16
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)
Matthew Fultz: 5
\$0
Danny Moore: 5 \$0
Daniel Whitcraft: 5 \$0
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 25
Danny Moore: 24
Daniel Whitcraft: 23
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)

Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
Matthew Fultz: 23
Danny Moore: 24
Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 20

Danny Moore: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 7

Danny Moore: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 10

Danny Moore: 9

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

WGI, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Matthew Fultz: 46

Danny Moore: 40

Daniel Whitcraft: 46

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 16

Danny Moore: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Matthew Fultz: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

\$0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 22

Danny Moore: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Matthew Fultz: 22

Danny Moore: 22

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 8

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Matthew Fultz: 16

Danny Moore: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 7

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Matthew Fultz: 7

Danny Moore: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

A bit confusing regarding who works for WGI, and Subconsultants.

ITA Revised24-37-DK Annual ESvcs for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing

Final Audit Report 2023-10-03

Created: 2023-10-03

By: Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)

Status: Signed

Transaction ID: CBJCHBCAABAAalQ1pznFNwekQupklFQB3bol3sgbp5la

"ITA Revised24-37-DK Annual ESvcs for Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing" History

- Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us) 2023-10-03 2:22:03 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.69
- Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) for signature 2023-10-03 2:23:37 PM GMT
- Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) 2023-10-03 2:27:28 PM GMT- IP address: 149.19.43.13
- Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)

 Signature Date: 2023-10-03 2:27:57 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13
- Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature 2023-10-03 2:27:59 PM GMT
- Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) 2023-10-03 2:29:22 PM GMT- IP address: 163,120,80,11
- Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)

 Signature Date: 2023-10-03 3:11:32 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 163,120,80,11
- Agreement completed. 2023-10-03 - 3:11:32 PM GMT