



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

July 20, 2023

MEMORANDUM

TO: Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB, Procurement Manager
FROM: Darryl R. Kight, CPPB, Procurement Supervisor Darryl Kight (Jul 21, 2023 08:33 EDT)
SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 24-117-TW Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Solicitation Opening Date: 2:00 PM, Wednesday, May 31, 2023
Solicitation Notifications View Count: 441 Vendors
Solicitations Downloaded by: 19 Vendors
Solicitations Submissions: 6 Vendors

Firms:

Bureau Veritas North America, Inc.
St. Cloud, FL 34771

Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.
Jacksonville, FL 32256

ECS Florida LLC
Jacksonville, FL 32256

Joe Payne, Inc.
Melbourne Beach, FL 32951

SAFEBuilt Florida, LLC
Loveland, CO 80537

Willdan Engineering, Inc.
Orlando, FL 32801

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee's award ranking below for RFP 24-117-TW Annual Third Party Building Plan Review.

1. Willdan Engineering, Inc.
2. SAFEBuilt Florida, LLC
3. Joe Payne, Inc.

Authorize staff to negotiate agreement with top ranked firm, Willdan Engineering, Inc., and with the second and third ranked firms SAFEbuilt and JPI, if negotiations with the top ranked vendor fail.

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



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

Jul 21, 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;
 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 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 24-117-TW Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Date: July 19, 2023

Start Time: 1:00 pm

Location: 3rd Floor Conference Room
12 SE 1st 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 along with Mandy Mullins with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Holly Banner (Leader), Jeffrey Hays, and Dan Gargas.
- 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. Last meeting, Procurement provided points to members for Location, SBE and VOW.
- 3.2. 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.
- 3.3. *As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.*
- 3.4. **Second**, This is the second phase of the Evaluation for Oral Presentations.
- 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	Holly Banner	Dan Gargas	Jeffrey Hays	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Willdan Engineering	357	333	324	338
SAFEbuilt	342	346	297	328.33
JPI	320	240	253	271

- 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: **Oral Presentation 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 Approve Ranking: Jeffrey Hays motion to recommend the final rankings be approved and sent to the BOCC for Approval. Then start contract negotiations the with the top ranked firm Willdan Engineering and with the second and third ranked firms SAFEbuilt and JPI if negotiations fail with the top ranked vendor, seconded by Holly Banner.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

5. Public Comments (3 minutes):

6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Jeffrey Hays moved to approve the Minutes; Dan Gargas seconded the motion.
Vote 3-0 in favor.
7. Meeting Adjourn at 1:19 pm



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW
Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 31, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Friday, July 21, 2023

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Annual Third Party Building Plan Review
Project ID	RFP 24-117-TW
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	April 26, 2023
Due Date	May 31, 2023
Procurement Agent	Theodore White
Evaluators	Holly Banner, Dan Gargas, Jeffrey Hays
Project Description	Purpose: The Alachua County Building Division has need of professional services for complete building plan review to supplement the work done by the County's Plans Examiners on an as-needed basis to ensure all building permit applications meet the requirements of the Florida Building Code. This supplemental service is needed in order to meet the required time frames for building plan review identified in Section 553.79, Florida Statutes. Such work will focus primarily on commercial building plan review. Permit Volume: For annual building permit data please see https://growth-management.alachuacounty.us/Building/UtilizationReportFY2122

INTRODUCTION

Summary

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 24-117-TW Annual Third Party Building Plan Review.

The following apply to this request for proposal: [Instruction to Proposers](#), [Terms and Conditions](#), [Insurance](#), [Scope of Work](#), [Proposal Requirements and Organization](#), [Request for Proposal Selection Procedures](#), [Evaluation Phases](#), [Attachments](#), [Submittals](#) and [Sample Agreement](#).

Purpose:

The Alachua County Building Division has need of professional services for complete building plan review to supplement the work done by the County's Plans Examiners on an as-needed basis to ensure all building permit applications meet the requirements of the Florida Building Code. This supplemental service is needed in order to meet the required time frames for building plan review identified in Section 553.79, Florida Statutes. Such work will focus primarily on commercial building plan review.

Permit Volume: For annual building permit data please see <https://growth-management.alachuacounty.us/Building/UtilizationReportFY2122>

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.

Contact Information

Theodore White

Procurement Agent II, CPPB

Email: twhite@alachuacounty.us

Phone: [\(352\) 384-3091](tel:(352)384-3091)

Department:

Growth Management

Timeline

OpenGov Release Project Date	April 26, 2023
Question Submission Deadline	May 21, 2023, 12:01am
Solicitation Submission Deadline	May 31, 2023, 2:00pm

Solicitation Opening – Teams Meeting	May 31, 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
Apr 4, 2023 9:33 AM	Draft	Theodore White
Apr 11, 2023 3:11 PM	Review	Mandy Mullins
Apr 21, 2023 2:34 PM	Final	Mandy Mullins
Apr 21, 2023 2:34 PM	Post Pending	Mandy Mullins

Date	Changed To	Changed By
Apr 26, 2023 6:00 AM	Open	OpenGov Bot
May 31, 2023 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
May 31, 2023 2:20 PM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	JPI	Joseph Payne joepayneinc@gmail.com	May 30, 2023 10:02 AM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	Apr 26, 2023 7:22 AM
Submitted	SAFEbuilt	Jessica Koehler proposals@safebuilt.com	May 31, 2023 1:02 PM
Submitted	Willdan Engineering	Al Brady rfps@willdan.com	May 31, 2023 1:34 PM
Excluded	Bureau Veritas NA Inc	Flora Kirby flora.kirby@bureauveritas.com	May 30, 2023 7:37 PM
Excluded	Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.	Sarah Ellington sarahellington@caa.inc (801) 628-1159	May 31, 2023 10:27 AM
Excluded	ECS Limited	Rachelle Ferrell rferrell@ecslimited.com	May 31, 2023 1:39 PM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	JPI	Network Craze	SAFEbuilt	Willdan Engineering	Bureau Veritas NA Inc (Excluded)
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledge that you have reviewed all Addendum(s) issued with this solicitation.	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW

Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Question Title	JPI	Network Craze	SAFEbuilt	Willdan Engineering	Bureau Veritas NA Inc (Excluded)
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 1: SBE Proposer	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Small Business Enterprise Option 2: 30% SBE Proposer Participation	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Small Business Enterprise Option 3: 15% - 29% SBE Prosper Participation	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Small Business Enterprise Option 4: No Subcontractors	Pass	No Response	Fail	Pass	Pass
Consultant Small Business Enterprise Good Faith Effort Option 5.	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Government Minimum Wage	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Location Preference	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements..	Pass	No Response	Pass	Pass	Pass
Question Title	Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. (Excluded)			ECS Limited (Excluded)	
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass			Pass	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW
Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Question Title	JPI	Network Craze	SAFEbuilt	Willdan Engineering	Bureau Veritas NA Inc (Excluded)
Acknowledge that you have reviewed all Addendum(s) issued with this solicitation.		Pass		Pass	
State Compliance		Pass		Pass	
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request		Pass		Pass	
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request		Pass		Pass	
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request		No Response		No Response	
Small Business Enterprise Option 1: SBE Proposer		Pass		Pass	
Small Business Enterprise Option 2: 30% SBE Proposer Participation		Pass		Pass	
Small Business Enterprise Option 3: 15% - 29% SBE Prosper Participation		Pass		Pass	
Small Business Enterprise Option 4: No Subcontractors		Pass		Pass	
Consultant Small Business Enterprise Good Faith Effort Option 5.		Pass		Pass	
Alachua County Government Minimum Wage		Pass		Pass	
Alachua County Location Preference		Pass		Pass	
Drug Free Workplace		Pass		Pass	
Vendor Eligibility		Pass		Pass	
NON-SBE Subcontractors		Pass		Pass	
Responsible Agent Designation		Pass		Pass	
Conflict of Interest		Pass		Pass	
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation		Pass		Pass	
You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements..		Pass		Pass	

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

No Questions Received.

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

No Addenda issued.

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

May 31, 2023 2:18 PM

Vendors that submitted Proposals.

Notice #2

Jun 6, 2023 7:29 PM

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 24-117-TW Annual Third-Party Building Plan Review

Time: Thursday, June 29, 2023 @ 10:00 am Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Administration Building

Third Floor Conference Room

12 SE 1st Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

Join Zoom Meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://alachuacounty-us.zoom.us/j/86249280083?pwd=b1p1Qm5nODFHTW14bjZpcndRcVppZz09>

Meeting ID: 862 4928 0083

Passcode: 035360

One tap mobile

+13052241968,,86249280083# US

+13126266799,,86249280083# US (Chicago)

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

Jun 29, 2023 2:41 PM

Attached is the Recorded Public Meeting and the meeting minutes

Notice #4

Jun 30, 2023 9:34 AM

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 24-117-TW Annual Third-Party Building Plan Review
Time: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 @ 1:00 pm Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Location: Alachua County Administration Building
Third Floor Conference Room
12 SE 1st Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

EVALUATION

PHASE 3

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Holly Banner	Zoning Administrator	Jun 13, 2023 2:38 PM
Dan Gargas	Building Official	Jun 21, 2023 10:26 AM
Jeffrey Hays	Acting Director	Jun 21, 2023 11:34 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability of Professional Personnel	Points Based	50 (12.5% 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% 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)
Location	Points Based	10 (2.5% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE)	Points Based	15 (3.8% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

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 (6.3% 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 ten (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 (6.3% 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 (2.5% 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 (5% 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 (2.5% 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 (2.5% 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 - Oral	Points Based	50 (12.5% of Total)

Description:

- 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 - Oral	Points Based	40 (10% 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 - Oral	Points Based	50 (12.5% 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 - Oral	Points Based	50 (12.5% 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 - Oral	Points Based	10 (2.5% 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 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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW
Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Vendor	Holly Banner	Dan Gargas	Jeffrey Hays	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Willdan Engineering	357	333	324	338
SAFEbuilt	342	346	297	328.33
JPI	320	240	253	271
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	145	119	126	130
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	143	70	136	116.33
ECS Limited Excluded	100	34	98	77.33

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (3.8%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)
Willdan Engineering	42.7	16.7	0	0	5
SAFEbuilt	40	16.7	0	10	5
JPI	41.3	15.7	0	0	5
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	38.3	15.7	0	0	0
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	31.7	11.7	0	0	0
ECS Limited Excluded	21.7	9	0	0	0
Vendor	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.3%)	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.3%)	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (5%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)
Willdan Engineering	20.7	20.7	9	16.3	8.3
SAFEbuilt	20.3	19.3	7.7	16.3	8.3
JPI	21	21	9	15.3	8.3
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	20	18	7	16.3	7.3
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	20.7	19	6.3	13.7	6.7
ECS Limited Excluded	11.7	12.3	5.3	11	2.3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW
Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (3.8%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)
Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Understanding of Project - Oral Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Responsiveness to Questions - Oral Points Based 40 Points (10%)	Project Team - Oral Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Project Manager - Oral Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)
Willdan Engineering	9	47	39	46.7	48.3
SAFEbuilt	6.3	46.7	38.3	40	45.7
JPI	8.3	38.3	33.3	16.7	33.3
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	7.3	0	0	0	0
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	6.7	0	0	0	0
ECS Limited Excluded	4	0	0	0	0
Vendor	Other - Oral Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)		Total Score (Max Score 400)		
Willdan Engineering	8.7		338		
SAFEbuilt	7.7		328.33		
JPI	4.3		271		
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	0		130		
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	0		116.33		
ECS Limited Excluded	0		77.33		

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

JPI
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)
Holly Banner: 47
100% local govt, Citizenserve experience, focus on consistency with current expectations/review comments
Dan Gargas: 35
Jeffrey Hays: 42
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 12

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

two primaries identified seem to have minimal PX experience, but others on team have sufficient qualifications

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 50

Jeffrey Hays: 25

Responsiveness to Questions - Oral | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Holly Banner: 35

Dan Gargas: 35

Jeffrey Hays: 30

Project Team - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 35

Dan Gargas: 0

No project team

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Project Manager - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 25

Jeffrey Hays: 35

Other - Oral | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 3

Citizenserve interaction & experience

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

SAFEbuilt

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

workload is a concern - staff ratio to local govts served may be insufficient

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

Dan Gargas: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

Jeffrey Hays: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 18

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 7

unclear - no resume provided for project manager

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

poorly organized, errors, somewhat generic

Dan Gargas: 10

No points were deducted for the proposal referencing county instead of state

Jeffrey Hays: 4

Understanding of Project - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 45

Dan Gargas: 50

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Responsiveness to Questions - Oral | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 35

Project Team - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 50

Jeffrey Hays: 30

Project Manager - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 45

Dan Gargas: 50

company has a very large Florida presence

Jeffrey Hays: 42

Other - Oral | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

dedicated coordinator

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 8

Willdan Engineering

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 45

98% service to local govts, review/comment portal available both to clients and County

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)	
Holly Banner:	5
Dan Gargas:	5
Jeffrey Hays:	5
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.3%)	
Holly Banner:	25
Dan Gargas:	15
Jeffrey Hays:	22
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.3%)	
Holly Banner:	25
Dan Gargas:	15
Jeffrey Hays:	22
Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	
Holly Banner:	10
Dan Gargas:	10
Jeffrey Hays:	7
Project Team Points Based 20 Points (5%)	
Holly Banner:	20
Dan Gargas:	15
Jeffrey Hays:	14
Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	
Holly Banner:	10
Dan Gargas:	8
Jeffrey Hays:	7
Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Understanding of Project - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 45

Dan Gargas: 50

Jeffrey Hays: 46

Responsiveness to Questions - Oral | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 37

Project Team - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 45

Dan Gargas: 50

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Project Manager - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 50

Dan Gargas: 50

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Other - Oral | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 7

QA/QC, flexibility with special project needs, no private provider work

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 9

Bureau Veritas NA Inc
(Excluded)

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

significant plan review experience, multiple jurisdictions served in FL

Dan Gargas: 35

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 12

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

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

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

No Citizenserve experience

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 19

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

Some job changes, new to BV

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 7

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

No hourly rates provided

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Understanding of Project - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Responsiveness to Questions - Oral | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Project Team - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Project Manager - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Other - Oral | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

**Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.
(Excluded)**

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 42

exclusively serves public agencies

Dan Gargas: 10

minimal experience in Florida

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

current workload for assigned staff is a little unclear

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	
	Holly Banner: 0
	Dan Gargas: 0
	Jeffrey Hays: 0
Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (3.8%)	
	Holly Banner: 0
	Dan Gargas: 0
	Jeffrey Hays: 0
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)	
	Holly Banner: 0
	Dan Gargas: 0
	Jeffrey Hays: 0
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.3%)	
	Holly Banner: 25
	Dan Gargas: 15
	Jeffrey Hays: 22
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.3%)	
	Holly Banner: 20
	somewhat generic, approach unclear regarding software used and how information is transferred
	Dan Gargas: 15
	Jeffrey Hays: 22
Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	
	Holly Banner: 7
	FL specific experience unclear
	Dan Gargas: 5
	Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 9

lacked some procedural details, but did include an hourly rate

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Understanding of Project - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Responsiveness to Questions - Oral | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Project Team - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Project Manager - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Other - Oral | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

**ECS Limited
(Excluded)**

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 20

experience completing plan reviews on behalf of local govts is unclear

Dan Gargas: 20

There was no clear indication that this firm has a background of completing private provider plan reviews.

Jeffrey Hays: 25

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

current workload unclear

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 12

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

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

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

approach description lacks detail

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 17

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

work experience information is limited and does not identify plan review but focuses on specialized inspections

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

limited plans examiner experience cited for team members

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 13

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

no schedule identified

Dan Gargas: 2

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

limited information, no hourly rates provided

Dan Gargas: 2

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Responsiveness to Questions - Oral | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Project Team - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Project Manager - Oral | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Other - Oral | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Holly Banner	Zoning Administrator	Jun 13, 2023 2:38 PM
Dan Gargas	Building Official	Jun 21, 2023 10:26 AM
Jeffrey Hays	Acting Director	Jun 21, 2023 11:34 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability of Professional Personnel	Points Based	50 (25% 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.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW
Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements	Points Based	20 (10% 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)
Location	Points Based	10 (5% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE)	Points Based	15 (7.5% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County	Points Based	5 (2.5% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	25 (12.5% 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 ten (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 (12.5% 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% 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 (10% 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 (5% 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% 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	Holly Banner	Dan Gargas	Jeffrey Hays	Total Score (Max Score 200)
SAFEbuilt	167	146	137	150
Willdan Engineering	170	133	142	148.33
JPI	167	125	143	145
Bureau Veritas NA Inc	150	124	131	135
Excluded				
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.	148	75	141	121.33
Excluded				
ECS Limited	105	39	103	82.33
Excluded				

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (10%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%)
SAFEbuilt	40	16.7	0	10	5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW

Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (10%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%)
Willdan Engineering	42.7	16.7	0	0	5
JPI	41.3	15.7	0	0	5
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	38.3	15.7	0	0	5
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	31.7	11.7	0	0	5
ECS Limited Excluded	21.7	9	0	0	5
Vendor	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (12.5%)	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (12.5%)	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (10%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5%)
SAFEbuilt	20.3	19.3	7.7	16.3	8.3
Willdan Engineering	20.7	20.7	9	16.3	8.3
JPI	21	21	9	15.3	8.3
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	20	18	7	16.3	7.3
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	20.7	19	6.3	13.7	6.7
ECS Limited Excluded	11.7	12.3	5.3	11	2.3
Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5%)		Total Score (Max Score 200)		
SAFEbuilt	6.3		150		
Willdan Engineering	9		148.33		
JPI	8.3		145		
Bureau Veritas NA Inc Excluded	7.3		135		
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc. Excluded	6.7		121.33		
ECS Limited Excluded	4		82.33		

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

JPI

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 47

100% local govt, Citizenserve experience, focus on consistency with current expectations/review comments

Dan Gargas: 35

Jeffrey Hays: 42

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 12

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

two primaries identified seem to have minimal PX experience, but others on team have sufficient qualifications

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 5

SAFEbuilt

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

workload is a concern - staff ratio to local govts served may be insufficient

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

Dan Gargas: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

Jeffrey Hays: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 18

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 7

unclear - no resume provided for project manager

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

poorly organized, errors, somewhat generic

Dan Gargas: 10

No points were deducted for the proposal referencing county instead of state

Jeffrey Hays: 4

Willdan Engineering

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 45

98% service to local govts, review/comment portal available both to clients and County

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Bureau Veritas NA Inc
(Excluded)

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

significant plan review experience, multiple jurisdictions served in FL

Dan Gargas: 35

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 12

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option 4. Emailed response to question "0" points The Consultant will perform ALL work and that no subcontractors will be utilized for this proposal." But should it be mandatory for the County to meet the SBE percentage participation goal of 15% - 29%, we will be able to engage a subcontractor for this requirement. Thank you.

Dan Gargas: 0

Option 4. Emailed response to question "0" points The Consultant will perform ALL work and that no subcontractors will be utilized for this proposal." But should it be mandatory for the County to meet the SBE percentage participation goal of 15% - 29%, we will be able to engage a subcontractor for this requirement. Thank you.

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option 4. Emailed response to question "0" points The Consultant will perform ALL work and that no subcontractors will be utilized for this proposal." But should it be mandatory for the County to meet the SBE percentage participation goal of 15% - 29%, we will be able to engage a subcontractor for this requirement. Thank you.

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

No Citizenserve experience

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 19

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

Some job changes, new to BV

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 7

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

No hourly rates provided

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.
(Excluded)

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 42

exclusively serves public agencies

Dan Gargas: 10

minimal experience in Florida

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

current workload for assigned staff is a little unclear

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option # 4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option # 4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option # 4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

somewhat generic, approach unclear regarding software used and how information is transferred

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 7

FL specific experience unclear

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 9

lacked some procedural details, but did include an hourly rate

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 6

ECS Limited
(Excluded)

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 20

experience completing plan reviews on behalf of local govts is unclear

Dan Gargas: 20

There was no clear indication that this firm has a background of completing private provider plan reviews.

Jeffrey Hays: 25

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

current workload unclear

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 12

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

The vendor said yes. Do not see the listing for an office in Gainesville. The Location Preference factor provides points to local business entities who have an established local presence in Alachua County, Florida and local staff that will be directly involved in the project or services. A business entity is local based on the following criteria: Has a staffed and equipped office that has been in business in Alachua County for at least twelve (12) months prior to the advertisement for a Request for Proposal, Request for Qualifications, etc. by the Procurement; and Holds all business licenses required by the State, County, or a City within Alachua County; and Employs at least one (1) full time employee (FTE), or part-time employees' equivalent to one FTE, whose primary residence(s) is in Alachua County.

Dan Gargas: 0

The vendor said yes. Do not see the listing for an office in Gainesville. The Location Preference factor provides points to local business entities who have an established local presence in Alachua County, Florida and local staff that will be directly involved in the project or services. A business entity is local based on the following criteria: Has a staffed and equipped office that has been in business in Alachua County for at least twelve (12) months prior to the advertisement for a Request for Proposal, Request for Qualifications, etc. by the Procurement; and Holds all business licenses required by the State, County, or a City within Alachua County; and Employs at least one (1) full time employee (FTE), or part-time employees' equivalent to one FTE, whose primary residence(s) is in Alachua County.

Jeffrey Hays: 0

The vendor said yes. Do not see the listing for an office in Gainesville. The Location Preference factor provides points to local business entities who have an established local presence in Alachua County, Florida and local staff that will be directly involved in the project or services. A business entity is local based on the following criteria: Has a staffed and equipped office that has been in business in Alachua County for at least twelve (12) months prior to the advertisement for a Request for Proposal, Request for Qualifications, etc. by the Procurement; and Holds all business licenses required by the State, County, or a City within Alachua County; and Employs at least one (1) full time employee (FTE), or part-time employees' equivalent to one FTE, whose primary residence(s) is in Alachua County.

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

approach description lacks detail

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 17

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

work experience information is limited and does not identify plan review but focuses on specialized inspections

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

limited plans examiner experience cited for team members

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 13

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

no schedule identified

Dan Gargas: 2

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

limited information, no hourly rates provided

Dan Gargas: 2

Jeffrey Hays: 5

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Holly Banner	Zoning Administrator	Jun 13, 2023 2:38 PM
Dan Gargas	Building Official	Jun 21, 2023 10:26 AM
Jeffrey Hays	Acting Director	Jun 21, 2023 11:34 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability of Professional Personnel	Points Based	50 (25% of Total)

Description:

- 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.
- Has the firm done this type of work in the past?
- Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?
- 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 (10% 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.**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW
Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Location	Points Based	10 (5% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE)	Points Based	15 (7.5% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County	Points Based	5 (2.5% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	25 (12.5% 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 ten (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 (12.5% 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% 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 (10% 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 (5% 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% 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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-117-TW

Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Vendor	Holly Banner	Dan Gargas	Jeffrey Hays	Total Score (Max Score 200)
SAFEbuilt	167	146	137	150
Willdan Engineering	170	133	142	148.33
JPI	167	125	143	145
Bureau Veritas NA Inc	150	124	131	135
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.	148	75	141	121.33
ECS Limited	105	39	103	82.33

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (10%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%)
SAFEbuilt	40	16.7	0	10	5
Willdan Engineering	42.7	16.7	0	0	5
JPI	41.3	15.7	0	0	5
Bureau Veritas NA Inc	38.3	15.7	0	0	5
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.	31.7	11.7	0	0	5
ECS Limited	21.7	9	0	0	5
Vendor	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (12.5%)	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (12.5%)	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (10%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5%)
SAFEbuilt	20.3	19.3	7.7	16.3	8.3
Willdan Engineering	20.7	20.7	9	16.3	8.3
JPI	21	21	9	15.3	8.3
Bureau Veritas NA Inc	20	18	7	16.3	7.3
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.	20.7	19	6.3	13.7	6.7
ECS Limited	11.7	12.3	5.3	11	2.3
Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5%)		Total Score (Max Score 200)		
SAFEbuilt	6.3		150		
Willdan Engineering	9		148.33		
JPI	8.3		145		
Bureau Veritas NA Inc	7.3		135		
Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.	6.7		121.33		

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (10%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%)
ECS Limited		4		82.33	

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Bureau Veritas NA Inc

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

significant plan review experience, multiple jurisdictions served in FL

Dan Gargas: 35

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 12

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option 4. Emailed response to question "0" points The Consultant will perform ALL work and that no subcontractors will be utilized for this proposal." But should it be mandatory for the County to meet the SBE percentage participation goal of 15% - 29%, we will be able to engage a subcontractor for this requirement. Thank you.

Dan Gargas: 0

Option 4. Emailed response to question "0" points The Consultant will perform ALL work and that no subcontractors will be utilized for this proposal." But should it be mandatory for the County to meet the SBE percentage participation goal of 15% - 29%, we will be able to engage a subcontractor for this requirement. Thank you.

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option 4. Emailed response to question "0" points The Consultant will perform ALL work and that no subcontractors will be utilized for this proposal." But should it be mandatory for the County to meet the SBE percentage participation goal of 15% - 29%, we will be able to engage a subcontractor for this requirement. Thank you.

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

No Citizenserve experience

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 19

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

Some job changes, new to BV

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 7

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

No hourly rates provided

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 42

exclusively serves public agencies

Dan Gargas: 10

minimal experience in Florida

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

current workload for assigned staff is a little unclear

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option # 4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option # 4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option # 4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

somewhat generic, approach unclear regarding software used and how information is transferred

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 7

FL specific experience unclear

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 9

lacked some procedural details, but did include an hourly rate

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 6

ECS Limited

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 20

experience completing plan reviews on behalf of local govts is unclear

Dan Gargas: 20

There was no clear indication that this firm has a background of completing private provider plan reviews.

Jeffrey Hays: 25

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

current workload unclear

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 12

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

The vendor said yes. Do not see the listing for an office in Gainesville. The Location Preference factor provides points to local business entities who have an established local presence in Alachua County, Florida and local staff that will be directly involved in the project or services. A business entity is local based on the following criteria: Has a staffed and equipped office that has been in business in Alachua County for at least twelve (12) months prior to the advertisement for a Request for Proposal, Request for Qualifications, etc. by the Procurement; and Holds all business licenses required by the State, County, or a City within Alachua County; and Employs at least one (1) full time employee (FTE), or part-time employees' equivalent to one FTE, whose primary residence(s) is in Alachua County.

Dan Gargas: 0

The vendor said yes. Do not see the listing for an office in Gainesville. The Location Preference factor provides points to local business entities who have an established local presence in Alachua County, Florida and local staff that will be directly involved in the project or services. A business entity is local based on the following criteria: Has a staffed and equipped office that has been in business in Alachua County for at least twelve (12) months prior to the advertisement for a Request for Proposal, Request for Qualifications, etc. by the Procurement; and Holds all business licenses required by the State, County, or a City within Alachua County; and Employs at least one (1) full time employee (FTE), or part-time employees' equivalent to one FTE, whose primary residence(s) is in Alachua County.

Jeffrey Hays: 0

The vendor said yes. Do not see the listing for an office in Gainesville. The Location Preference factor provides points to local business entities who have an established local presence in Alachua County, Florida and local staff that will be directly involved in the project or services. A business entity is local based on the following criteria: Has a staffed and equipped office that has been in business in Alachua County for at least twelve (12) months prior to the advertisement for a Request for Proposal, Request for Qualifications, etc. by the Procurement; and Holds all business licenses required by the State, County, or a City within Alachua County; and Employs at least one (1) full time employee (FTE), or part-time employees' equivalent to one FTE, whose primary residence(s) is in Alachua County.

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 20

approach description lacks detail

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 17

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

work experience information is limited and does not identify plan review but focuses on specialized inspections

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

limited plans examiner experience cited for team members

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 13

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

no schedule identified

Dan Gargas: 2

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

limited information, no hourly rates provided

Dan Gargas: 2

Jeffrey Hays: 5

JPI

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 47

100% local govt, Citizenserve experience, focus on consistency with current expectations/review comments

Dan Gargas: 35

Jeffrey Hays: 42

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 12

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 15

two primaries identified seem to have minimal PX experience, but others on team have sufficient qualifications

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 5

SAFEbuilt

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 40

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

workload is a concern - staff ratio to local govts served may be insufficient

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

Dan Gargas: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

Jeffrey Hays: 10

Option #2 Small Business Enterprise: The Consultant commits to using 30% SBE participation in subcontracted work. Vendor submitted email if able they commit to using 30% SBE's.

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 18

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 7

unclear - no resume provided for project manager

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 5

poorly organized, errors, somewhat generic

Dan Gargas: 10

No points were deducted for the proposal referencing county instead of state

Jeffrey Hays: 4

Willdan Engineering

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Holly Banner: 45

98% service to local govts, review/comment portal available both to clients and County

Dan Gargas: 40

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 0

Dan Gargas: 0

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Holly Banner: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Dan Gargas: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

Jeffrey Hays: 0

Option #4 Small Business Enterprise: No Subcontractors

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

Holly Banner: 5

Dan Gargas: 5

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (6.3%)

Holly Banner: 25

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (5%)

Holly Banner: 20

Dan Gargas: 15

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 8

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Holly Banner: 10

Dan Gargas: 10

Jeffrey Hays: 7

ITA 24-117-TW Annual Third Party Building Plan Review

Final Audit Report

2023-07-21

Created:	2023-07-21
By:	Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAUYUi9PtokI0bp-FkZ4J0j0LdjLchneqV

"ITA 24-117-TW Annual Third Party Building Plan Review" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
2023-07-21 - 2:53:15 AM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) for signature
2023-07-21 - 2:55:07 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
2023-07-21 - 12:31:50 PM GMT- IP address: 66.231.154.232
-  Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
Signature Date: 2023-07-21 - 12:33:04 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 66.231.154.232
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2023-07-21 - 12:33:05 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
2023-07-21 - 7:53:58 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-07-21 - 8:07:54 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Agreement completed.
2023-07-21 - 8:07:54 PM GMT