

Alachua County, Florida

Procurement

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

County Administration Building, Gainesville, FL 32601 (352) 374-5202

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-422-DK

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

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

Monday, August 7, 2023

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida
Project ID	RFP 23-422-DK
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	May 24, 2023
Due Date	June 28, 2023
Procurement Agent	Darryl R Kight
Evaluators	Jeffrey Hays, Danny Moore, Patrick Thomas, Daniel Whitcraft
Project Description	Purpose: Alachua County Board of County Commissioners is seeking proposals from licensed professionals for the provision of Architecture & Engineering services for the design of the New Civil Courthouse Building in downtown Gainesville, Alachua County, FL.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose: Alachua County Board of County Commissioners is seeking proposals from licensed professionals for the provision of Architecture & Engineering services for the design of the New Civil Courthouse Building in downtown Gainesville, Alachua County, FL.

Background

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

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

Contact Information

Darryl R Kight

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

Phone: (352) 374-5202

Department:

Facilities Management

Timeline

OpenGov Release Project Date	May 24, 2023
Question Submission Deadline	June 18, 2023, 12:00am
Solicitation Submission Deadline	June 28, 2023, 2:00pm

Solicitation Opening – Teams Meeting

June 28, 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
May 3, 2023 10:25 AM	Draft	Darryl R Kight
May 5, 2023 11:19 AM	Review	Darryl R Kight
May 16, 2023 4:09 PM	Draft	Theodore White
May 16, 2023 4:26 PM	Review	Theodore White

Date	Changed To	Changed By
May 18, 2023 10:06 AM	Final	Darryl R Kight
May 18, 2023 10:06 AM	Post Pending	Darryl R Kight
May 24, 2023 10:00 AM	Open	OpenGov Bot
Jun 28, 2023 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Jun 28, 2023 4:12 PM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	DLR Group	Karlee Ward kward@dlrgroup.com	Jun 28, 2023 11:10 AM
No Bid	East Coast CDB Inc.	Janice Street janice@eastcoastcdbinc.com	Jun 16, 2023 10:18 AM
Submitted	НОК	Kristine Johnson kristine.johnson@hok.com (703) 402-4674	Jun 28, 2023 9:44 AM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	May 24, 2023 10:02 AM
No Bid	Southern Roofing Co., Inc.	Michele Gannon bids@southroof.com (813) 251-5252 Ext: 111	May 24, 2023 11:56 AM
Submitted	Walker Architects	Andrea Cellini acellini@walker-arch.com (352) 672-6448	Jun 28, 2023 1:35 PM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	DLR Group	East Coast CDB Inc.	нок	Network Craze	Southern Roofing Co., Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Acknowledge that you have reviewed all Addendum(s) issued with this solicitation.	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
State Compliance	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response

Question Title	DLR Group	East Coast CDB Inc.	НОК	Network Craze	Southern Roofing Co., Inc.
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
State Compliance	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Conflict of Interest	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements	Pass	No Response	Pass	No Response	No Response
Question Title			Walker Architects		
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature			Pass		
	t you have reviewed ed with this solicitat		Pass		
	State Compliance		Pass		
	de Secret or Propri formation Exempti	•		Pass	
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request		Pass			
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request		No Response			
Drug Free Workplace		Pass			
State Compliance		Pass			
	Vendor Eligibility		Pass		
NC	N-SBE Subcontract	ors	Pass		
Respo	nsible Agent Desigr	nation	Pass		
	Conflict of Interest			Pass	

Questic	on Title	DLR Group	East Coast CDB Inc.	нок	Network Craze	Southern Roofing Co., Inc.
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation		Pass				
You ha	You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements			Pass		

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. Budget and Schedule

May 24, 2023 4:37 PM

Question: Does the County have a budget and desired completion date for new courthouse?

May 24, 2023 4:37 PM

Answered by Danny Moore: 1.5 million / April 2024

Jun 15, 2023 8:51 PM

2. Resumes

Jun 8, 2023 11:43 AM

Question: The RFP requests resumes in Sections 7.3 and 7.4. Does the County wish to see resumes for professional personnel in both sections?

Jun 8, 2023 11:43 AM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: hello: please, in accordance with your submission. thanks. d.

Jun 15, 2023 8:52 PM

3. Funding

Jun 16, 2023 10:38 AM

Question: Is the project funded for design and construction?

Jun 16, 2023 10:38 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Yes

Jun 19, 2023 8:49 AM

4. Environmental

Jun 16, 2023 10:38 AM

Question: Please provide the Environmental Assessment of the site.

Jun 16. 2023 10:38 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: NA

Jun 19, 2023 8:50 AM

5. Master Planning Documents

Jun 16, 2023 10:38 AM

Question: Please provide a copy of the program and any master planning documents available that outline the scope of the project.

Jun 16, 2023 10:38 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: See Addendum #1 for "Conceptual" Rendering of the Complex

Jun 19, 2023 8:50 AM

6. Master Plan

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Question: Are firms that were involved in the master planning efforts precluded from participating in this solicitation?

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: I don't believe there were any firms involved in the master plan

Jun 19, 2023 8:50 AM

7. CMaR

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Question: Has a CMaR been selection for this work?

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: In progress

Jun 19, 2023 8:50 AM

8. Sample Agreement

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Question: As per 6.1.B, civil services are excluded from the A/E contract. Please confirm geotechnical and environmental services specifically are excluded and the A/E is only to advise the County if these services are required as per RFP Section 6.7.K.

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Environmental only

Jun 19, 2023 8:51 AM

9. Building Life Cycle Assessment

Jun 16, 2023 10:40 AM

Question: Is a Whole Building Life Cycle Assessment included in the scope of work as part of the base A/E contract?

Jun 16, 2023 10:40 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: No

Jun 19, 2023 8:51 AM

10. LEED accreditation

Jun 16, 2023 10:40 AM

Question: What level of LEED accreditation is the project targeting?

Jun 16, 2023 10:40 AM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: Leeds certification Not Required.

Jun 22, 2023 2:14 PM

11. E-Verified

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Question: As per RFP Section 4.4, new employees hired by the Consultant during the term of the contract are to be E-Verified. Please confirm this is only new employees that are planned to be staffed on the project.

Jun 16, 2023 10:39 AM

Answered by Thomas Rouse: A variation of the following will be included in the agreement: E-Verify. Pursuant to F.S. sec. 448.095, Contractor shall register with and use the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's E-Verify system to verify the work authorization status of all new employees of the Contractor

during the term of the Agreement. Contractor shall require any subcontractors performing work or providing Services under this Agreement to register and use the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's E-Verify system to verify the work authorization status of all new employees of the subcontractor during the term of this Agreement, and otherwise comply with Florida law. The E-Verify system is located at https://www.uscis.gov/E-Verify. Failure to comply with this section is grounds for termination and the contractor (a) may not be awarded a contract with the County for at least 1 year after the date on which the contract was terminated and (b) is liable for any additional costs incurred by the County as a result of termination of this Agreement.

Jun 22, 2023 2:14 PM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

Addendum #1

Jun 21, 2023 9:34 AM

Question # 5

Conceptual Rendering of Complex

ADDENDA ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Addendum #1

Proposal	Confirmed	Confirmed At	Confirmed By
нок	X	Jun 28, 2023 9:08 AM	Kristen Pappas
DLR Group	X	Jun 21, 2023 9:55 AM	Karlee Ward
Walker Architects	Х	Jun 28, 2023 1:23 PM	Andrea Cellini

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Jun 28, 2023 2:11 PM List of proposers

Notice #2

Jul 18. 2023 10:59 AM

Attached is the Recorded Public Meeting and the meeting minutes and public meeting posting for final evaluation.

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on Monday, July 31, 2023 @ 11:30 am, to discuss and update of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-

422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

_

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse

Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Time: Monday, July 31, 2023 @ 11:30 am Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Facilities Management

Conference Room

915 SE 5th Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

Click here to join the meeting Meeting ID: 217 283 863 71

Passcode: DaS9Ku

<u>Download Teams</u> | <u>Join on the web</u>

Or call in (audio only)

<u>+1 469-998-7938,,450724134#</u> United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 450 724 134#

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

Jul 21, 2023 10:03 PM

Will the County be able to provide the proposal submissions and commentary related to scoring for all firms prior to the oral interviews? The RFP opened on 6/28/23 we will release the proposal submissions on 7/27/23, commentary related to 1st phase of the evaluation was released in Official Notice #2: Public Meeting and Recorded Scores.

We have evaluation criteria for the interview as listed in the RFP, are there any specific points to address? **None at this point.**

What is the timing for the presentation? Questions? **30 minutes for presentation and 15 minutes for question and answers.**

Do you have a limitation on the number of people on the interview team attending? **The room has seating for 14.**

Are there any key roles that we are required to bring? At the discretion of the presenting firm.

How many members will be on the selection committee in case we want to prepare leave behinds? 4 committee members plus 1 for procurement.

What is the room set up going to be? Conference table, conference hall, podium, etc? **Conference table**.

Will we have access to AV systems and how should we bring our presentation (flash drive, laptop, etc.)? You can bring a laptop to plug in for presentation. (there is a projector)

The State Attorney's office is illustrated in the aerial master plan PDF but not in the RFP's civil courthouse description of the functions and departments to be included. Can you please clarify if the State Attorney's office is included in the 80,000-square-foot requirement? Please follow scope of services release in the RFP.

Are we to assume the civil courthouse will be served by the proposed new central energy plant illustrated on the master plan? Please follow scope of services release in the RFP.

Notice #4

Jul 28, 2023 3:43 AM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on Monday, July 31, 2023 @ 11:30 am, to discuss and update of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Topic:

Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse

Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

Time: Monday, July 31, 2023 @ 11:30 am Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Facilities Management

Conference Room

915 SE 5th Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

Click here to join the meeting Meeting ID: 217 283 863 71

Passcode: DaS9Ku

<u>Download Teams</u> | <u>Join on the web</u>

Or call in (audio only)

+1 469-998-7938,,450724134# United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 450 724 134#

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 #5

Aug 1, 2023 10:46 PM

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee's award ranking below for RFP 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

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

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

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

Notice #6

Aug 2, 2023 10:44 AM

Revised ITA posted to correct Scribner error.

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee's award ranking below for RFP 23-422-DK A&E Services for the New Civil Courthouse Building in Downtown Gainesville, Alachua County Florida

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

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

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

EVALUATION

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

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

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

A. Does the project manager have experience with responsibility for projects of comparable size and scope? Did he/she have a good understanding of this project?

B. Did the project manager participate in the presentation? How effectively did he/she communicate ideas and respond to questions?

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

Description:

- A. Award additional points for unique experience or abilities; organization of approach; understanding of "why it is to be done", as well as, "what is to be done," etc. Do not award points for excessive boilerplate, excessive participation by "business development", and use of "professional" presenters.
- B. The Other Factors to be considered, but not limited to, are those items, such as Small Business Enterprise status, past performance, and previous amount of work for Alachua County. Fee proposals, when requested and deemed appropriate, are also to be considered in the evaluation process, where the request for such fees is in accordance with the County's Procurement Code.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

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

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
DLR Group	38.5	48.5	48	8.8	341.5
Walker Architects	37.8	46	45.5	8.5	340.25
НОК	36	44.8	45	9	329.75

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

DLR Group

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

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Danny Moore: 49

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

Patrick Thomas: 45

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

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

Jeffrey Hays: 12

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 15

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 1

\$383,546.77

Danny Moore: 1

\$383,546.77

Patrick Thomas: 1

\$383,546.77

Daniel Whitcraft: 1

\$383,546.77

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

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

Thorough understanding of project.

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

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

Jeffrey Hays: 21

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 20

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

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

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 7

Patrick Thomas: 8

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

Strong team, large amount of experiencey.

Daniel Whitcraft: 19

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

Schedule seems reasonable.

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 10

Excellent proposal.

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

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

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 45

Daniel Whitcraft: 50

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

Jeffrey Hays: 38

Danny Moore: 40

Patrick Thomas: 38

Daniel Whitcraft: 38

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

Jeffrey Hays: 46

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 50

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

Jeffrey Hays: 44

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 50

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 8

Danny Moore: 10

Patrick Thomas: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

HOK

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

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Danny Moore: 46

6 points awarded for specialized experience..

Patrick Thomas: 45

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

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

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 10

Design schedule seems reasonable, did not see current workload

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Somewhat generic on both Time and Budget.

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

Jeffrey Hays: 5

\$0

Danny Moore: 5

\$0

Patrick Thomas: 5

\$0

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

\$0

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

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 20

well thought out proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

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

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

systematic approach

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 8

good stability with firm, similar project experience

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

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

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

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

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

schedule seems reasonable

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Task are fine, schedule is long.

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

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 10

excellent proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

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

Jeffrey Hays: 35

Danny Moore: 49

Patrick Thomas: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 42

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

Jeffrey Hays: 30

Danny Moore: 39

Patrick Thomas: 37

Daniel Whitcraft: 38

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

Jeffrey Hays: 37

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 47

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

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

Jeffrey Hays: 37

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 48

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 10

Patrick Thomas: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

Walker Architects

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

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Danny Moore: 45

Patrick Thomas: 48

Partner firm has extensive experience, specialize in justice facilities

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

showed proof of insurability and financial stability

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

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

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)
Jeffrey Hays: 4
\$61,791.80
Danny Moore: 4
\$61,791.80
Patrick Thomas: 4
\$61,791.80
Daniel Whitcraft: 4
\$61,791.80

Hadanata dia af Daria da Daiata Daria da 25 Daiata (6.70%)
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
Jeffrey Hays: 22
Danny Moore: 25
Patrick Thomas: 25
thorough understanding, visionary
Daniel Whitcraft: 22

Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)			
Jeffrey Hays: 22			
Danny Moore: 25			
Patrick Thomas: 25			
proposal specific to the needs of the County			
Daniel Whitcraft: 22			
The courtroom mock-up might be a bit of an over-reach (cost/reward).			

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

Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)				
Jeffrey Hays: 6				
Danny Moore: 7				
Patrick Thomas: 4				
good experience, large projects but no judicial				

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

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

Project Team Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)
--

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 17

Patrick Thomas: 20

4 sub contractors, reputable and local

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

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

Jeffrey Hays: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 5

project timeline seems compressed

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

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

Jeffrey Hays: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 10

excellent proposal, a lot of photographs

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

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

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 49

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

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

Jeffrey Hays: 35

Danny Moore: 40

Patrick Thomas: 38

Daniel Whitcraft: 38

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

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 46

Daniel Whitcraft: 43

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

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Danny Moore: 50

Patrick Thomas: 46

Daniel Whitcraft: 43

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Jeffrey Hays: 8

Danny Moore: 10

Patrick Thomas: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Description:

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

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

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

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

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

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

A. Does the project manager have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?

B. Does the Project Manager have a stable job history? Have they been with the firm long, or have there been frequent job changes?

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

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

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

DLR Group

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

Jeffrey Hays: 43

Danny Moore: 49

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

Patrick Thomas: 45

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

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

Jeffrey Hays: 12

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 15

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

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

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)
Jeffrey Hays: 1
\$383,546.77
Danny Moore: 1
\$383,546.77
Patrick Thomas: 1
\$383,546.77
Daniel Whiteraft: 1

\$383,546.77

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

Jeffrey Hays: 20

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

Thorough understanding of project.

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

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

Jeffrey Hays: 21

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 20

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

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

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 7

Patrick Thomas: 8

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Jeffrey Hays: 16

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

Strong team, large amount of experiencey.

Daniel Whitcraft: 19

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 5

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

Schedule seems reasonable.

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 10

Excellent proposal.

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

HOK

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

Jeffrey Hays: 40

Danny Moore: 46

6 points awarded for specialized experience..

Patrick Thomas: 45

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

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

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 10

Design schedule seems reasonable, did not see current workload

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Somewhat generic on both Time and Budget.

	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)
	Jeffrey Hays: 5
\$0	
	Danny Moore: 5
\$0	
	Patrick Thomas: 5
\$0	
	Daniel Whitcraft: 5

Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
Jeffrey Hays: 20
Danny Moore: 25
Patrick Thomas: 20
well thought out proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)	
	Jeffrey Hays: 20	
	Danny Moore: 25	
	Patrick Thomas: 25	
systematic approach		
	Daniel Whitcraft: 22	

Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Jeffrey Hays: 6
Danny Moore: 9

\$0

Patrick Thomas: 8

good stability with firm, similar project experience

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

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

Jeffrey Hays: 14

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

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

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

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

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 8

schedule seems reasonable

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Task are fine, schedule is long.

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

Jeffrey Hays: 7

Danny Moore: 9

Patrick Thomas: 10

excellent proposal

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

Walker Architects

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

Jeffrey Hays: 45

Danny Moore: 45

Patrick Thomas: 48

Partner firm has extensive experience, specialize in justice facilities

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 18

Danny Moore: 18

Patrick Thomas: 20

showed proof of insurability and financial stability

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 4

\$61,791.80

Danny Moore: 4

\$61,791.80

Patrick Thomas: 4

\$61,791.80

Daniel Whitcraft: 4

\$61,791.80

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

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

thorough understanding, visionary

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

Jeffrey Hays: 22

Danny Moore: 25

Patrick Thomas: 25

proposal specific to the needs of the County

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 6

Danny Moore: 7

Patrick Thomas: 4

good experience, large projects but no judicial

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

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

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

Jeffrey Hays: 15

Danny Moore: 17

Patrick Thomas: 20

4 sub contractors, reputable and local

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

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

Jeffrey Hays: 9

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 5

project timeline seems compressed

Daniel Whitcraft: 10

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

Jeffrey Hays: 8

Danny Moore: 8

Patrick Thomas: 10

excellent proposal, a lot of photographs

Daniel Whitcraft: 9