



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

April 24, 2023

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Darryl R. Kight, CPPB, Procurement Supervisor 
Darryl Kight (Apr 26, 2023 06:24 EDT)

FROM: Mandy Mullins, Procurement Agent I 

SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

<u>Solicitation Opening Date:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, January 18, 2023
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	456 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Downloaded by:</u>	22 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Submissions:</u>	3 Vendors

Firms:

Causseaux, Hewett, & Walpole, Inc. d/b/a CHW
Alachua, FL 32615

JBrown Professional Group, Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32606

Yuro & Associates
Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee's award ranking below for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement.

1. JBrown Professional Group, Inc.
2. Causseaux, Hewett, & Walpole, Inc. d/b/a CHW

Authorize staff to negotiate agreement with top ranked firm, JBrown Professional Group, Inc., and with the second ranked vendor Causseaux, Hewett, & Walpole, Inc. d/b/a CHW, 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

Apr 26, 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)

RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Oral Presentation Public Meeting

Date: April 24, 2023

Start Time: 4:01 pm

Location: Public Works Department, Conference Room B, 5620 NW 120 Lane, Gainesville, FL

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

- 2.1. Good afternoon, I am **TJ White** with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Ramon Gavarrete (Leader), Chris Dawson, Stephen Hofstetter
- 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' oral presentation, 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**, in OPENGOV, all evaluators have certified that they have no Conflict of Interest, and I will show them on screen, discuss if necessary.
- 3.2. **Second**, due to the cone-of-silence imposed on the committee members, this is the third 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. **Third**, we will record and discuss the preliminary scores on the screen. Call for validation of scores to ensure they are the scores the members entered in OPENGOV.

Vendor	Chris Dawson	Ramon Gavarrete	Stephen Hofstetter	Total Score (Max Score 175)
JBPro	149	165	163	159
CHW	146	162	165	157.67
Yuro & Associates	151	90	120	120.33

Vendor	Chris Dawson- W/T	Chris Dawson	Ramon Gavarrete - W/T	Ramon Gavarrete	Stephen Hofstetter - W/T	Stephen Hofstetter	W/T Scores Avg	Total Score	Final Scores
CHW		146		163		165	157.67	183.67	262.505
JBPro		149		185		163	159	190.33	269.83
Yuro & Associates		151		0		120	120.33	0	60.165

- 3.5. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals one by one. Starting with the team leader allow each member to give feedback. (**Encourage dialog**)
 - 3.5.1. Discuss scores and make Changes if pertinent.
 - 3.5.2. Discussion record and Update: **Evaluation Scores**
 - 3.5.2.1. Encourage discussion on the proposals, scoring and until all members are satisfied.
 - 3.5.2.2. NOTE: Agents will monitor the discussion, keep it on track; keep it on topic.
 - 3.5.3. Call for validation of RFP team Evaluation Scores for the Team's Final Ranking.
4. Motion to Award Rankings (RFP): Chris Dawson motion to recommend the final rankings be approved and then start contract negotiations with the top ranked firm JBPro. Should the staff be unable to

negotiate a satisfactory contract with the top ranked firm, negotiations with that firm will be terminated. If needed, negotiations with the second ranked firm CHW shall be undertaken in the same manner in order of ranking until a contract is reached. Stephen Hofstetter seconded the motion.

Motion Carried: 3-0 in favor.

5. Public Comments (3 minutes): No Comment
6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Chris Dawson moved to approve the Public Meeting Minutes; Ramon Gavarrete seconded the motion.
Vote 3-0 in favor.
7. Meeting Adjourn at – 4:24 p.m.

Vendor	Chris Daws	Chris Daws	Ramon Ga	Ramon Ga	Stephen H	Stephen H	W/T Score	Total Score	Final Score
CHW	146	163	162	199	165	189	157.67	183.67	262.505
JBPro	149	185	165	196	163	190	159	190.33	269.83
Yuro & Ass	151	0	90	0	120	0	120.33	0	60.165



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 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

RESPONSE DEADLINE: January 18, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Wednesday, April 26, 2023

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement
Project ID	RFP 23-391-TW
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	December 7, 2022
Due Date	January 18, 2023
Procurement Agent	Theodore White
Evaluators	Chris Dawson, Ramon Gavarrete, Stephen Hofstetter
Project Description	<p>Santa Fe Hills is a subdivided neighborhood located in unincorporated Alachua County near the city limits of Alachua. The subdivision entrance is located on NW 168th Avenue at the intersection with NW 173rd Street (CR 235A), just west of Santa Fe High School. The subdivision consists of 87 lots, several of which are vacant. The residents of Santa Fe Hills primarily receive their potable water from the Santa Fe Hills Water System, whose water plant is located on Lot 46 (Alachua County Tax Parcel 03043-046-000) within the subdivision.</p> <p>Originally a privately owned facility, the Santa Fe Hills Water System was constructed in 1966 with the intent to provide potable water to local residents who had no other available water source at the time. Alachua County took over operation and maintenance of the system in 2002. The County inherited an aged water system that was lacking in detailed design information. The system has reached the end of its service life and needs to be replaced. Connection to the City of Alachua's potable water system is now a viable option. The City's system is located nearby along NW 173rd Street (CR 235A).+</p>

INTRODUCTION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Request For Proposal - Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Page 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Summary

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners is seeking proposals from licensed professionals (hereinafter, referred to as Consultants) for the provision of RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement.

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/Contract](#).

This RFP is procured in accordance with Florida Statutes 287, Procurement of Personal Property and Services, CCNA.

Santa Fe Hills is a subdivided neighborhood located in unincorporated Alachua County near the city limits of Alachua. The subdivision entrance is located on NW 168th Avenue at the intersection with NW 173rd Street (CR 235A), just west of Santa Fe High School. The subdivision consists of 87 lots, several of which are vacant. The residents of Santa Fe Hills primarily receive their potable water from the Santa Fe Hills Water System, whose water plant is located on Lot 46 (Alachua County Tax Parcel 03043-046-000) within the subdivision.

Originally a privately owned facility, the Santa Fe Hills Water System was constructed in 1966 with the intent to provide potable water to local residents who had no other available water source at the time. Alachua County took over operation and maintenance of the system in 2002. The County inherited an aged water system that was lacking in detailed design information. The system has reached the end of its service life and needs to be replaced. Connection to the City of Alachua's potable water system is now a viable option. The City's system is located nearby along NW 173rd Street (CR 235A).+

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

Theodore White

Procurement Agent II, CPPB

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW
Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Email: twhite@alachuacounty.us

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

Department:

Public Works

Timeline

OpenGov Release Project Date	December 7, 2022
Second Advertisement Date	December 14, 2022
Question Submission Deadline	January 8, 2023, 12:00am
Solicitation Submission Deadline	January 18, 2023, 2:00pm

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Solicitation Opening – Zoom Meeting

January 18, 2023, 2:00pm

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

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/93437702771?pwd=S2QxMVpUTG5xQUtBTEVMbkRxakNEZz09>

Meeting ID: 934 3770 2771

Passcode: 702897

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,93437702771# US (Chicago)

+19292056099,,93437702771# US (New York)

Dial by your location

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

Meeting ID: 934 3770 2771

Find your local number:

<https://zoom.us/j/93437702771?pwd=S2QxMVpUTG5xQUtBTEVMbkRxakNEZz09>

If you have a disability and need an accommodation in order to participate in a County program, service or public meeting, 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. TDD/TTY users, please call 711 (Florida Relay Service)

SOLICITATION STATUS HISTORY

Date	Changed To	Changed By
Nov 3, 2022 4:28 PM	Draft	Theodore White

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Date	Changed To	Changed By
Nov 17, 2022 11:03 AM	Review	Theodore White
Dec 6, 2022 11:26 AM	Final	Theodore White
Dec 6, 2022 11:26 AM	Post Pending	Theodore White
Dec 7, 2022 8:00 AM	Open	OpenGov Bot
Jan 18, 2023 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Jan 31, 2023 7:24 AM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 10:25 AM	Pending	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 10:26 AM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 1:48 PM	Award Pending	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 1:48 PM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 5:03 PM	Award Pending	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 5:04 PM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 5:18 PM	Pending	Theodore White
Apr 25, 2023 5:18 PM	Evaluation	Theodore White
Apr 25, 2023 6:32 PM	Pending	Mandy Mullins
Apr 25, 2023 6:32 PM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	CHW	Shannon Braddy marketing@chw-inc.com (352) 331-1976	Jan 18, 2023 10:11 AM
Submitted	JBPro	Anthony "Jay" Brown jay.brown@jbpro.com (352) 318-9462	Jan 18, 2023 1:56 PM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	Dec 7, 2022 8:09 AM
Excluded	Yuro & Associates	Heather Kelley hkelley@mjyuro.com	Jan 18, 2023 11:20 AM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Question Title	CHW	JBPro	Network Craze	Yuro & Associates (Excluded)
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Acknowledge that you have reviewed all Addendum(s) issued with this solicitation.	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements..	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

No Questions Received.

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

No Addenda issued.

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Feb 6, 2023 7:22 AM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on Tuesday, March 28, 2023 @ 9:00 am, to evaluate and make final recommendations of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Time: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 @ 9:00 am Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Public Works

Conference Room B

5620 NW 120 Lane, Gainesville, FL 32653

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://alachuacounty-us.zoom.us/j/83102980228>

Meeting ID: 831 0298 0228

One tap mobile

+13052241968,,83102980228# US

+13126266799,,83102980228# US (Chicago)

Dial by your location

+1 305 224 1968 US

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 931 3860 US

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 309 205 3325 US

+1 669 444 9171 US

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 689 278 1000 US

+1 719 359 4580 US

+1 253 205 0468 US

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 360 209 5623 US

+1 386 347 5053 US

+1 507 473 4847 US

+1 564 217 2000 US

Meeting ID: 831 0298 0228

Find your local number: <https://alachuacounty-us.zoom.us/j/kbaA2hWpgU>

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 #2

Mar 28, 2023 2:25 PM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on Monday, April 24, 2023 @ 4:00 pm, to evaluate and make final recommendations of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Time: Monday, April 24, 2023 @ 4:00 pm Eastern Time (US and Canada)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW
Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Location: Alachua County Public Works
Conference Room B
5620 NW 120 Lane, Gainesville, FL 32653

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://alachuacounty-us.zoom.us/j/81627327411>

Meeting ID: 816 2732 7411

One tap mobile

+13052241968,,81627327411# US

+19292056099,,81627327411# US (New York)

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

Apr 4, 2023 9:25 AM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on Wednesday, April 12, 2023 @ 4:00 pm, to discuss and update the motion of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Time: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 @ 4:00 pm Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Administration Building
Third Floor Conference Room
12 SE 1st Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://alachuacounty-us.zoom.us/j/82064668856>

Meeting ID: 820 6466 8856

One tap mobile

+13052241968,,82064668856# US

+19292056099,,82064668856# US (New York)

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

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 #4

Apr 13, 2023 7:01 AM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on Monday, April 24, 2023 @ 5:00 pm, to evaluate and make final recommendations of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Time: Monday, April 24, 2023 @ 4:00 pm Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Public Works
Conference Room B
5620 NW 120 Lane, Gainesville, FL 32653

EVALUATION

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Chris Dawson	Transportation Planning Manager	Mar 15, 2023 8:56 AM
Ramon Gavarrete	Public Works Director	Mar 20, 2023 7:53 AM
Stephen Hofstetter	Director	Feb 1, 2023 9:28 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	50 (25% of Total)

Description:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

- 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 (20% 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 (25% 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 (25% 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?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Other	Points Based	10 (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

Vendor	Chris Dawson	Ramon Gavarrete	Stephen Hofstetter	Total Score (Max Score 200)
JBPro	185	196	190	190.33
CHW	163	199	189	183.67
Yuro & Associates Excluded	0	0	0	0

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Understanding of Project Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Responsiveness to Questions Points Based 40 Points (20%)	Project Team Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Project Manager Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Other Points Based 10 Points (5%)
JBPro	49.3	37.3	49.3	46	8.3
CHW	47.7	37.3	42	48.3	8.3
Yuro & Associates Excluded	0	0	0	0	0

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 200)
JBPro	190.33
CHW	183.67
Yuro & Associates Excluded	0

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

CHW
Understanding of Project Points Based 50 Points (25%)
Chris Dawson: 45
Ramon Gavarrete: 50
Stephen Hofstetter: 48
Provided specific details about the project with clear timeline presented and demonstrated the approach.
Responsiveness to Questions Points Based 40 Points (20%)
Chris Dawson: 35
Ramon Gavarrete: 39
Consultant responded to questions directly and expressed their knowledge of City Staff.
Stephen Hofstetter: 38
answered questions and gave a few examples
Project Team Points Based 50 Points (25%)
Chris Dawson: 30
Ramon Gavarrete: 50
Good TEAM. Knowledge of adjacent City of Alachua's private development.
Stephen Hofstetter: 46
Most of the project team participated. Subcontractors did not participate and presentation
Project Manager Points Based 50 Points (25%)
Chris Dawson: 45
Ramon Gavarrete: 50
Knowledgeable of stake holders. Let the community know of design / construction issues / progress. Information Flow. Keeping the City of Alachua informed.
Stephen Hofstetter: 50
project manager participated in the presentation and shoed experience with the project
Other Points Based 10 Points (5%)
Chris Dawson: 8
Ramon Gavarrete: 10

Very good approach on Public Involvement and coordination with the City of Alachua. Commit to meet with Community as many times is necessary. Elaborated on Bidding / Construction services.

Stephen Hofstetter: 7

Currently provides all utilities for the city so very knowledgeable with the city infrastructure and needs

JBPro

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 50

Ramon Gavarrete: 50

Extensive knowledge of project. Provided a good schedule and items of special attention for the project. Good TEAM.

Stephen Hofstetter: 48

Strong understanding of the project and specific to the project. Presented a workable approach with a general timeline

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 40 Points (20%)

Chris Dawson: 35

Ramon Gavarrete: 39

Consultant responded to questions directly and expressed their knowledge of City Staff.t.

Stephen Hofstetter: 38

A. Yes, they answered them clearly

Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 50

Ramon Gavarrete: 50

Very good presentation and all TEAM members were present and participated

Stephen Hofstetter: 48

All the team participated. No subcontractor included

Project Manager | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 40

Ramon Gavarrete: 49

Consultant provided several examples of work.

Stephen Hofstetter: 49

Yes, project manager participated and communicated the ideas and responded to questions.

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 10

Ramon Gavarrete: 8

Stephen Hofstetter: 7

Unique experience with prior survey work on the project and knowledge of city infrastructure

**Yuro & Associates
(Excluded)**

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 0

Ramon Gavarrete: 0

Stephen Hofstetter: 0

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 40 Points (20%)

Chris Dawson: 0

Ramon Gavarrete: 0

Stephen Hofstetter: 0

Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 0

Ramon Gavarrete: 0

Stephen Hofstetter: 0

Project Manager | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 0

Ramon Gavarrete: 0

Stephen Hofstetter: 0

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 0

Ramon Gavarrete: 0

Stephen Hofstetter: 0

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Chris Dawson	Transportation Planning Manager	Mar 15, 2023 8:56 AM
Ramon Gavarrete	Public Works Director	Mar 20, 2023 7:53 AM
Stephen Hofstetter	Director	Feb 1, 2023 9:28 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.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (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 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)
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?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

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	Chris Dawson	Ramon Gavarrete	Stephen Hofstetter	Total Score (Max Score 175)
JBPro	149	165	163	159
CHW	146	162	165	157.67
Yuro & Associates	151	90	120	120.33

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)
JBPro	45.3	19	0	25	24.7
CHW	45	18.7	2	24.3	22.3
Yuro & Associates	23.3	15.7	5	16.7	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

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)
JBPro	10	19	6	10	159
CHW	10	19.3	6	10	157.67
Yuro & Associates	10	13.7	9	8	120.33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

CHW

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 42

Firm has extensive experience in Alachua County

Ramon Gavarrete: 48

Stephen Hofstetter: 45

Extensive knowledge of key staff and project manager. They have done this work before. The work is not being subcontracted. The company and key staff have done this work locally before. Having a local knowledge and prior experience working for Alachua County, awarded 5 additional points.

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

Chris Dawson: 17

No time schedules are included to evaluate

Ramon Gavarrete: 19

Although there are numerous references to project schedule, no schedule was submitted. Not even a generic version. Staff is adequate to meet AC expectations.

Stephen Hofstetter: 20

Key staff appear to have the capacity and I'm not aware of them not meeting time and budget requirements.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.5%)

Chris Dawson: 2

\$267,589.90

Ramon Gavarrete: 2

\$267,589.90

Stephen Hofstetter: 2

\$267,589.90

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (12.5%)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Chris Dawson: 25

Ramon Gavarrete: 23

Good understanding of the Scope. Proposer is aware of the need to coordinate with the City of Alachua and to design to the City's specifications. Proposer missed that constant communication with City of Alachua is critical with Alachua County being primary.

Stephen Hofstetter: 25

Understands the project and emphasized the appropriate work tasks

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (12.5%)

Chris Dawson: 20

Specific permitting agencies weren't mentioned.

Ramon Gavarrete: 22

Stephen Hofstetter: 25

The approach appears logical and reasonable. The material is presented in a way that specifically addressed the county's needs.

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 10

Ramon Gavarrete: 10

Stephen Hofstetter: 10

Extensive experience with similar jobs and at this scale.

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

Chris Dawson: 20

Ramon Gavarrete: 20

Stephen Hofstetter: 18

The project team was identified and appropriately scaled and skilled for the project. No subcontractors to enhance the project team. Hours assigned for the various team members are appropriate.

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 0

No schedule is included

Ramon Gavarrete: 8

Although there are numerous references to project schedule, no schedule was submitted. Not even a generic version.

Stephen Hofstetter: 10

Schedule was logical and reasonable and properly assigned to the team member's skill set.

Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5%)
Chris Dawson: 10
Ramon Gavarrete: 10
Stephen Hofstetter: 10

JBPro

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 42

Firm has special knowledge of the project due to prior phase experience

Ramon Gavarrete: 48

Very familiar with the standards and design requirements of the City of Alachua for their water systems and are used to working closely with the Public Services staff that review and ultimately approve water systems and utility improvements for the City.

Stephen Hofstetter: 46

Resumes of key staff and project manager provided and firm has done similar work in the past and locally. Overall team has good experience (28/30 points). Gave 8 points for unique factors based on their strong knowledge and experience in already drafting a plan for this facility.

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

Chris Dawson: 17

No proposed schedules are included

Ramon Gavarrete: 20

Stephen Hofstetter: 20

Key staffing have significant percentage of involvement in the project, including subcontractor. Not aware of any past budget or time commitment issues from past projects. Work load appears appropriate.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.5%)

Chris Dawson: 0

\$706,476.44

Ramon Gavarrete: 0

\$706,476.44

Stephen Hofstetter: 0

\$706,476.44

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (12.5%)

Chris Dawson: 25

Ramon Gavarrete: 25

Stephen Hofstetter: 25

Clearly understands the project and appropriately emphasized the work tasks and needs. They have done this type of work in the past.

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (12.5%)

Chris Dawson: 25

Ramon Gavarrete: 24

Stephen Hofstetter: 25

Developed a workable approach and specifically addressed the county's needs.

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 10

Ramon Gavarrete: 10

Stephen Hofstetter: 10

Project manager has experience and a long history with this company

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

Chris Dawson: 20

Ramon Gavarrete: 20

Stephen Hofstetter: 17

The team is appropriate and has experience. The subcontractor will enhance the project team. The time commitment for each team member is appropriate

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 0

No schedule was included.

Ramon Gavarrete: 8

Schedule not submitted.

Stephen Hofstetter: 10

Schedule seems reasonably and properly sequenced.

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 10

Ramon Gavarrete: 10

Stephen Hofstetter: 10

Proposal was property organized and all necessary documents were provided.

Yuro & Associates

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Chris Dawson: 35

Ramon Gavarrete: 12

Only 1 PE and 1 PSM on staff. Limited similar experience

Stephen Hofstetter: 23

The team had average experience with no subcontractors (15/30 points). Work done in State but not in Alachua county (8/10). No unique factors identified.

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

Chris Dawson: 20

Ramon Gavarrete: 12

Only 1 PE on staff (Owner). Limited staffing.

Stephen Hofstetter: 15

The application had limited information available about the similar work done and whether it was done within budget (15/20 points)

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.5%)

Chris Dawson: 5

\$0

Ramon Gavarrete: 5

\$0

Stephen Hofstetter: 5

\$0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (12.5%)

Chris Dawson: 20

No reference om schedule to permitting with City of Alachua;

Ramon Gavarrete: 10

Lack of understanding. Design plans shall be based on City of Alachua's design requirements; NOT AC. No mention that the funds are Federal (ARPA)

Stephen Hofstetter: 20

Demonstrated understanding of the project but lacked some emphasis in various work tasks.

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (12.5%)

Chris Dawson: 25

Ramon Gavarrete: 12

Generic Content

Stephen Hofstetter: 20

Provided a workable approach but more generic in nature in its content.

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 10

Ramon Gavarrete: 10

Owner is only PE

Stephen Hofstetter: 10

Project manager has experience with similar jobs.

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

Chris Dawson: 18

Ramon Gavarrete: 12

Only 1 Engineer assigned. Owner. Design seem to depend mostly on CADD Technicians

Stephen Hofstetter: 11

The team was identified and appropriate but may lack some experience overall, no subcontractor and hours assigned to each member for each task was unclear.

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 8

No reference to permitting with City of Alachua

Ramon Gavarrete: 10

Stephen Hofstetter: 9

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Chris Dawson: 10

Ramon Gavarrete: 7

Stephen Hofstetter: 7

Some of the paperwork was for a different project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-391-TW

Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

ITA 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement

Final Audit Report

2023-04-27

Created:	2023-04-26
By:	Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAPXQIfX9wzN4qUTJHsNvbffLz6Lcs6OZ0

"ITA 23-391-TW Engineering Services for Santa Fe Hills Water System Replacement" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
2023-04-26 - 0:31:39 AM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) for signature
2023-04-26 - 0:33:06 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
2023-04-26 - 10:23:12 AM GMT- IP address: 66.231.154.232
-  Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
Signature Date: 2023-04-26 - 10:24:08 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 66.231.154.232
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2023-04-26 - 10:24:09 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
2023-04-27 - 3:22:36 AM GMT- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-04-27 - 3:24:45 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Agreement completed.
2023-04-27 - 3:24:45 AM GMT