



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

November 13, 2023

MEMORANDUM

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

From: Darryl R. Kight, CPPB, Procurement Supervisor 

Via: Mandy Mullins, Procurement Agent I

Mandy Mullins

**SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 23-426-DK Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and
University of Florida Supplement**

<u>Solicitation Opening Date:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, September 13, 2023
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	689 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Downloaded by:</u>	52 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Submissions:</u>	5 Vendors

Firms:

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32601

Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
Tampa, FL 33602

*Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC
Temple Terrace, FL 33637

*Toole Design Group, LLC
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Volkert, Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32601

*Proposal excluded during the evaluation process and was not part of the final evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee’s ranking below for RFP 23-426-DK Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement.

1. Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
2. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
3. Volkert, Inc.

Approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate an agreement with the top ranked firm. Should the staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the top-ranked firm, negotiations with the unsuccessful firm will be terminated. Negotiations may be undertaken in the same manner in order of ranking until an agreement is reached, and so forth.

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

TJ White

Nov 15, 2023

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

Date

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

TW/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 responsive in accordance with the criteria that the protesting party alleges should be used;
 - iv. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest;
 - v. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;
 - vi. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party’s alleged basis for the protest; and
 - vii. The form of the relief requested.
 - (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Solicitation Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Solicitation Protest is untimely and, therefore, rejected. The Procurement Manager shall consider all timely Solicitation Protests and may conduct any inquiry that the Procurement Manager deems necessary to make a determination regarding a protest. The Procurement Manager shall issue a written determination granting or denying the protest. The written determination shall contain a concise statement of the basis for the determination.

(d) *Appeal:* If the protesting party is not satisfied with the Procurement Manager's determination, the protesting party may appeal the determination to the County Manager by filing a written appeal, which sets forth the basis upon which the appeal is based, including all supporting documentation. The scope of the appeal shall be limited to the basis alleged in the Solicitation Protest. The appeal must be filed with the Procurement Manager within five business days of the date on which the Procurement Manager's written determination was sent to the protesting party. Failure to timely file an appeal shall constitute a waiver of the protesting party's rights to an appeal of the Procurement Manager's determination, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said Solicitation defects in a subsequent award protest, if any, or any other administrative or legal proceeding. After considering the appeal, the County Manager must determine whether the solicitation should stand, be revised, or be cancelled, and issue a written determination and provide copies of the determination to the protesting party. The determination of the County Manager shall be final and not subject to further appeal under this code.

(3) *Award Protest.* Any Bidder who is not the intended awardee and who claims to be the rightful awardee may file an award protest. However, an award protest is not valid and shall be rejected for lack of standing if it does not demonstrate that the protesting party would be awarded the Solicitation if its protest is upheld.

(a) *Basis of the Award Protest:* The alleged basis for an Award Protest shall be limited to the following:

- i. The protesting party was incorrectly deemed non-responsive due to an incorrect assessment of fact or law;
- ii. The County failed to substantively follow the procedures or requirements specified in the solicitation documents, except for minor irregularities that were waived by the County in accordance with this Code, which resulted in a competitive disadvantage to the protesting party; and
- iii. The County made a mathematical error in evaluating the responses to the solicitation, resulting in an incorrect score and not *protesting party not being selected for award*.

(b) *Timing and Content of the Award Protest:* The Award Protest must be in writing and must be received by the Procurement Manager, twhite@alachuacounty.us by no later than 3:00 PM on the third business day after the County's proposed Award decision was posted by the County. Failure to timely file an Award Protest shall constitute a total and complete waiver of the Bidder's right to protest or appeal the County's proposed Award decision in any administrative or legal proceeding. In the event an Award Protest is timely filed, the protesting party shall be deemed to have waived any and all proposed Award defects that were not timely alleged in the protesting party's Award Protest, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said Award defects in any administrative or legal proceeding. The Award Protest must include, at a minimum, the following information:

- i. The name, address, e-mail and telephone number of the protesting party;
- ii. The Solicitation number and title;
- iii. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party's response was responsive to the Solicitation;
- iv. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party has legal standing to file the Solicitation Protest because:
 1. The protesting party submitted a response to the Solicitation or other basis for establishing legal standing;
 2. The protesting party has a substantial interest in and is aggrieved in connection with the proposed Award decision; and
 3. The protesting party, and not any other bidder, should be awarded the Solicitation if the protesting party's Award Protest is upheld.
- v. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest;
- vi. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;

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

Public Meeting Minutes (Record)

Ranking for RFP 23-426 Alachua Countywide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Date: November 13, 2023 Start Time: 1:00 pm

Location: 12 SE 1st Street, 3rd Floor Conference Room

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

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

3. RFP Committee Members Process Instructions

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

Vendor	Rachel Mandell	Alison Moss	Thomas Strom	Scott Wright	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	378	389	344	363	368.5
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	372	349	348	359	357
Volkert, Inc.	364	340	342	356	350.5

- 3.5. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals. You have your proposal evaluation forms so now we can start discussions with the first vendor. (**Encourage dialog**)
 - 3.5.1. Discuss scores and make Changes if pertinent.
 - 3.5.2. Discussion record and Update: **Proposal Score Evaluation**
 - 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 **Proposal Scores** for the Team's Final Ranking.
4. Motion: Alison Moss motioned to Approve the above ranking and authorize staff to process an agreement with the top ranked firm, and with the second ranked firm, if an agreement with the top ranked vendor fails, seconded by Scott Wright.

Vote 4-0 in favor.

5. Public Comments (3 minutes):

6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Scott Wright moved to approve the Minutes; Thomas Strom seconded the motion.

Vote 4-0 in favor.

7. Meeting Adjourn at 1:15 pm.



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 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

RESPONSE DEADLINE: September 13, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Tuesday, November 14, 2023

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement
Project ID	RFP 23-426-DK
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	August 9, 2023
Due Date	September 13, 2023
Procurement Agent	Darryl R Kight
Evaluators	Rachel Mandell, Alison Moss, Thomas Strom, Scott Wright
Project Description	<p>The purpose of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan is to make walking and biking attractive transportation choices for residents and visitors of all ages and abilities. It aims to do so through the creation of goals, policies, programs, and projects that will make walking and biking safer, more comfortable, and more convenient.</p> <p>The project Includes two separate scopes of work (detailed in the scope of work), to be evaluated by the same committee for award.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Scope of Work: the Alachua Countywide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan B. Scope of Work: the University of Florida Campus Bicycle Master Plan <p>Note: The two scopes will be contracted separately and the University of Florida (UF) may decide not to contract for its supplemental Scope of Work.</p>

Introduction

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

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 23-426-DK Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement.

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](#).

The purpose of the Alachua Countywide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan is to make walking and biking attractive transportation choices for residents and visitors of all ages and abilities. It aims to do so through the creation of goals, policies, programs, and projects that will make walking and biking safer, more comfortable, and more convenient.

The project Includes two separate scopes of work (detailed in the scope of work), to be evaluated by the same committee for award.

- A. Scope of Work: the Alachua Countywide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan
- B. Scope of Work: the University of Florida Campus Bicycle Master Plan

Note: The two scopes will be contracted separately and the University of Florida (UF) may decide not to contract for its supplemental Scope of Work.

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](tel:(352)374-5202)

Department:

Growth Management

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Timeline

OpenGov Release Project Date:	August 9, 2023
2nd Advertisement Date:	August 16, 2023
Question Submission Deadline	September 3, 2023, 12:01am
Question Response Deadline	September 6, 2023, 6:30pm
Solicitation Submission Deadline	September 13, 2023, 2:00pm

<p>Solicitation Opening – Teams Meeting</p>	<p>September 13, 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.</p> <p>Join Microsoft Teams meeting Join on your computer, mobile app or room device Click here to join the meeting</p> <p>https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_ZTQyYzk5YzMtZDc4ZS00N2lxLTljMWUtMjAwNTQwN2NjNTNi%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22c82ab8e7-6ee1-4cd5-9191-4aa322a1828f%22%7d</p> <p>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#</p> <p>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).</p>
--	---

SOLICITATION STATUS HISTORY

Date	Changed To	Changed By
Jun 19, 2023 9:16 AM	Draft	Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM
Jul 3, 2023 10:31 AM	Review	Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM
Aug 9, 2023 11:22 AM	Final	Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM
Aug 9, 2023 11:23 AM	Post Pending	Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM
Aug 9, 2023 11:24 AM	Open	Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM
Sep 13, 2023 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Sep 14, 2023 10:06 PM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins
Nov 13, 2023 7:48 PM	Award Pending	Mandy Mullins

SELECTED VENDOR

VENDOR RECOMMENDED BY THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Vendor	Location
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	Tampa, FL

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Chris Towne florida.marketing@kimley-horn.com (352) 415-1923	Sep 13, 2023 11:45 AM
Submitted	Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	Jennifer Musselman jmusselman@kittelson.com (813) 556-6973	Sep 13, 2023 8:17 AM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	Aug 9, 2023 11:26 AM
No Bid	Rome Truck Parts and Repair, Inc.	Kristin Kent kristin@rometruckparts.com	Aug 9, 2023 12:32 PM
No Bid	Unipak Corp.	Brian Marcus customercare@unipakcorp.net (888) 808-5120	Aug 9, 2023 12:18 PM
Submitted	Volkert, Inc.	Ned Baier, AICP ned.baier@volkert.com (813) 245-1618	Sep 13, 2023 11:15 AM
Excluded	Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	Nicole Janney nicole.janney@patelgreene.com	Sep 13, 2023 1:11 PM
Excluded	Toole Design Group, LLC	Jennifer Toole marketing@tooledesign.com	Sep 13, 2023 10:30 AM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	Network Craze	Rome Truck Parts and Repair, Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
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	No Response
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	No Response	No Response

Question Title	Unipak Corp.	Volkert, Inc.		Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC (Excluded)
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
State Compliance	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Question Title	Unipak Corp.	Volkert, Inc.		Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC (Excluded)
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	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	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
Conflict of Interest	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	No Response	Pass	No Response	Pass

Question Title	Toole Design Group, LLC (Excluded)
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass
State Compliance	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass

Question Title	Toole Design Group, LLC (Excluded)
Vendor Eligibility	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass

PRICING RESPONSES

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. indemnification provision

Aug 15, 2023 10:02 AM

Question: Question: As written, the County’s indemnification provision in both its solicitation and sample agreement is unenforceable pursuant to Florida Stat. Section 725.08 which limits a design professional’s indemnify and defense obligations when contracting with a public agency. Will the County modify this provision upon any contract award to ensure it is consistent with Florida Stat. Section 725.08: 13. Indemnification. (ADD: TO THE EXTENT ALLOWED UNDER FLORIDA STAT. §725.08,) PROFESSIONAL HEREBY WAIVES AND RELEASES, AND AGREES TO (DELETE: PROTECT, DEFEND,) INDEMNIFY AND HOLD HARMLESS ALACHUA COUNTY AND ITS BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, VOLUNTEERS, AND ATTORNEYS (COLLECTIVELY “ALACHUA COUNTY”) FROM AND AGAINST ANY AND ALL CLAIMS, DEMANDS, PENALTIES, EXPENSES, AND CAUSES OF ACTION OF ANY AND EVERY DESCRIPTION, AND DAMAGES, INCLUDING (ADD: REASONABLE) ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS, BROUGHT AGAINST ALACHUA COUNTY RESULTING FROM ANY ACCIDENT, INCIDENT OR OCCURRENCE (ADD: TO THE EXTENT CAUSED BY) (DELETE: ARISING OUT OF OR IN CONNECTION WITH AN A) (ADD: NEGLIGENCE) ACT, ERROR OR OMISSION OF PROFESSIONAL OR PROFESSIONAL’S EMPLOYEES, OFFICERS, AGENTS, ASSIGNS OR SUBCONTRACTORS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF THE SERVICES SET FORTH IN THIS AGREEMENT, INCLUDING ATTACHED EXHIBITS, OR FROM PROFESSIONAL’S ENTRY ONTO ALACHUA COUNTY’S PROPERTY AND ANY AND ALL IMPROVEMENTS THEREON. This obligation shall in no way be limited in any nature by any limitation on the amount or type of Professional’s insurance coverage. (DELETE: In the event the County is alleged to

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

be liable on account of alleged acts or omissions, or both, of Professional or Professional's employees, representatives or agents, then Professional will investigate, respond to and provide a defense for any allegations and claims, at Professional's sole costs and expense. Furthermore, Professional will pay all costs, fees and other expenses of any defense, including but not limited to, all attorneys' fees, court costs and expert witness fees and expenses.) Professional and County will jointly cooperate with each other in the event of any litigation, including any request for documentation. This indemnification provision will survive the termination of this Agreement. Nothing contained herein shall constitute a waiver by the County of sovereign immunity or the provisions or limitation of liability of §768.28, Florida Statutes, as may be amended.

Aug 15, 2023 10:02 AM

Answered by Thomas Rouse: A sample contract is attached to solicitations as a benefit to the parties. However, the form is a sample and is subject to negotiations. During the negotiation period, the County generally works with an awarded vendor to mutually agree to terms.

Aug 16, 2023 5:12 PM

2. Resumes

Aug 15, 2023 10:02 AM

Question: Question: Resumes are requested in Section 7.3, page 29, "Provide resumes to include years of experience within the area of specialty, length of service with the Consultant and knowledge of local government." And in Section 7.4, page 29, "Resumes of the key staff that support the firm's competency in doing this type of work and key staff includes the Project Manager, and other project team professionals." Should resumes be in both sections? Or can they be in one or the other? Which section would you like to see the organizational chart?

Aug 15, 2023 10:02 AM

Answered by Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM: Per the RFP, please include the resumes in appropriate sections/tabs.

Aug 15, 2023 11:18 AM

3. Staff Qualifications

Aug 15, 2023 10:03 AM

Question: Question: Qualifications (project descriptions) of the staff are requested in Section 7.3, page 29, "Consultants shall demonstrate experience in the scope of services required herein. Describe in detail any prior experience." And in Section 7.4, page 29, "The firm has done this type of work in the past." Should this be included in both sections? Or can they be in one of the other?

Aug 15, 2023 10:03 AM

Answered by Alison Moss: Please answer both questions as the former (Section 7.3) relates to the consultants' experience and the latter (Section 7.4) relates to the firm as a whole.

Aug 29, 2023 12:31 PM

4. Workload

Aug 15, 2023 10:03 AM

Question: Question: Workload is requested in Section 7.2, page 29 “Indicate how this project will fit into the total workload of the Consultant during the project period.” And in Section 7.3, page 29, “Summary of the Consultant's current workload and ability to satisfy the County requirements.” Should this be included in both sections? Or can they be in one of the other?

Aug 15, 2023 10:03 AM

Answered by Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM: Please answer both questions as the former relates to the consultants' experience and the latter relates to the firm as a whole. thank you.

Aug 29, 2023 12:39 PM

5. Budget

Aug 18, 2023 2:19 PM

Question: What is the anticipated budget for the primary scope and the supplemental scope?

Aug 18, 2023 2:19 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM: The estimated budget for the project is \$100,000.

Aug 26, 2023 4:38 PM

6. Response Length

Aug 18, 2023 2:20 PM

Question: Is there a page limit for responses? If so, what is the limit?

Aug 18, 2023 2:20 PM

Answered by Alison Moss: There is no page limit for responses.

Aug 24, 2023 5:21 PM

7. Selection Committee

Aug 18, 2023 2:20 PM

Question: Who are the selection committee members and which agencies do they each represent?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Aug 18, 2023 2:20 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM: The RFP Evaluation Committee is being finalized for evaluation of this RFP.

Aug 24, 2023 5:20 PM

8. Key Staff Previous Experience

Aug 23, 2023 11:07 AM

Question: Please confirm if we can use key staff's previous project experience.

Aug 23, 2023 11:07 AM

Answered by Alison Moss: Confirmed: you may use key staff's previous project experience.

Aug 26, 2023 4:38 PM

9. Key Staff Involvement

Aug 23, 2023 11:08 AM

Question: Please confirm if percent involvement for the project refers to availability for the project.

Aug 23, 2023 11:08 AM

Answered by Alison Moss: Confirmed: percent involvement refers to availability for the project.

Aug 26, 2023 4:37 PM

10. 2nd Advertisement Release

Aug 24, 2023 5:26 PM

Question: Does the County intend on issuing a 2nd Advertisement, as noted on RFP Page 4, Section 1.4 Timeline, prior to the submission deadline?

Aug 24, 2023 5:26 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight CPPB, CPM: This is referring to the local "Gainesville Sun" advertising: OpenGov will only release a project once.

Aug 29, 2023 12:39 PM

11. No subject

Aug 28, 2023 2:57 PM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Question: In section 7.5, does "provide the level of key staffing and their percentage of involvement" refer to the percent of project hours that will be distributed to each staff person or the overall availability of each staff person?

Aug 28, 2023 2:57 PM

Answered by Alison Moss: It refers to the overall availability of each staff person.

Aug 29, 2023 1:17 PM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

No Addenda issued.

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Sep 26, 2023 9:05 AM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on Wednesday, **October 18, 2023 @ 1:00 pm**, to discuss and update of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-426-DK Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

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

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 239 155 601 049

Passcode: enFhLN

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 469-998-7938,,333972633#](#) United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 333 972 633#

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

Nov 13, 2023 11:10 AM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Monday, November 13, 2023 @ 1:00 pm**, to discuss and update of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-426-DK Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

-

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

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 238 270 021 710 Passcode: 56qcps

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 469-998-7938,,834399615#](#) United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 834 399 615#

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.

EVALUATION

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Rachel Mandell	Senior Planner	Oct 10, 2023 9:51 AM

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Alison Moss	Sr Transportation Planner	Sep 5, 2023 9:25 AM
Thomas Strom	Transportation Engineering Manager	Oct 13, 2023 1:42 PM
Scott Wright	Planner IV	Sep 21, 2023 12:21 PM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability of Professional Personnel	Points Based	70 (17.5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Do the resumes of the key staff, including Project Manager and other project team professionals, support the firm’s competency in doing this type of work (bicycle/pedestrian or active transportation planning)?
- B. Has the firm done this type of work in the past?
- C. Does the project manager have consistent experience with projects comparable in size and scope?
- D. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, do the team members have experience with comparable projects?
- E. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?
- F. Has the company or key staff recently (within the past 5 years) done this type of work for the County, the State, local government, or for a large university in the past?
- G. Are there factors, such as unique abilities, which would make a noticeable (positive) impact on the project?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements	Points Based	50 (12.5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Does the level of key staffing and their percentage of involvement, the use of subcontractors (if any), office location, and/or information contained in the transmittal letter indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time and budget requirements?
- B. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?
- C. Is the proposed schedule reasonable based on quantity of personnel assigned to the project?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	40 (10% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was proposal organization per the RFP?
- B. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project?
- C. Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Approach	Points Based	40 (10% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?
- B. Did the firm develop an innovative approach to the project, particularly maximizing value where resources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative data) may be lacking?
- C. Did the firm develop a strong public engagement strategy, specifically citing a multifaceted approach?
- D. Does the proposal specifically address the County's needs or is it "generic" in content?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	80 (20% 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 tailored to the Agencies' project needs or a "generic" presentation?
- C. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Manager & Project Team	Points Based	65 (16.3% of Total)

Description:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

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

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Responsiveness to Questions	Points Based	55 (13.8% of Total)

Description:

- A. Were questions answered directly and with sufficient detail?

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Rachel Mandell	Alison Moss	Thomas Strom	Scott Wright
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	378	389	344	363
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	372	349	348	359
Volkert, Inc.	364	340	342	356
Toole Design Group, LLC	178	192	143	164
Excluded				
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	185	175	136	179
Excluded				

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	368.5
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	357
Volkert, Inc.	350.5
Toole Design Group, LLC	169.25
Excluded	
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	168.75
Excluded	

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 70 Points (17.5%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 40 Points (10%)	Project Approach Points Based 40 Points (10%)
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	62.8	44	37	36
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	61	43.3	35.5	36.3
Volkert, Inc.	61.5	42.8	36.3	34.8
Toole Design Group, LLC	60.8	41.3	34.3	33
Excluded				
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	58.5	42.3	33.5	34.5
Excluded				

Vendor	Understanding of Project Points Based 80 Points (20%)	Project Manager & Project Team Points Based 65 Points (16.3%)	Responsiveness to Questions Points Based 55 Points (13.8%)	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	74.5	61.3	53	368.5
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	72.8	58.8	49.5	357
Volkert, Inc.	71.3	56	48	350.5
Toole Design Group, LLC	0	0	0	169.25
Excluded				
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	0	0	0	168.75
Excluded				

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 70 Points (17.5%)
Rachel Mandell: 67
Alison Moss: 62
Firm has strong experience in Active Transportation, but it's not their primary market.
Thomas Strom: 51

Scott Wright: 64

Firm has done bike/ped and ped plans in State; has designed bike facilities; has local presence; exp PM and alt; extensive local experience

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 48

Alison Moss: 45

Overall, I'm confident that they can meet time and budget requirements, but think 12 month schedule may be too aggressive for this project, especially given extensive Community Engagement.

Thomas Strom: 36

Scott Wright: 44

Large, organized team approach; good availability of key staff; ambitious timeframe

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 38

Alison Moss: 36

Good understanding of local issues and opportunities. It's clear that this plan will offer implementable solutions, but hoping for a bigger/aspirational vision as well, and projects to achieve that vision.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 34

Clear, organized proposal; touches on all work tasks but minimal elaboration on some tasks; outlines key deliverables for each stage

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 36

Thomas Strom: 37

Scott Wright: 35

Strong focus on public outreach with details; overall approach to project lacking in some areas; somewhat tailored approach

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 80 Points (20%)

Rachel Mandell: 72

Alison Moss: 70

As with the written proposal, firm understands the fundamentals of the plan, but does not seem to fully understand the visionary/aspirational nature appropriate to a master plan.

Thomas Strom: 75

Scott Wright: 74

Coordinate two plans; bridge gap to FDOT- scoping reports; public outreach "where they are"; interactive mapping tool for coordination with public; understand how future development affects; analyze data of existing trips; establish prioritization criteria, consider feasibility of implementation

Project Manager & Project Team | Points Based | 65 Points (16.3%)

Rachel Mandell: 60

Alison Moss: 55

Firm has strong experience, but is not at the forefront of active transportation design and research, as is the leading firms (leading per my evaluation).

Thomas Strom: 60

Scott Wright: 60

All core team presented; local and state-based staff; focus on road safety professionals; almost 20 years in context sensitive and low-stress; community outreach experience; "established relationships"

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 55 Points (13.8%)

Rachel Mandell: 50

Alison Moss: 45

Firm did not fully answer several of the questions compared to other firms. Would've appreciated more depth and more angles.

Thomas Strom: 55

Scott Wright: 48

All advance questions covered in presentation 1- GIS data; existing trip data; public feedback 2- conflict points; separations of users; crossings; N Main at 2nd Ave- excessive pavement 3- east Gainesville focus on alt modes and awareness; missing facilities on many corridors in west

Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 68

Alison Moss: 68

This type of work is a primary focus of this firm and they are recognized as leaders in the field, having contributed to important research and guidance at the State and Federal levels.

Thomas Strom: 52

Scott Wright: 63

National experts in active transportation; some local experience and in State; subcontract to national expert - previous collaborator; lead has moderate experience, but some in FL

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 48

Alison Moss: 48

18 months is a realistic schedule for this project.

Thomas Strom: 35

Scott Wright: 45

Detailed and fairly realistic schedule; monthly schedule and budget checks;

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 40

Alison Moss: 38

Kittelson's proposal indicates a strong understanding of the project, the various tasks and how they relate to one another.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 36

Proposal follows RFP; good recognition of key issues/opportunities; examples of goals and objectives

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 38

Kittelson proposes an approach that is highly workable and customized to the needs of the County. It includes innovative approaches to analysis (to address potential data deficiencies) and community engagement (to involve hard-to reach populations).

Thomas Strom: 32

Scott Wright: 37

Multi-faceted approach to outreach (including survey); community engagement throughout; tailored proposal

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 80 Points (20%)

Rachel Mandell: 73

Alison Moss: 79

Exceptional understanding of project, local context and needs.

Thomas Strom: 74

Scott Wright: 72

oriented to grant funding; combo of in-person and online; grounded in data; emphasis on low-stress; networks-gaps-prioritize; understandable graphical results; 18-month schedule

Project Manager & Project Team | Points Based | 65 Points (16.3%)

Rachel Mandell: 59

Alison Moss: 64

Exceptionally qualified project managers and support staff.

Thomas Strom: 62

Scott Wright: 60

all project team participated; planners/engineers; local/UF experience; FDOT experience (context class); performance measure experts

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 55 Points (13.8%)

Rachel Mandell: 53

Alison Moss: 54

Questions were answered thoroughly, with multiple team members responding to different facets of the question.

Thomas Strom: 55

Scott Wright: 50

Advance questions all answered effectively 1- all users; key crossings; safety analysis; policy gaps; continuity across jurisdictions 2- protected bike intersection in Tampa (FDOT); intersection redesign in SANDAG 3- RTS; trail network expansion; focus on shorter trips (not necessarily commutes)

Volkert, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 69

Alison Moss: 60

The firm has done this type of work in the past, but they do not appear to have the depth of experience as some of the other firms.

Thomas Strom: 54

Scott Wright: 63

PM and others involved in project have extensive bike/ped experience; firm(s) have worked in Gainesville and state on related projects; multi-firm organizational approach

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 47

Alison Moss: 45

Proposed team seems too large, and potentially unwieldy, to me.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 45

Good availability of staff; detailed and believable schedule

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 35

The Volkert team understands the project needs, but the proposal indicates they may not possess the same level of expertise (as other firms) to meet them.

Thomas Strom: 35

Scott Wright: 38

Proposal organization follows scope and covers all details of it; comprehensive understanding of project

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 32

Alison Moss: 35

This proposal was long and repetitive, which causes concerns regarding project process and final deliverable, the Master Plan.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 38

Very thorough consideration of tasks needed to complete the project; strong public engagement component; tailored approach

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 80 Points (20%)

Rachel Mandell: 71

Alison Moss: 70

Firm demonstrated sufficient, but not exceptional understanding of the project, particularly the importance of FDOT corridors and the experience needed to navigate required coordination (i.e., looking for more than familiarity with FDOT standards and processes, but specific experience working through innovative and even controversial projects in FDOT ROW).

Thomas Strom: 71

Scott Wright: 73

Projects, policies, programs; low stress - local road network and address high-stress crossings; bike boulevards; provide alternative routes; fun and interesting public outreach; communicate needs with visuals; low-cost methods with high ROI; project champions and on-site visits

Project Manager & Project Team | Points Based | 65 Points (16.3%)

Rachel Mandell: 58

Alison Moss: 50

Firm has strong experience, but is not at the forefront of active transportation design and research, as is the leading firm (leading per my evaluation).

Thomas Strom: 59

Scott Wright: 57

Core team members presented; 14 BPMP by project manager- on-time and on-budget; university experience (specifically at UF); experience with low-stress networks-MPath; experience with gap analysis in FL; SUN Trail understanding; extensive FDOT project exp

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 55 Points (13.8%)

Rachel Mandell: 50

Alison Moss: 45

Some answers were a bit repetitive and high level.

Thomas Strom: 55

Scott Wright: 42

Addressed advance questions directly in presentation 1- equity analysis, potential trip replacement, conversations with public 2- mid-block crossings on corridors ... not specific to project; geometry leading to advance notice warning in Tallahassee; trail access projects 3- complete gaps; identify demands; high-stress points

Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC
(Excluded)

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 67

Alison Moss: 60

This firm has done this type of work in the past, but seems to derive much of their technical expertise from their subconsultant Fehr & Peers.

Thomas Strom: 43

Scott Wright: 64

PM recently joined firm, has local and state knowledge; firm has considerable FL experience; subcontractor for data analysis/multimodal, previous collaborator

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 45

Alison Moss: 47

16 months may be a bit aggressive for a project of this scope.

Thomas Strom: 33

Scott Wright: 44

Significant staffing availability; reasonable schedule, minimal detail

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 36

Alison Moss: 33

Some responses indicate an inadequate understanding of the project (e.g., working group meeting #1, sample Programs matrix, UF's "Bicycle Friendly University" status).

Thomas Strom: 31

Scott Wright: 34

Proposal organized per RFP; list of possible prioritization metrics;

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 35

Project approach -- specifically Task 6 (Network and Project Development) and (Task 7) Project Prioritization -- lacks some clarity.

Thomas Strom: 29

Scott Wright: 37

Somewhat tailored approach; propose innovative StoryMap version of plan; emphasis on community partnerships in outreach

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 80 Points (20%)

Rachel Mandell: 0

Alison Moss: 0

Thomas Strom: 0

Scott Wright: 0

Project Manager & Project Team | Points Based | 65 Points (16.3%)

Rachel Mandell: 0

Alison Moss: 0

Thomas Strom: 0

Scott Wright: 0

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 55 Points (13.8%)

Rachel Mandell: 0

Alison Moss: 0

Thomas Strom: 0

Scott Wright: 0

**Toole Design Group, LLC
(Excluded)**

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 64

Alison Moss: 68

Curated team of highly qualified professionals. This firm has authored seminal State and Federal guidelines for Active Transportation, and is a recognized leader in the field.

Thomas Strom: 51

Scott Wright: 60

PM moderate experience; firm limited experience in state, no local; no subcontracts;

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 44

Alison Moss: 47

16 months may be too aggressive for a project of this scope.

Thomas Strom: 32

Scott Wright: 42

Reasonable schedule though lacks detail; good staff availability

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 35

Alison Moss: 38

Organization is exactly per the RFP and indicates a thorough understanding of the project needs, including a very deliberate approach to goals and policies, network development and analysis, and meaningful community engagement.

Thomas Strom: 32

Scott Wright: 32

Proposal organized per RFP

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 35

Alison Moss: 39

Proposal was very responsive to the tasks and emphases provided in the RFP.

Thomas Strom: 28

Scott Wright: 30

somewhat tailored approach; minimal detail on outreach and project identification/prioritization

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 80 Points (20%)

Rachel Mandell: 0

Alison Moss: 0

Thomas Strom: 0

Scott Wright: 0

Project Manager & Project Team | Points Based | 65 Points (16.3%)

Rachel Mandell: 0

Alison Moss: 0

Thomas Strom: 0

Scott Wright: 0

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 55 Points (13.8%)

Rachel Mandell: 0

Alison Moss: 0

Thomas Strom: 0

Scott Wright: 0

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Rachel Mandell	Senior Planner	Oct 10, 2023 9:51 AM
Alison Moss	Sr Transportation Planner	Sep 5, 2023 9:25 AM
Thomas Strom	Transportation Engineering Manager	Oct 13, 2023 1:42 PM
Scott Wright	Planner IV	Sep 21, 2023 12:21 PM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability of Professional Personnel	Points Based	70 (35% of Total)

Description:

- A. Do the resumes of the key staff, including Project Manager and other project team professionals, support the firm’s competency in doing this type of work (bicycle/pedestrian or active transportation planning)?
- B. Has the firm done this type of work in the past?
- C. Does the project manager have consistent experience with projects comparable in size and scope?
- D. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, do the team members have experience with comparable projects?
- E. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?
- F. Has the company or key staff recently (within the past 5 years) done this type of work for the County, the State, local government, or for a large university in the past?
- G. Are there factors, such as unique abilities, which would make a noticeable (positive) impact on the project?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements	Points Based	50 (25% 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. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?
- C. Is the proposed schedule reasonable based on quantity of personnel assigned to the project?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	40 (20% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was proposal organization per the RFP?
- B. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project?
- C. Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Approach	Points Based	40 (20% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?
- B. Did the firm develop an innovative approach to the project, particularly maximizing value where resources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative data) may be lacking?
- C. Did the firm develop a strong public engagement strategy, specifically citing a multifaceted approach?
- D. Does the proposal specifically address the County's needs or is it "generic" in content?

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Rachel Mandell	Alison Moss	Thomas Strom	Scott Wright
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	193	192	153	181
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	190	179	158	177
Volkert, Inc.	185	175	157	184
Toole Design Group, LLC	178	192	143	164
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	185	175	136	179

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 200)
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	179.75
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	176
Volkert, Inc.	175.25
Toole Design Group, LLC	169.25
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	168.75

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 70 Points (35%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 40 Points (20%)	Project Approach Points Based 40 Points (20%)
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	62.8	44	37	36
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	61	43.3	35.5	36.3
Volkert, Inc.	61.5	42.8	36.3	34.8
Toole Design Group, LLC	60.8	41.3	34.3	33
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	58.5	42.3	33.5	34.5

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 200)
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	179.75
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	176
Volkert, Inc.	175.25
Toole Design Group, LLC	169.25
Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC	168.75

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 67

Alison Moss: 62

Firm has strong experience in Active Transportation, but it's not their primary market.

Thomas Strom: 51

Scott Wright: 64

Firm has done bike/ped and ped plans in State; has designed bike facilities; has local presence; exp PM and alt; extensive local experience

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 48

Alison Moss: 45

Overall, I'm confident that they can meet time and budget requirements, but think 12 month schedule may be too aggressive for this project, especially given extensive Community Engagement.

Thomas Strom: 36

Scott Wright: 44

Large, organized team approach; good availability of key staff; ambitious timeframe

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 38

Alison Moss: 36

Good understanding of local issues and opportunities. It's clear that this plan will offer implementable solutions, but hoping for a bigger/aspirational vision as well, and projects to achieve that vision.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 34

Clear, organized proposal; touches on all work tasks but minimal elaboration on some tasks; outlines key deliverables for each stage

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 36

Thomas Strom: 37

Scott Wright: 35

Strong focus on public outreach with details; overall approach to project lacking in some areas; somewhat tailored approach

Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 68

Alison Moss: 68

This type of work is a primary focus of this firm and they are recognized as leaders in the field, having contributed to important research and guidance at the State and Federal levels.

Thomas Strom: 52

Scott Wright: 63

National experts in active transportation; some local experience and in State; subcontract to national expert - previous collaborator; lead has moderate experience, but some in FL

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 48

Alison Moss: 48

18 months is a realistic schedule for this project.

Thomas Strom: 35

Scott Wright: 45

Detailed and fairly realistic schedule; monthly schedule and budget checks;

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 40

Alison Moss: 38

Kittelson's proposal indicates a strong understanding of the project, the various tasks and how they relate to one another.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 36

Proposal follows RFP; good recognition of key issues/opportunities; examples of goals and objectives

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 38

Kittelson proposes an approach that is highly workable and customized to the needs of the County. It includes innovative approaches to analysis (to address potential data deficiencies) and community engagement (to involve hard-to reach populations).

Thomas Strom: 32

Scott Wright: 37

Multi-faceted approach to outreach (including survey); community engagement throughout; tailored proposal

Patel, Greene and Associates, LLC

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 67

Alison Moss: 60

This firm has done this type of work in the past, but seems to derive much of their technical expertise from their subconsultant Fehr & Peers.

Thomas Strom: 43

Scott Wright: 64

PM recently joined firm, has local and state knowledge; firm has considerable FL experience; subcontractor for data analysis/multimodal, previous collaborator

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 45

Alison Moss: 47

16 months may be a bit aggressive for a project of this scope.

Thomas Strom: 33

Scott Wright: 44

Significant staffing availability; reasonable schedule, minimal detail

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 36

Alison Moss: 33

Some responses indicate an inadequate understanding of the project (e.g., working group meeting #1, sample Programs matrix, UF's "Bicycle Friendly University" status).

Thomas Strom: 31

Scott Wright: 34

Proposal organized per RFP; list of possible prioritization metrics;

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 35

Project approach -- specifically Task 6 (Network and Project Development) and (Task 7) Project Prioritization -- lacks some clarity.

Thomas Strom: 29

Scott Wright: 37

Somewhat tailored approach; propose innovative StoryMap version of plan; emphasis on community partnerships in outreach

Toole Design Group, LLC

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 64

Alison Moss: 68

Curated team of highly qualified professionals. This firm has authored seminal State and Federal guidelines for Active Transportation, and is a recognized leader in the field.

Thomas Strom: 51

Scott Wright: 60

PM moderate experience; firm limited experience in state, no local; no subcontracts;

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 44

Alison Moss: 47

16 months may be too aggressive for a project of this scope.

Thomas Strom: 32

Scott Wright: 42

Reasonable schedule though lacks detail; good staff availability

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 35

Alison Moss: 38

Organization is exactly per the RFP and indicates a thorough understanding of the project needs, including a very deliberate approach to goals and policies, network development and analysis, and meaningful community engagement.

Thomas Strom: 32

Scott Wright: 32

Proposal organized per RFP

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 35

Alison Moss: 39

Proposal was very responsive to the tasks and emphases provided in the RFP.

Thomas Strom: 28

Scott Wright: 30

somewhat tailored approach; minimal detail on outreach and project identification/prioritization

Volkert, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 70 Points (17.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 69

Alison Moss: 60

The firm has done this type of work in the past, but they do not appear to have the depth of experience as some of the other firms.

Thomas Strom: 54

Scott Wright: 63

PM and others involved in project have extensive bike/ped experience; firm(s) have worked in Gainesville and state on related projects; multi-firm organizational approach

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Rachel Mandell: 47

Alison Moss: 45

Proposed team seems too large, and potentially unwieldy, to me.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 45

Good availability of staff; detailed and believable schedule

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 37

Alison Moss: 35

The Volkert team understands the project needs, but the proposal indicates they may not possess the same level of expertise (as other firms) to meet them.

Thomas Strom: 35

Scott Wright: 38

Proposal organization follows scope and covers all details of it; comprehensive understanding of project

Project Approach | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Rachel Mandell: 32

Alison Moss: 35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-426-DK

Alachua County Wide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

This proposal was long and repetitive, which causes concerns regarding project process and final deliverable, the Master Plan.

Thomas Strom: 34

Scott Wright: 38

Very thorough consideration of tasks needed to complete the project; strong public engagement component; tailored approach










ITA 23-426 Alachua Countywide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement

Final Audit Report

2023-11-15

Created:	2023-11-14
By:	Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA_YjKQx1IH6M264RyGkMZtEqMaKBjkcUp

"ITA 23-426 Alachua Countywide Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan and University of Florida Supplement" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
2023-11-14 - 0:58:33 AM GMT- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document e-signed by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-11-14 - 1:00:23 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) for signature
2023-11-14 - 1:00:24 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
2023-11-14 - 1:06:59 AM GMT- IP address: 104.28.32.207
-  Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
Signature Date: 2023-11-14 - 7:53:44 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2023-11-14 - 7:53:46 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
2023-11-15 - 1:53:15 PM GMT- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-11-15 - 8:56:27 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Agreement completed.
2023-11-15 - 8:56:27 PM GMT