



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

August 31, 2023

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Darryl R. Kight, CPPB, Procurement Supervisor 
Darryl Kight (Aug 31, 2023 10:28 EDT)

FROM: Leira Cruz Cáliz, CPPB, Procurement Agent II 

SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex

Solicitation Opening Date: 2:00 PM, Wednesday, July 19, 2023
Solicitation Notifications View Count: 571 Vendors
Solicitations Downloaded by: 36 Vendors
Solicitations Submissions: 3 Vendors

Firms:

Causeaux, Hewett, & Walpole, Inc.
Alachua, FL 32615

EDA Consultants, Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32601

JBrown Professional Group Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32606

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee’s award ranking below for RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex.

1. EDA Consultants, Inc.
2. JBrown Professional Group Inc.
3. Causseaux, Hewett, & Walpole, Inc.

Authorize staff to negotiate 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 with the second ranked firm may be undertaken in the same manner and in order of ranking until an agreement is reached.

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



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

Sep 1, 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 Protest 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 (Recording)

Ranking for RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex

Date: 8/10/2023

Start Time: 10:01 am

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

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

- 2.1. Good morning, I am Leira Cruz Cáliz along with Darryl Kight, Procurement, and I will be leading our meeting today. As the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Dan Whitcraft (Leader), Danny Moore, and Dan Priscott.
- 2.2. Thank you, committee, for taking the time out of your busy schedule to evaluate these proposals. Welcome to the citizens attending this Public Meeting. This meeting is open to the public and recorded. The public will have an announced time of 3 minutes for public comments, which no responses will be provided.
 - 2.2.1. Please review the agenda on the screen.
- 2.3. The Committee Team Members (Members) will be evaluating submitted proposals, discussing their scores, and approving the Team's Ranking.
 - 2.3.1. This Team's final ranking will be submitted to the BoCC for their approval and authorization to negotiate a contract.

3. RFP Committee Team Member Instructions

- 3.1. **First**, all signed Disclosure Forms (Conflict of Interest) are on file. (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. **Second**, merge procurement administration points, VOW only.
- 3.4. **Third**, Call for review and validation of scores, including VOW to ensure they are the Members' final.
As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.

Vendor	Danny Moore	Dan Priscott	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
JBPro	141	141	150	144
eda consultants, inc.	159	118	152	143
CHW	153	106	147	135.33

Click a vendor's name to view the scorecard submitted by each evaluator for that proposal.
Click an evaluator's name to view the detailed scorecard for each proposal reviewed by that evaluator.

3.5. All members are encouraged to discuss all vendor submittals. (Chair will monitor)

- 3.5.1. Discuss scores and make finalize all updates.
- 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. The Chair 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.
- 3.5.4. Choose to not to have Oral Presentation

4. Motion: Dan Whitcraft motioned to have Oral Presentations with the top three firms: CHW, EDA Consultants and JBPro, seconded by Danny Moore.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

5. Public Comments (3 minutes): No public comments.
6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Dan Whitcraft moved to approve the Minutes; Dan Priscott seconded the motion.
Vote 3-0 in favor.
7. Meeting Adjourn at 10:16 am.

Public Meeting Minutes (Recording)

Ranking for RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex Oral Presentations

Date: August 25, 2023

Start Time: 2:01 pm

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

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

- 2.1. Good morning, I am Leira Cruz Cáliz along with Darryl Kight, Procurement, and I will be leading our meeting today. As the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Dan Whitcraft (Leader), Danny Moore, and Dan Priscott.
- 2.2. Thank you, committee, for taking the time out of your busy schedule to evaluate these proposals. Welcome to the citizens attending this Public Meeting. This meeting is open to the public and recorded. The public will have an announced time of 3 minutes for public comments, which no responses will be provided.
 - 2.2.1. Please review the agenda on the screen.
- 2.3. The Committee Team Members (Members) will be evaluating submitted proposals, discussing their scores, and approving the Team's Ranking.
 - 2.3.1. This Team's final ranking will be submitted to the BoCC for their approval and authorization to negotiate a contract.

3. RFP Committee Team Member Instructions

- 3.1. **First**, all signed Disclosure Forms (Conflict of Interest) are on file. (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. **Second**, merge procurement administration points, VOW only.
- 3.4. **Third**, Call for review and validation of scores, including VOW to ensure they are the Members' final.
As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.

Vendor	Danny Moore	Dan Priscott	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 375)
eda consultants, inc.	359	301	345	335
JBPro	340	321	335	332
CHW	352	283	323	319.33

- 3.5. All members are encouraged to discuss all vendor submittals. (Chair will monitor)
 - 3.5.1. Discuss scores and make finalize all updates.
 - 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. The Chair 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 to Approve Ranking: **Danny Moore** motion to recommend the final rankings above to be approved and sent to the BOCC for Approval. Then start contract negotiations the with the top ranked firm. If negotiations fail with the top ranked vendor, start contract negotiations with the second ranked firm, and so forth. Seconded by **Dan Priscott**.

Vote 3 - 0 in favor

5. Public Comments (3 minutes): none
6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: **Danny Moore** moved to approve the Minutes; **Dan Whitcraft** seconded the motion.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

7. Meeting Adjourn at 2:16 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 23-430-DK

Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex

RESPONSE DEADLINE: July 19, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Thursday, August 31, 2023

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex
Project ID	RFP 23-430-DK
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	June 14, 2023
Due Date	July 19, 2023
Procurement Agent	Darryl R Kight
Evaluators	Danny Moore, Dan Priscott, Daniel Whitcraft
Project Description	Purpose: This project will require a Development Plan application to the City of Gainesville and GRU for the proposed courthouse building, parking garage, and central energy plant, as well as storm water permitting through the St. Johns River Water Management District. This scope of work includes preparation of construction plans for the development, including all proposed site improvements.

INTRODUCTION

Summary

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners (hereinafter, the "County" or "Alachua County") is seeking proposals from qualified individuals or entities (hereinafter, referred to as "Consultant" or the "proposer") for the provision of RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex.

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

Purpose: This project will require a Development Plan application to the City of Gainesville and GRU for the proposed courthouse building, parking garage, and central energy plant, as well as storm water

permitting through the St. Johns River Water Management District. This scope of work includes preparation of construction plans for the development, including all proposed site improvements.

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:

Facilities Management

Timeline

OpenGov Release Project Date	June 14, 2023
Question Submission Deadline	July 9, 2023, 12:01am
Solicitation Submission Deadline	July 19, 2023, 2:00pm

<p>Solicitation Opening – Teams Meeting</p>	<p>July 19, 2023, 2:00pm</p> <p>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>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
May 16, 2023 3:51 PM	Draft	Theodore White
May 30, 2023 1:07 PM	Review	Mandy Mullins
Jun 13, 2023 3:40 PM	Final	Darryl R Kight
Jun 13, 2023 3:41 PM	Post Pending	Darryl R Kight
Jun 14, 2023 10:30 AM	Open	OpenGov Bot
Jul 19, 2023 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Jul 21, 2023 9:23 AM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	CHW	Shannon Braddy marketing@chw-inc.com (352) 331-1976	Jul 19, 2023 1:34 PM
Submitted	JBPro	Login MBD login.mbd@jbpro.com	Jul 19, 2023 12:17 PM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	Jun 15, 2023 7:56 AM
Submitted	eda consultants, inc.	Sergio Reyes ascannella@edafl.com (352) 373-3541	Jul 19, 2023 11:53 AM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	CHW	JBPro	Network Craze	eda consultants, inc.
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
State Compliance	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
Alachua County Government Minimum Wage	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass

Question Title	CHW	JBPro	Network Craze	eda consultants, inc.
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass
You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements..	Pass	Pass	No Response	Pass

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. Evaluation Committee

Jun 16, 2023 1:47 PM

Question: Who is on the evaluation committee for this project?

Jun 16, 2023 1:47 PM

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

Jun 23, 2023 3:21 PM

2. Cyber Liability Insurance

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Question: In Section 5.2, is “cyber liability coverage” applicable to this contract?

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Yes for this project.

Jun 20, 2023 7:40 PM

3. Building Commissioning

Jun 20, 2023 2:36 PM

Question: A number of the requirements in sections 6.2 through 6.9 seem to apply to building material selection and building commissioning, which is not standard for civil engineering scope. Should we include a consultant on the team who can perform these services?

Jun 20, 2023 2:36 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: No thank you.

Jul 5, 2023 4:44 PM

4. Schedule

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Question: Under section 9.1 Evaluation Criteria, Section 2.D. and 8 both ask about proposed schedule, but section 6.10 Anticipated Design Schedule states TBD for each stage. Can you verify if a schedule is set for this project?

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: Points will be based on the matrix provided by the consultant as it pertains to meeting and providing budget/time methodology.

Jul 5, 2023 4:13 PM

5. Resumes

Jun 20, 2023 2:38 PM

Question: Resumes are listed in both Section 7.3 and Section 7.4. Which area should they be included in?

Jun 20, 2023 2:38 PM

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

Jun 21, 2023 6:35 PM

6. Subconsultants

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Question: Should our proposal include the subconsultants mentioned in 6.1.H (environmental, geotechnical, traffic, landscape, lighting, architect)?

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: Proposals should include Environmental, Geo, Traffic, Landscape, Lighting (No Architect) subconsultants.

Jul 5, 2023 4:16 PM

7. Page Limit

Jun 20, 2023 2:36 PM

Question: Is there a page limit for the proposal or any of the individual sections?

Jun 20, 2023 2:36 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: See Section, Evaluation Phases, refer to the following: The Evaluation Committee will not be impressed with excessive boilerplate, excessive numbers of resumes, excessive length of resumes, excessive numbers of photographs, work that distant offices have performed, excessive participation by "business development" personnel, and the use of "professional" presenters who will not be involved in the project or future presentations, or work not involving personnel to be assigned to the proposed project.

Jun 29, 2023 8:20 AM

8. Points

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Question: Under section 9.1 Evaluation Criteria, can you please clarify how the points will be awarded under "section 2. Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements"? (Number F 1, 2, and 3 seem to have been taken from elsewhere in the rubric and do not match up with the points allotted for this section)

Jun 20, 2023 2:37 PM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: Points will be based on the matrix provided by the consultant as it pertains to meeting and providing budget/time methodology.

Jul 5, 2023 4:19 PM

9. Survey

Jul 7, 2023 10:01 AM

Question: Should surveying services be included?

Jul 7, 2023 10:01 AM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: Yes Please.

Jul 7, 2023 12:35 PM

10. Volume of previous work

Jul 7, 2023 10:50 AM

Question: Should the proposer include in our proposal our calculations of the fees rendered by Alachua County, or will these amounts be calculated by the County from their system?

Jul 7, 2023 10:50 AM

Answered by Darryl R Kight: The County will calculate volume figure from our finical system.

Jul 7, 2023 12:35 PM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

No Addenda issued.

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Jul 19, 2023 2:39 PM

Please see the attached document.

Notice #2

Jul 25, 2023 6:13 PM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Thursday, August 10, 2023 @ 10:00 am**, to discuss and update of the proposals for competitive solicitation for [RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex](#). The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

-

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for [RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex](#)

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

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

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 264 002 455 130

Passcode: TNNdBd

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 469-998-7938,,737295233#](#) United States, Dallas

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 23-430-DK

Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex

Phone Conference ID: 737 295 233#

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

Aug 12, 2023 6:46 PM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Friday, August 25, 2023 at 2:00 pm**, to discuss and update of the oral presentations for competitive solicitation for RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

-

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex

Time: Friday, August 25, 2023, at 2:00 pm Eastern Time (US and Canada)

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: 267 346 648 875

Passcode: aifiME

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

Or call in (audio only)

+1 469-998-7938,,303061455# United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 303 061 455#

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 #4

Aug 12, 2023 6:47 PM

Attached is the Recorded Public Meeting and the Public Meeting minutes.

Notice #5

Aug 25, 2023 2:25 PM

Included are the Agenda, Minutes and Recording for the Public Meeting for Oral Presentations

EVALUATION

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Danny Moore	Project Coordinator	Jul 25, 2023 6:45 AM
Dan Priscott	Administrative Director	Jul 28, 2023 2:47 PM
Daniel Whitcraft	Director of Facilities	Jul 24, 2023 12:34 PM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

- A. Does the project manager have experience with responsibility for projects of comparable size and scope? Did he/she have a good understanding of this project?
- B. Did the project manager participate in the presentation? How effectively did he/she communicate ideas and respond to questions?

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

Description:

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

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Danny Moore	Dan Priscott	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 375)
eda consultants, inc.	359	301	345	335
JBPro	340	321	335	332
CHW	352	283	323	319.33

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 23-430-DK
Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex

Vendor	Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
eda consultants, inc.	39.7	17.3	1	21.3
JBPro	41.7	16.7	0	22.7
CHW	37.7	16.3	1	20

Vendor	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
eda consultants, inc.	21.7	8.3	17	8
JBPro	22.3	7.7	16.3	8.3
CHW	20	7.3	16.3	8

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	Understanding of Project Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	Responsiveness to Questions Points Based 40 Points (10.7%)	Project Team Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
eda consultants, inc.	8.7	49	39	47.3
JBPro	8.3	48	37.3	48
CHW	8.7	46	36.7	46.7

Vendor	Project Manager Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	Other Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 375)
eda consultants, inc.	48.7	8	335
JBPro	48.3	6.3	332
CHW	48.3	6.3	319.33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

CHW	
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	
Danny Moore: 40	
Dan Priscott: 28	
Daniel Whitcraft: 45	

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

Danny Moore: 20
Dan Priscott: 12
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

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

Danny Moore: 1 \$353,020.30
Dan Priscott: 1 \$353,020.30
Daniel Whitcraft: 1 \$353,020.30

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

Danny Moore: 23
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

Danny Moore: 23
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

Danny Moore: 9
Dan Priscott: 5
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Danny Moore: 17
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

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

Danny Moore: 10

Dan Priscott: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Schedule was a bit difficult to follow, for instance, the transition from Design Docs to Pre-Con Docs, i found hard to follow.

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

Danny Moore: 10

Dan Priscott: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Danny Moore: 50

Dan Priscott: 45

Daniel Whitcraft: 43

Not up to date on progress of PD Amendment

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

Danny Moore: 40

Dan Priscott: 35

Daniel Whitcraft: 35

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

Danny Moore: 50

Dan Priscott: 45

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

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

Danny Moore: 50

Dan Priscott: 47

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.7%)

Danny Moore: 9

Dan Priscott: 5

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

eda consultants, inc.

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

Danny Moore: 42
Dan Priscott: 32
Daniel Whitcraft: 45

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

Danny Moore: 20
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

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

Danny Moore: 1
\$344,234.44
Dan Priscott: 1
\$344,234.44
Daniel Whitcraft: 1
\$344,234.44

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

Danny Moore: 25
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 24

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

Danny Moore: 24
Dan Priscott: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Green Building approach, COG Downtown Master Plan and how the Court Complex fits into plan.

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

Danny Moore: 9
Dan Priscott: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 9

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

Danny Moore: 18

Dan Priscott: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Presented Org Chart, including subconsultants.

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

Danny Moore: 10

Dan Priscott: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Somewhat generic.

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

Danny Moore: 10

Dan Priscott: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Danny Moore: 50

Dan Priscott: 47

Daniel Whitcraft: 50

PD Amendment/Road Vacating.

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

Danny Moore: 40

Dan Priscott: 38

Daniel Whitcraft: 39

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

Danny Moore: 50

Dan Priscott: 44

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

Project Manager Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
Danny Moore: 50
Dan Priscott: 47
Daniel Whitcraft: 49

Other Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Danny Moore: 10
Dan Priscott: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Difference from others, realistic understanding/expectations about Stormwater credits.

JBPro
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
Danny Moore: 37
Dan Priscott: 42
Daniel Whitcraft: 46

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)
Danny Moore: 16
Dan Priscott: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Using UF was an example is probably not a fair comparison given the differences in AHJ.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)
Danny Moore: 0 \$832,516.18
Dan Priscott: 0 \$832,516.18
Daniel Whitcraft: 0 \$832,516.18

Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
Danny Moore: 23
Dan Priscott: 20

Daniel Whitcraft: 25

Explained the history of the site well.

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

Danny Moore: 22

Dan Priscott: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

Danny Moore: 7

Dan Priscott: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Danny Moore: 16

Dan Priscott: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

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

Danny Moore: 10

Dan Priscott: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Using UF vas an example is probably not a fair comparison given the differences in AHJ.

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

Danny Moore: 10

Dan Priscott: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Danny Moore: 50

Dan Priscott: 46

Daniel Whitcraft: 48

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

Danny Moore: 40
Dan Priscott: 35
Daniel Whitcraft: 37
Project Team Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
Danny Moore: 50
Dan Priscott: 47
Daniel Whitcraft: 47
Project Manager Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
Danny Moore: 50
Dan Priscott: 47
Daniel Whitcraft: 48
Other Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Danny Moore: 9
Dan Priscott: 5
Daniel Whitcraft: 5

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Danny Moore	Project Coordinator	Jul 25, 2023 6:45 AM
Dan Priscott	Administrative Director	Jul 28, 2023 2:47 PM
Daniel Whitcraft	Director of Facilities	Jul 24, 2023 12:34 PM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Description:

- A. Resumes of the key staff support the firm's Competency in doing this type of work? Key staff includes the Project Manager, and other project team professionals.
- B. Has the firm done this type of work in the past?

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

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

Description:

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

3. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.

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

Description:
Points Provided by Procurement.

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

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

Description:

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

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Danny Moore	Dan Priscott	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
JBPro	141	141	150	144
eda consultants, inc.	159	118	152	143
CHW	153	106	147	135.33

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%)
JBPro	41.7	16.7	0	22.7
eda consultants, inc.	39.7	17.3	1	21.3
CHW	37.7	16.3	1	20

Vendor	Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
JBPro	22.3	7.7	16.3	8.3
eda consultants, inc.	21.7	8.3	17	8
CHW	20	7.3	16.3	8

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 175)
JBPro	8.3	144
eda consultants, inc.	8.7	143
CHW	8.7	135.33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

CHW	
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)	
Danny Moore: 40	
Dan Priscott: 28	
Daniel Whitcraft: 45	
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)	
Danny Moore: 20	
Dan Priscott: 12	
Daniel Whitcraft: 17	

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

Danny Moore: 1
\$353,020.30

Dan Priscott: 1
\$353,020.30

Daniel Whitcraft: 1
\$353,020.30

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

Danny Moore: 23

Dan Priscott: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

Danny Moore: 23

Dan Priscott: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

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

Danny Moore: 9

Dan Priscott: 5

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

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

Danny Moore: 17

Dan Priscott: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

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

Danny Moore: 10

Dan Priscott: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Schedule was a bit difficult to follow, for instance, the transition from Design Docs to Pre-Con Docs, i found hard to follow.

Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Danny Moore: 10
Dan Priscott: 8
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

eda consultants, inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
Danny Moore: 42
Dan Priscott: 32
Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)
Danny Moore: 20
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)
Danny Moore: 1 \$344,234.44
Dan Priscott: 1 \$344,234.44
Daniel Whitcraft: 1 \$344,234.44

Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
Danny Moore: 25
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)
Danny Moore: 24
Dan Priscott: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Green Building approach, COG Downtown Master Plan and how the Court Complex fits into plan.

Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Danny Moore: 9
Dan Priscott: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 9

Project Team Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)
Danny Moore: 18
Dan Priscott: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Presented Org Chart, including subconsultants.

Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Danny Moore: 10
Dan Priscott: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Somewhat generic.

Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Danny Moore: 10
Dan Priscott: 8
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

JBPro
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (13.3%)
Danny Moore: 37
Dan Priscott: 42
Daniel Whitcraft: 46

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)
Danny Moore: 16
Dan Priscott: 18
Daniel Whitcraft: 16

Using UF vas an example is probably not a fair comparison given the differences in AHJ.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)	
Danny Moore: 0	\$832,516.18
Dan Priscott: 0	\$832,516.18
Daniel Whitcraft: 0	\$832,516.18

Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)	
Danny Moore: 23	
Dan Priscott: 20	
Daniel Whitcraft: 25	

Explained the history of the site well.

Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (6.7%)	
Danny Moore: 22	
Dan Priscott: 23	
Daniel Whitcraft: 22	

Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	
Danny Moore: 7	
Dan Priscott: 8	
Daniel Whitcraft: 8	

Project Team Points Based 20 Points (5.3%)	
Danny Moore: 16	
Dan Priscott: 15	
Daniel Whitcraft: 18	

Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)	
Danny Moore: 10	
Dan Priscott: 8	
Daniel Whitcraft: 7	

Using UF vas an example is probably not a fair comparison given the differences in AHJ.

Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.7%)
Danny Moore: 10
Dan Priscott: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 8











ITA 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex

Final Audit Report

2023-09-01

Created:	2023-08-31
By:	Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAqIUZF7hWHsunZO48T_n0VR76fm5XQbOM

"ITA 23-430-DK Civil Engineering for the New County Court Complex" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
2023-08-31 - 1:03:50 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Document emailed to Leira Cruz Caliz (lcruzcaliz@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2023-08-31 - 1:05:35 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Leira Cruz Caliz (lcruzcaliz@alachuacounty.us)
2023-08-31 - 1:07:23 PM GMT- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document e-signed by Leira Cruz Caliz (lcruzcaliz@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-08-31 - 1:07:48 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) for signature
2023-08-31 - 1:07:49 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
2023-08-31 - 2:27:10 PM GMT- IP address: 66.231.140.136
-  Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
Signature Date: 2023-08-31 - 2:28:33 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 66.231.140.136
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2023-08-31 - 2:28:34 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
2023-09-01 - 7:04:25 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-09-01 - 7:08:26 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 163.120.80.69

✔ Agreement completed.

2023-09-01 - 7:08:26 PM GMT