



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

December 13, 2023

MEMORANDUM

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

From: Darryl R. Kight, CPPB, Procurement Supervisor 
Darryl Kight (Dec 13, 2023 10:28 EST)

Via: Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, Procurement Agent III 

SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services

<u>Solicitation Opening Date:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, August 23, 2023
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	715 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Downloaded by:</u>	35 Vendors
<u>Solicitations Submissions:</u>	10 Vendors

Firms:

3002 Surveying, LLC
Gainesville, FL 32606

Alliant Engineering, Incorporated
Jacksonville, FL 32256

Ayres Associates Inc
Eau Claire, WI 54701

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

DRMP, Inc.
Orlando, FL 32814

EDA Consultants Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32601

George F. Young, Inc.
St. Petersburg, FL 33701

NV5, Inc.
Orlando, FL 32822

Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation
Orlando, FL 32810

WGI, Inc.
West Palm Beach, FL 33411

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approve the Evaluation Committee’s ranking below for RFP 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services

1. EDA Consultants Inc.
2. Causseaux, Hewett, & Walpole, Inc.
3. George F. Young, Inc.
4. WGI, Inc.
5. DRMP, Inc.
6. Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation
7. 3002 Surveying, LLC
8. NV5, Inc.
9. Ayres Associates Inc
10. Alliant Engineering, Incorporated

Approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate agreements with the top three ranked firms.

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

TJ White

Dec 14, 2023

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

Date

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

TW/dk/lc/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 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services

Date: Monday, December 11, 2023

Start Time: 2:02 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 with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Brian Kauffman (Leader), Kevin Ratkus, Daniel Whitcraft.
- 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. **Second**, provide procurement points to members for VOW.
- 3.3. 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.
- 3.4. *As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.*
- 3.5. **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.

Aggregate Scores Summary

Vendor	Brian Kauffman	Kevin Ratkus	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
eda consultants, inc.	160	171	152	161
CHW	160	166	148	158
George F. Young, Inc.	155	157	154	155.33
WGI, Inc.	155	152	154	153.67
DRMP, Inc.	138	158	150	148.67
Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Cor...	150	138	153	147
3002 Surveying, LLC	149	150	140	146.33
NV5, Inc.	142	127	151	140
Ayres Associates Inc	148	129	141	139.33
Alliant Engineering, Inc.	143	125	149	139

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

- 3.6. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals. You have your proposal evaluation forms so now we can start discussions with the first vendor. (**Encourage dialog**)
 - 3.6.1. Discuss scores and make Changes if pertinent.
 - 3.6.2. Discussion record and Update: **Proposal Score Evaluation**
 - 3.6.2.1. Encourage discussion on the proposals, scoring and until all members are satisfied.
 - 3.6.2.2. NOTE: Agents will monitor the discussion, keep it on track; keep it on topic.
 - 3.6.3. Call for validation of RFP team **Proposal Scores** for the Team's Final Ranking.

3.6.4. Choose to have/not have Oral Presentation

4. Motion: Brian Kauffman motioned not to have Oral Presentations with the 3 top ranked firms, seconded by Kevin Ratkus.
Vote 3-0 in favor.

Motion to Approve Ranking: Daniel Whitcraft motioned to recommend the ranking to the board and authorize staff to negotiate an agreement with the top three (3) ranked firms, seconded by Kevin Ratkus.
Vote 3-0 in favor.

5. Public Comments (3 minutes):
6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Daniel Whitcraft moved to approve the Minutes; Kevin Ratkus seconded the motion.
Vote 3-0 in favor.
7. Meeting Adjourn at 2:19 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 24-23-LC

Annual Professional Surveying Services

RESPONSE DEADLINE: November 1, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Wednesday, December 13, 2023

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Annual Professional Surveying Services
Project ID	RFP 24-23-LC
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	September 13, 2023
Due Date	November 1, 2023
Procurement Agent	Leira Cruz Cáliz, CAPM, CPPB
Evaluators	Brian Kauffman, Kevin Ratkus, Daniel Whitcraft
Project Description	<p>Alachua County Board of County Commissioners is seeking proposals from licensed professionals (hereinafter, referred to as Consultants) for the provision of Annual Professional Surveying.</p> <p>The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit proposals from consultants to provide Professional Land Surveying and Plat Preparation Services on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>The annual services contract will not guarantee the successful consultant(s) a specified dollar value of work or limit the County's right to seek proposals and award other Professional Surveying Services to firm(s) other than the selected consultant(s) for this annual services contract.</p>

Introduction

Summary

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners (hereinafter, the "County" or "Alachua County") is seeking proposals from qualified individuals or entities (hereinafter, referred to as "Consultant" or the "proposer") for the provision of RFP 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services.

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](#).

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners is seeking proposals from licensed professionals (hereinafter, referred to as Consultants) for the provision of Annual Professional Surveying.

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit proposals from consultants to provide Professional Land Surveying and Plat Preparation Services on an as-needed basis.

The annual services contract will not guarantee the successful consultant(s) a specified dollar value of work or limit the County's right to seek proposals and award other Professional Surveying Services to firm(s) other than the selected consultant(s) for this annual services contract.

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

Leira Cruz Cáliz, CAPM, CPPB

Procurement Agent II

Email: lcruzcaliz@alachuacounty.us

Phone: [\(352\) 337-6268](tel:(352)337-6268)

Department:

Public Works

Timeline

OpenGov Release Project Date	September 13, 2023
Question Submission Deadline	October 22, 2023, 12:01am
Solicitation Submission Deadline	November 1, 2023, 2:00pm

<p>Solicitation Opening – Teams Meeting</p>	<p>November 1, 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
Aug 3, 2023 9:04 AM	Draft	Mandy Mullins
Aug 3, 2023 9:14 AM	Review	Mandy Mullins
Sep 6, 2023 4:49 PM	Final	Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, CAPM
Sep 6, 2023 4:49 PM	Post Pending	Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, CAPM
Sep 13, 2023 8:30 AM	Open	OpenGov Bot
Nov 1, 2023 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Nov 1, 2023 2:18 PM	Evaluation	Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, CAPM

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	3002 Surveying, LLC	Brian Murphy bmurphy@3002inc.com (352) 538-1320	Nov 1, 2023 1:45 PM
Submitted	Alliant Engineering, Inc.	Kathy Liguori kliguori@alliant-inc.com (904) 240-0300	Oct 26, 2023 9:45 PM
Submitted	Ayres Associates Inc	Jenn Stirmel stirmelj@ayresassociates.com	Oct 31, 2023 5:52 PM
Submitted	CHW	Shannon Braddy marketing@chw-inc.com (352) 331-1976	Nov 1, 2023 11:00 AM
Submitted	DRMP, Inc.	Lisa Greene marketingdept@drmp.com (407) 896-0594	Oct 31, 2023 1:49 PM
Submitted	George F. Young, Inc.	Christina Gorman cgorman@georgefyoung.com (813) 541-9902	Oct 31, 2023 12:44 PM
Submitted	NV5, Inc.	Candace Austin candace.austin@nv5.com	Oct 25, 2023 12:57 PM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	Sep 13, 2023 9:03 AM
Submitted	Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	Heather Krick marketing@ssmc.us (407) 292-8580	Nov 1, 2023 1:10 PM

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	WGI, Inc.	Jeremiah Slaymaker jeremiah.slaymaker@wginc.com (561) 687-2220	Nov 1, 2023 9:03 AM
Submitted	eda consultants, inc.	Ashley Scannella ascannella@edafl.com	Nov 1, 2023 9:14 AM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	3002 Surveying, LLC	Alliant Engineering, Inc.	Ayres Associates Inc	CHW
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-23-LC
Annual Professional Surveying Services

Question Title	DRMP, Inc.	George F. Young, Inc.	NV5, Inc.	Network Craze
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	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	Pass	No Response
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	No Response

Question Title	Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	WGI, Inc.	eda consultants, inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass

Question Title	Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	WGI, Inc.	eda consultants, inc.
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass

PRICING RESPONSES

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Set Aside

Oct 4, 2023 12:56 PM

Question: Will the County be doing a set aside for Surveying companies that are certified as an Alachua County Small Business Enterprise?

Oct 4, 2023 12:56 PM

Answered by Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, CAPM: For this solicitation, the County will not be awarding any points or preferences based on SBE.

Oct 13, 2023 7:37 AM

2. Small Business Enterprise

Oct 20, 2023 9:33 AM

Question: Based on the previous Q&A response it was stated that no points or preferences will be awarded based on SBE status.; however, this appears to be a contradiction to the Alachua County Administrative Code Sec. 22.11-204. - "Acquisition of Professional Services" which states: "When procuring professional services, the county shall endeavor to include SBE. The county's administrative procedures for the formal evaluation of professional services shall include but not be limited to SBE status." Can you please provide reconsideration to the previous Q&A response, and if Alachua County does decide to include additional preference points for certified Small Business Enterprise utilization, can you provide guidance as to how this will be evaluated?

Oct 20, 2023 9:33 AM

Answered by Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, CAPM: For this solicitation, the County will not award preference points for Small Business Enterprise, and Location. The County will also not be requiring Alachua County Government Minimum Wage.

Oct 20, 2023 2:51 PM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

Addendum #1

Oct 13, 2023 10:58 AM

This addendum extends submission deadline to Wednesday, November 1st, 2023

ADDENDA ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Addendum #1

Proposal	Confirmed	Confirmed At	Confirmed By
NV5, Inc.	X	Oct 25, 2023 12:48 PM	Candace Austin
Alliant Engineering, Inc.	X	Oct 16, 2023 11:06 AM	Kathy Liguori
George F. Young, Inc.	X	Oct 31, 2023 12:43 PM	Christi Gorman
DRMP, Inc.	X	Oct 23, 2023 2:52 PM	Lisa Greene
Ayres Associates Inc	X	Oct 13, 2023 11:08 AM	Tiffany Rivera
WGI, Inc.	X	Oct 30, 2023 7:34 AM	Michael Sackett
eda consultants, inc.	X	Nov 1, 2023 9:02 AM	Ashley Scannella
CHW	X	Nov 1, 2023 10:49 AM	Shannon Braddy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-23-LC
Annual Professional Surveying Services

Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	X	Nov 1, 2023 12:59 PM	Heather Krick
3002 Surveying, LLC	X	Oct 16, 2023 10:04 PM	Brian Murphy

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Nov 1, 2023 2:06 PM

Please see bid tabulation attached.

Notice #2

Nov 17, 2023 1:22 PM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Monday, November 27, 2023, at 10:00 AM**, to evaluate technical and written proposals and make final recommendations of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting RFP 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services

Time: Monday, November 27, 2023, at 10:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Administration Building

Third Floor Conference Room

12 SE 1st Street, Gainesville, FL 32601, Third Floor

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_YmZlYTk1OTctMTE3MC00NzRiLWlwMmltNzk5NGFhMmY5ZDcx%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%2294b8c9af-b3ad-4936-84ec-688266cf3236%22%7d

Meeting ID: 265 667 663 672

Passcode: 3Kknkk

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 469-998-7938](tel:+14699987938), [363372362#](tel:+14699987938) United States, Dallas

Phone Conference ID: 363 372 362#

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

Nov 22, 2023 1:12 PM

The Public Meeting scheduled for 10:00 am, November 27, 2023 has been cancelled and will be rescheduled at a later date.

EVALUATION

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Brian Kauffman	Assistant Public Works Director	Nov 20, 2023 11:21 AM
Kevin Ratkus	Senior Planner - Conservation Land Acquisition Coordinator	Nov 16, 2023 9:50 AM
Daniel Whitcraft	Director of Facilities	Nov 27, 2023 12:38 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	Brian Kauffman	Kevin Ratkus	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
eda consultants, inc.	160	171	152	161
CHW	160	166	148	158
George F. Young, Inc.	155	157	154	155.33
WGI, Inc.	155	152	154	153.67
DRMP, Inc.	138	158	150	148.67
Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	150	138	153	147
3002 Surveying, LLC	149	150	140	146.33
NV5, Inc.	142	127	151	140
Ayres Associates Inc	148	129	141	139.33

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 24-23-LC
Annual Professional Surveying Services

Vendor	Brian Kauffman	Kevin Ratkus	Daniel Whitcraft	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Alliant Engineering, Inc.	143	125	149	139

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%)
eda consultants, inc.	44.3	19	2	24.7
CHW	44.3	18.3	1	24.3
George F. Young, Inc.	40.3	18.7	5	24
WGI, Inc.	39	18	5	23.7
DRMP, Inc.	37.7	17	1	24.7
Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	36	16.3	5	24
3002 Surveying, LLC	38.3	15.3	5	23
NV5, Inc.	34.3	14.3	2	22.7
Ayres Associates Inc	34.3	14.7	5	23
Alliant Engineering, Inc.	34.7	13.7	5	22.7

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%)
eda consultants, inc.	24.3	9.3	19	9
CHW	23.7	9.3	19	9
George F. Young, Inc.	22.7	9.3	18.3	8.7
WGI, Inc.	23.3	9.3	18	8.7
DRMP, Inc.	24	8.7	18.3	9
Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	22.3	9	18	8.3
3002 Surveying, LLC	21.7	9	17.3	8.7
NV5, Inc.	23.3	8.3	18.3	8.3
Ayres Associates Inc	21	9	18.3	7.3

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%)
Alliant Engineering, Inc.	21.7	8	18.3	8

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 175)
eda consultants, inc.	9.3	161
CHW	9	158
George F. Young, Inc.	8.3	155.33
WGI, Inc.	8.7	153.67
DRMP, Inc.	8.3	148.67
Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation	8	147
3002 Surveying, LLC	8	146.33
NV5, Inc.	8.3	140
Ayres Associates Inc	6.7	139.33
Alliant Engineering, Inc.	7	139

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

3002 Surveying, LLC

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 28

Kevin Ratkus: 44

Daniel Whitcraft: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 14

Daniel Whitcraft: 12

Vague.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 5

No previous work

Kevin Ratkus: 5

No previous work

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

No previous work

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 21

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 22

Kevin Ratkus: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 20

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 9

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 15

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 9

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Mentioned AC would be a priority.

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 9

Kevin Ratkus: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Alliant Engineering, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 26

Kevin Ratkus: 35

Daniel Whitcraft: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 15

Kevin Ratkus: 12

Daniel Whitcraft: 14

Somewhat generic.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 5

No previous work

Kevin Ratkus: 5

No previous work

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

No previous work

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 19

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 6

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 7

Kevin Ratkus: 6

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Ayres Associates Inc

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 28

Kevin Ratkus: 32

Daniel Whitcraft: 43

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 17

Kevin Ratkus: 15

Daniel Whitcraft: 12

Talked about their finances, was looking for how they would approach our financial requirements.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 5

No previous work

Kevin Ratkus: 5

No previous work

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

No previous work

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 20

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 20

Did not see in proposal where they are based? I see two FL offices, but did not see what cities?

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 9

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

Did not see much related to scheduling?

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 8

Kevin Ratkus: 6

Daniel Whitcraft: 6

Did not see topics addressed in detail.

CHW	
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	
Brian Kauffman:	39
Kevin Ratkus:	48
Daniel Whitcraft:	46
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	
Brian Kauffman:	20
Kevin Ratkus:	20
Daniel Whitcraft:	15
Appeared as long as it does impact their current project schedule?	
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)	
Brian Kauffman:	1
\$389,634	
Kevin Ratkus:	1
\$389,634	
Daniel Whitcraft:	1
\$389,634	
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	
Brian Kauffman:	25
Kevin Ratkus:	25
Daniel Whitcraft:	23
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	
Brian Kauffman:	25
Kevin Ratkus:	23
Daniel Whitcraft:	23
Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	
Brian Kauffman:	10

Kevin Ratkus: 10
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20
Kevin Ratkus: 20
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10
Kevin Ratkus: 10
Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Again, if it does not impact their current schedule.

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10
Kevin Ratkus: 9
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

DRMP, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 24
Kevin Ratkus: 44
Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 15
Kevin Ratkus: 19
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 1
\$334,589
Kevin Ratkus: 1

\$334,589

Daniel Whitcraft: 1

\$334,589

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 25

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 24

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 8

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 8

Kevin Ratkus: 9

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

eda consultants, inc.	
Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	
	Brian Kauffman: 38
	Kevin Ratkus: 50
	Daniel Whitcraft: 45
Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	
	Brian Kauffman: 20
	Kevin Ratkus: 20
	Daniel Whitcraft: 17
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)	
\$244,518	Brian Kauffman: 2
\$244,518	Kevin Ratkus: 2
\$244,518	Daniel Whitcraft: 2
Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	
	Brian Kauffman: 25
	Kevin Ratkus: 25
	Daniel Whitcraft: 24
Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (14.3%)	
	Brian Kauffman: 25
	Kevin Ratkus: 25
	Daniel Whitcraft: 23
Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	
	Brian Kauffman: 10
	Kevin Ratkus: 10
	Daniel Whitcraft: 8
Project Team Points Based 20 Points (11.4%)	

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 19

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

George F. Young, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 30

Kevin Ratkus: 46

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 19

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 5

No previous work

Kevin Ratkus: 5

No previous work

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

No previous work

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 23

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 20

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 18

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 9

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

NV5, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 33

Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 16

Kevin Ratkus: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 2

\$233,560

Kevin Ratkus: 2

\$233,560

Daniel Whitcraft: 2

\$233,560

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 20

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 22

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 7

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 18

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10
Kevin Ratkus: 8
Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 9
Kevin Ratkus: 8
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Southeastern Surveying and Mapping Corporation

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 29
Kevin Ratkus: 34
Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 17
Kevin Ratkus: 15
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 5
No previous work
Kevin Ratkus: 5
No previous work
Daniel Whitcraft: 5
No previous work

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25
Kevin Ratkus: 23
Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25
Kevin Ratkus: 20
Daniel Whitcraft: 22

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10
Kevin Ratkus: 9
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20
Kevin Ratkus: 17
Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10
Kevin Ratkus: 8
Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 9
Kevin Ratkus: 7
Daniel Whitcraft: 8

WGI, Inc.

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)

Brian Kauffman: 30
Kevin Ratkus: 42
Daniel Whitcraft: 45

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.9%)

Brian Kauffman: 5

No previous work

Kevin Ratkus: 5

No previous work

Daniel Whitcraft: 5

No previous work

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 22

Daniel Whitcraft: 24

Project Approach | Points Based | 25 Points (14.3%)

Brian Kauffman: 25

Kevin Ratkus: 22

Daniel Whitcraft: 23

Project Manager | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 10

Daniel Whitcraft: 8

Project Team | Points Based | 20 Points (11.4%)

Brian Kauffman: 20

Kevin Ratkus: 17

Daniel Whitcraft: 17

Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5.7%)

Brian Kauffman: 10

Kevin Ratkus: 9

Daniel Whitcraft: 7

Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)
Brian Kauffman: 10
Kevin Ratkus: 8
Daniel Whitcraft: 8








ITA 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services

Final Audit Report

2023-12-14

Created:	2023-12-13
By:	Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAElf1dLp-oHBDzuoCr5iYnDmST7DIRrFT

"ITA 24-23-LC Annual Professional Surveying Services" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
2023-12-13 - 11:38:00 AM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document emailed to Leira Cruz Caliz (lcruzcaliz@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2023-12-13 - 11:39:58 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by Leira Cruz Caliz (lcruzcaliz@alachuacounty.us)
2023-12-13 - 12:33:23 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document e-signed by Leira Cruz Caliz (lcruzcaliz@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-12-13 - 12:33:35 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US) for signature
2023-12-13 - 12:33:36 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
2023-12-13 - 12:57:16 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@AlachuaCounty.US)
Signature Date: 2023-12-13 - 3:28:55 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2023-12-13 - 3:28:57 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
2023-12-14 - 4:37:13 PM GMT- IP address: 149.19.43.13
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2023-12-14 - 4:38:04 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 149.19.43.13

✔ Agreement completed.

2023-12-14 - 4:38:04 PM GMT