



ALACHUA COUNTY

Budget and Fiscal Services

Procurement

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB
Procurement Manager

Thomas J. Rouse
Contracts Supervisor

May 16, 2024

MEMORANDUM

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

From: Precious Merriweather, Procurement Agent I *Precious Merriweather*
Precious Merriweather (May 17, 2024 13:07 EDT)

SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Study for Cost-Revenue Analysis

<u>Solicitation Deadline:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, March 20, 2024
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	528 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Downloads:</u>	14 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Submissions:</u>	3 Vendors

Vendors:

Matrix Consulting Group
San Mateo, CA 94402

MGT of America Consulting, LLC
Tampa, FL 33609

American MindTrust*
Jacksonville, FL 32256

*This vendor was not evaluated during the second phase.

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approves the Evaluation Committee’s award ranking below for RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

1. Matrix Consulting Group
2. MGT of America Consulting, LLC

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

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

fwib

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

17/05/24

Date

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

PM/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.



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 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

RESPONSE DEADLINE: March 20, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Thursday, May 16, 2024

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis
Project ID	RFP 24-479-PM
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	February 21, 2024
Due Date	March 20, 2024
Procurement Agent	Precious Merriweather
Evaluators	Alex Corales, Alex Corona, Maureen Rischitelli
Project Description	Purpose: This Request for Proposal (RFP) invites qualified and experienced consulting firms to submit proposals for conducting a comprehensive Government Fee Study. The objective of this study is to assess and analyze the existing fee structures across various government departments and agencies. The selected firm will be tasked with evaluating the current fee models, benchmarking against industry standards, and selected comparative governments, and providing recommendations for optimizing and rationalizing fee structures.

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 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis.

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](#), [Submittals](#), [Pricing](#) and [Sample Agreement](#).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Purpose: This Request for Proposal (RFP) invites qualified and experienced consulting firms to submit proposals for conducting a comprehensive Government Fee Study. The objective of this study is to assess and analyze the existing fee structures across various government departments and agencies. The selected firm will be tasked with evaluating the current fee models, benchmarking against industry standards, and selected comparative governments, and providing recommendations for optimizing and rationalizing fee structures.

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

Precious Merriweather

Procurement Agent I

Email: pmerriweather@alachuacounty.us

Phone: [\(352\) 337-6269](tel:(352)337-6269)

Department:

Office of Management and Budget

Timeline

Solicitation Release Date	February 21, 2024
Question Submission Deadline	March 3, 2024, 12:01am
Solicitation Submission Deadline	March 20, 2024, 2:00pm

<p>Solicitation Opening – Teams Meeting</p>	<p>March 20, 2024, 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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Date	Changed To	Changed By
Jan 4, 2024 3:07 PM	Draft	Precious Merriweather
Jan 24, 2024 10:51 AM	Review	Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, CAPM
Feb 19, 2024 8:24 AM	Final	Precious Merriweather
Feb 19, 2024 3:21 PM	Post Pending	Precious Merriweather
Feb 21, 2024 8:30 AM	Open	OpenGov Bot
Mar 20, 2024 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Mar 20, 2024 2:58 PM	Evaluation	Precious Merriweather

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
No Bid	FentonStrategic Solutions: Implies a focus on strategic planning and solutions in challenging environments.	MICHAEL FENTON michaelandrewfenton@gmail.com	Mar 20, 2024 10:18 AM
No Bid	Fisher Scientific	John Bailey john.bailey@thermofisher.com	Feb 25, 2024 12:34 PM
Submitted	MGT of America Consulting, LLC	Shannon Blakey rcvrfp@mgtamer.com	Mar 20, 2024 12:57 PM
Submitted	Matrix Consulting Group	Richard Brady rbrady@matrixcg.net (650) 858-0507	Mar 13, 2024 11:33 AM
No Bid	Network Craze	Michael Featherstone mfeatherstone@networkcraze.com	Feb 21, 2024 9:33 AM
Excluded	American MindTrust	Raheem Williams raheem@americanmindtrust.com (904) 343-1597	Mar 14, 2024 1:52 AM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	MGT of America Consulting, LLC	Matrix Consulting Group
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Question Title	MGT of America Consulting, LLC	Matrix Consulting Group
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 1: SBE Proposer	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Certificate	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 2: 30% SBE Proposer Participation	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Certificate	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 3: 15% - 29% SBE Prosper Participation	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Certificate	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 4: No Subcontractors	Pass	Pass
Consultant Small Business Enterprise Good Faith Effort Option 5.	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Government Minimum Wage	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Location Preference	Pass	Pass
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass

PRICING RESPONSES

TABLE 1 (Table 1 of 2)

Line Item	Description	Quantity	Unit of Measure	American MindTrust			Matrix Consulting Group		
				Unit Cost	Discount (%)	Total	Unit Cost	Discount (%)	Total
1	All research, review, drafting and presentation of the Master Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis for Fiscal Year 2023-2024	1	Lump Sum			NaN			NaN
Total						\$0.00			\$0.00

TABLE 1 (Table 2 of 2)

Line Item	Description	Quantity	Unit of Measure	MGT of America Consulting, LLC		
				Unit Cost	Discount (%)	Total
1	All research, review, drafting and presentation of the Master Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis for Fiscal Year 2023-2024	1	Lump Sum			NaN
Total						\$0.00

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. Outline

Mar 1, 2024 12:35 PM

Question: Can you clarify the order of preferred proposal content? Should we follow page 21 or 22 of the RFP?

Mar 1, 2024 12:35 PM

Answered by Maureen Rischitelli: Page 22

Mar 4, 2024 8:33 AM

2. Pricing Information

Mar 1, 2024 12:35 PM

Question: Where in the proposal would you like us to include costs?

Mar 1, 2024 12:35 PM

Answered by Maureen Rischitelli: Separate cost sheet

Mar 4, 2024 8:33 AM

3. No subject

Mar 1, 2024 12:36 PM

Question: When was the County's last fee study conducted? Was it done in-house or externally? If externally, by whom?

Mar 1, 2024 12:36 PM

Answered by Maureen Rischitelli: Fiscal Year 2017, external Fiscal Choice Consulting

Mar 4, 2024 8:33 AM

4. No subject

Mar 1, 2024 12:37 PM

Question: What is the County's anticipated timeline for completion of the project?

Mar 1, 2024 12:37 PM

Answered by Maureen Rischitelli: By June 30, 2024 so fees can be calculated for FY25 Budget

Mar 4, 2024 8:33 AM

5. No subject

Mar 1, 2024 12:37 PM

Question: Does the County have a project budget for this study? If yes, can it be shared?

Mar 1, 2024 12:37 PM

Answered by Precious Merriweather: \$40,000.00

Mar 1, 2024 3:35 PM

6. No subject

Mar 1, 2024 12:39 PM

Question: Would you like us to include information about specific past project references (contact name, email, etc.) or general experience summaries?

Mar 1, 2024 12:39 PM

Answered by Maureen Rischitelli: References with County experience, provide contact name and email

Mar 4, 2024 8:33 AM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

Addendum #1

Mar 13, 2024 12:24 PM

Please use the [See What Changed](#) link to view all the changes made by this addendum.

Solicitation Submission Deadline has been extended to March 20, 2024, 2:00pm

ADDENDA ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Addendum #1

Proposal	Confirmed	Confirmed At	Confirmed By
Matrix Consulting Group			
American MindTrust	X	Mar 13, 2024 12:55 PM	Raheem Williams
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	X	Mar 20, 2024 12:54 PM	Shannon Blakey

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Mar 20, 2024 2:27 PM

Please see the bid tabulation for bid [RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis](#).

Attachments:

· [BT 24-479 AC Fee Schedule for Cost - Revenue Analysis](#)

Notice #2

Apr 4, 2024 4:27 PM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend a Public Meeting on **Wednesday, April 17, 2024, at 1:00 PM**, for vendors to attend and ask questions about the process and the software.

Topic: Public Notice of Public Meeting for RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost Revenue

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Time: Wednesday, April 17, 2024, at 1:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: County Administration Building

Third Floor Conference Room

12 SE 1st Street

Gainesville, FL 32601

Microsoft Teams Need help? Join the meeting now

https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_NDUxZWUyODYtOWVhOC00ZTdmLWlxNjAtYTlyM2YwZDgyMTY0%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22a7415bac-2a66-4acb-a196-d73a8994b0a7%22%7d

Meeting ID: 254 217 843 341

Passcode: fG9oDN

Dial-in by phone +1 469-998-7938,,661401807# United States, Dallas Find a local number

Phone conference ID: 661 401 807#

Notice #3

Apr 18, 2024 3:58 PM

Please see attached agenda, meeting minutes and recording for the Public Meeting held on April 17th, 2024.

Attachments:

- [RECORDING Fee Study 24-479-PM Public Meeting](#)
- [RFP 24-479-PM - Meeting Minutes](#)
- [RFP Agenda RFP 24-479-PM](#)

Notice #4

Apr 19, 2024 12:10 PM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Tuesday, May 7, 2024, at 11:00 AM**, to evaluate oral presentations and make final recommendations of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Time: Tuesday, May 7, 2024, at 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: County Administration Building
Third Floor Conference Room

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

12 SE 1st Street
Gainesville, FL 32601

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_ZGQ0ZTA1MmMtODdiMC00MmRjLTg0NGYtMzc2NWE5OWI0MWUy%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22a7415bac-2a66-4acb-a196-d73a8994b0a7%22%7d

Meeting ID: 234 415 038 840

Passcode: 7AQuxD

Dial-in by phone

[+1 469-998-7938](tel:+14699987938), [919046575#](tel:+1919046575) United States, Dallas

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 919 046 575#

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.

Attachments:

· [PM Notice RFP 24-479-PM - Public Meeting May 7th Oral Presentations](#)

Notice #5

Apr 26, 2024 11:25 AM

Subject: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for Oral Presentations RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Monday, May 6, 2024, at 11:00 AM**, to evaluate oral presentations and make final recommendations of the proposals for competitive solicitation for RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis. The final recommendations will be sent to the Board of County Commissioners.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Time: Monday, May 6, 2024, at 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

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

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[https://teams.microsoft.com/dl/launcher/launcher.html?url=%2F %23%2F%2Fmeetup-join%2F19%3Ameeting_ZGQ0ZTA1MmMtODdiMC00MmRjLTg0NGYtMzc2NWE5OWl0MWUy%40thread.v2%2F0%3Fcontext%3D%257b%2522Tid%2522%253a%252290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%2522%252c%2522Oid%2522%253a%2522a7415bac-2a66-4acb-a196-d73a8994b0a7%2522%257d%26anon%3Dtrue&type=meetup-join&deeplinkId=f182f99e-d535-43c7-aa98-89569b21b556&directDl=true&msLaunch=true&enableMobilePage=true&suppressPrompt=true](https://teams.microsoft.com/dl/launcher/launcher.html?url=%2F%23%2F%2Fmeetup-join%2F19%3Ameeting_ZGQ0ZTA1MmMtODdiMC00MmRjLTg0NGYtMzc2NWE5OWl0MWUy%40thread.v2%2F0%3Fcontext%3D%257b%2522Tid%2522%253a%252290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%2522%252c%2522Oid%2522%253a%2522a7415bac-2a66-4acb-a196-d73a8994b0a7%2522%257d%26anon%3Dtrue&type=meetup-join&deeplinkId=f182f99e-d535-43c7-aa98-89569b21b556&directDl=true&msLaunch=true&enableMobilePage=true&suppressPrompt=true)

Meeting ID: 234 415 038 840

Passcode: 7AQuxD

Dial-in by phone

[+1 469-998-7938](tel:+14699987938), [919046575#](tel:+1919046575) United States, Dallas

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 919 046 575#

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

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.

Attachments:

· [PM Notice RFP 24-479-PM - Public Meeting May 6th Oral Presentations](#)

EVALUATION

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Alex Corales	Sr. Fiscal Assistant	Apr 4, 2024 6:13 PM
Alex Corona	Financial management analyst	Mar 20, 2024 5:19 PM
Maureen Rischitelli	Budget Manager	Mar 22, 2024 10:35 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability and Competency of the Consultant	Points Based	50 (12.5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the Consultant provide a brief statement of background, organization, and size?
- B. Does the Consultant have experience with past work of similar scope and budget?
Has the Consultant recently done this type of work for a state, or local government in the past?
- C. Does the Consultant’s workload and ability satisfy County requirements for this project?
- D. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 21-30 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 11-20 points - Average Experience
- C. 0-10 points - Minimal Experience

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications	Points Based	30 (7.5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was a project team identified?
- B. Do the Project Manager, Project Team and Key Staff have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?
- C. Do the Project Manager, Project Team and Key Staff have experience with state or local government?
- D. Does the Project Manager have a stable job history?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

- E. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?
- F. Are there factors, such as unique abilities, which would make a noticeable (positive) impact on the project?
- G. Was a point of contact identified?
- H. Was there an alternate to the point of contact identified?
- I. Are the subcontractors, if any, identified?
- J. Does the subcontractor have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. If the work was acceptable, award up to ten (10) points.
- B. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
- C. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Understanding and Approach	Points Based	50 (12.5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project, the scope, and objectives through a concise narrative?
- B. Did the Consultant describe the approach to the provision of services as required and the specific work plan to be employed to implement it?
- C. Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?
- D. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?
- E. Does the proposal specifically address the County's needs or is it "generic" in content?
- F. Does the proposal indicate how this project fits into the total workload of the Consultant during the project period?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. If the work was acceptable, award up to twenty-five (25) points.
- B. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
- C. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements	Points Based	30 (7.5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did Consultant provide a draft project schedule that includes: milestones, individual tasks and major deliverable deadlines?
- B. Is the draft project schedule reasonable based on quantity of personnel assigned to the project?
- C. Did the Consultant provide the Project Manager, Project Team, and Key Staff’s percentage of involvement, tasks and/or hours assigned?
- D. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?
- E. Is the pricing provided reasonable for the project’s tasks?
- F. Is the pricing in line with the County’s budget?
- G. Does the information contained in the proposal indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time and budget requirement?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Proposal Organization	Points Based	10 (2.5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was proposal organization per the RFP? Did Consultant include a letter of interest?
- 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)
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)
Location	Points Based	10 (2.5% of Total)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
 RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM
 Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Description:
 Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE)	Points Based	15 (3.8% of Total)

Description:
 Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Understanding of Project	Points Based	50 (12.5% 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% 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 (12.5% 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?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Manager	Points Based	50 (12.5% 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 (2.5% of Total)

Description:

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

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Alex Corales	Alex Corona	Maureen Rischitelli	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Matrix Consulting Group	355	262	350	322.33
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	338	249	250	279
American MindTrust Excluded	129	120	60	103

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Vendor	Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (7.5%)	Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Points Based 30 Points (7.5%)
Matrix Consulting Group	42.7	24.7	41	28.3
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	39	24	33.3	17.3
American MindTrust Excluded	27.3	12.7	33.7	22

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (1.3%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (3.8%)
Matrix Consulting Group	9.3	5	0	0
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	5.3	5	0	0
American MindTrust Excluded	7.3	0	0	0

Vendor	Understanding of Project Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Responsiveness to Questions Points Based 40 Points (10%)	Project Team Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)	Project Manager Points Based 50 Points (12.5%)
Matrix Consulting Group	45.7	36.7	41.7	40
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	36.7	35	36.7	41.7
American MindTrust Excluded	0	0	0	0

Vendor	Other Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Matrix Consulting Group	7.3	322.33
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	5	279

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Vendor	Other Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)	Total Score (Max Score 400)
American MindTrust	0	103
Excluded		

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Matrix Consulting Group

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 43

The company has a brief statement of their background, work completed and the size of their group. They demonstrated that they have the experience to take on the task of the fee study not only in the state of Florida but in other states as well. The work load of two being in the final report does indicate that they should be able to have staff available to commit to our project. These two projects in final report are a part of six projects in total. The group mentioned that this work will not be subcontracted out.

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 25

Alex Corona: 19

The project team was identified being three members. The staff combined do have enough experience to take on the project; however, one area of concern is the resume of Abnash does not match up with experience mentioned on page 5 or PDF page 8. This denotes attention to detail was clearly missed. The job history seems stable and the three members have worked on several projects together which indicate that they are used to working together. The team does seem appropriate for the project. There is a Liaison which is the President of the group and Courtney Ramos the senior vice president as the POC for the proposal. There are no subcontractors.

Maureen Rischitelli: 30

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 38

The proposal did provide a thorough understanding of the project. The proposal went through each section of how they would approach each section of the project. These are broken down into tasks. I did feel that part of the proposal was sort of generic in nature. However, the groups work in fee studies allows for them to have a basic template and then tailor it to their client. The one area of concern is the

project timeline. The entity states it takes approximately 4-5 months to complete and we are looking for a faster turn around. The group states that they are able to make it happen but the timeline would be based off of starting on April 1st.

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 30

Alex Corona: 25

The group provided all the information for all of the questions provided, pricing fell in line and that they would meet the timeline IF it started April 1st.

Maureen Rischitelli: 30

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 10

Alex Corona: 8

Maureen Rischitelli: 10

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

Alex Corales: 5

No Prior Payments

Alex Corona: 5

No Prior Payments

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

No Prior Payments

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 50

Alex Corona: 37

The presentation did touchup on the different departments that we have and types of fees that we have which made it seem more tailored to our county.

Maureen Rischitelli: 50

Understands focus is on scaled downnumber of departments

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Alex Corales: 40

Alex Corona: 30

A lot of the questions that we going to be asked were already answered in the presentation.

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 50

Alex Corona: 25

The project team did participate in the meeting. The plan of action was presented and a new updated timeline was presented to give a good idea of when the project would more and likely begin and end.

Maureen Rischitelli: 50

project team understands and supports the operational aspects of departments

Project Manager | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 25

The project manager did show they have experience with presentations and seemed comfortable with projects. However, there was no real comparison of projects except the mention of projects from all around the U.S.

Maureen Rischitelli: 50

Team recognized that we are not doing all departments inthis review

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 10

Alex Corona: 7

The team did present a good approach to the fee schedule. It is basic but effective and how the fundamentals of a LSS project would end up. The methods to getting the data is the key and they seemed to provide an idea that there is a need to extrapolate that data in the best way to get the best data.

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

MGT of America Consulting, LLC

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 42

The MGT firm does have plenty of experience amongst its many employees. They have even shown an attachment of a previous job completed in the region. Non of the work will be subcontracted out. However, a lot of the key highlighted work has been outside of the state of Florida.

Maureen Rischitelli: 30

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 25

Alex Corona: 22

The project team was identified. The amount of experience amongst the staff is extensive and in the right areas. They do have a lot of experience with local and state governments. There is a point of contact identified.

Maureen Rischitelli: 25

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 30

The project did demonstrate what a fee study in general would undertake. I do not feel that proposal fully undertakes the full understanding of the project. The consultant described the approach and outlaid that approach in the project schedule. The project schedule does outlay the various tasks and emphasizes on what needs to be done and when. The proposal addresses everything in more of a generic content. Although the narrative mentions that they will meet the June 30th timeline there is no mention of other ongoing projects.

Maureen Rischitelli: 25

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 25

Alex Corona: 22

The consultant provided overall tasks that are further broken down into subtasks to be completed. The schedule is reasonable to the amount of staff that are proposed to be assigned to the project. The roles including the project manager, team and key staff were identified but not their percentage. However,

the actual project time breakdown is provided. The pricing is more than double the allotted amount. The information contained does state it will meet the time frame.

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 8

Alex Corona: 3

The organization included a LOI, all paper work was provided but there was a lot of resumes and boilerplates

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

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

Alex Corales: 5

No Prior Payments

Alex Corona: 5

No Prior Payments

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

No Prior Payments

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 35

The presentation did include some understanding of the project as far as fee studies go but was not too specific to the project but was more generic to the state of Florida in general.

Maureen Rischitelli: 30

Appreciate they have reviewed City and mentioned community initiatives but those are not related to this study

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Alex Corales: 40

Alex Corona: 25

The answers were directed towards older studies and studies around the state

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 25

The project team did participate and the action plan was presented.

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Project Manager | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 50

Alex Corona: 35

I do believe that they do have the experience to handle the project.

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 5

Alex Corona: 5

They have had experience in the past with our county but things have changed dramatically since the pandemic.

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

**American MindTrust
(Excluded)**

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 40

Alex Corona: 32

They have financial and operational background but it does not seem that they have worked directly in the fee study. Some of the peer reviewed papers are different quarters which does show Raheem has an

understanding of economics and labor. Keifer has a logistical background with maintenance records and reports which indicates they probably worked in the S4 maybe the G4 office. This can lead to having the skills of attention to detail.

Maureen Rischitelli: 10

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 20

Alex Corona: 18

The project team was identified, the staff do have some experience that can equate somewhat to this project, they have experience with state and local government, POC was identified but no other POC identified. There were no subcontractors identified.

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 40

Alex Corona: 36

The firm does demonstrate an understanding of the program. The firm does seem to have somewhat of a tailored approach to the project. The firm does state that they will have two working full time on the project but they do not state how it fits with other projects that they have if they have other projects. Without the demonstration of other projects it does not indicate the workload of the firm. I understand that the firm stated they would have two working full time it does not mean that they might not end up getting pulled away for other projects.

Maureen Rischitelli: 25

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 20

Alex Corona: 26

The schedule does show the different milestones. The schedule is reasonable in accordance with the work that needs to be done. It also allows leeway if needed in case additional hours are needed for a particular week. The project manager and project team are not necessarily indicated in the schedule of services but it indicated throughout the proposal. The hours are not assigned and have to be assumed but with two members working full time you can only assume what the number of hours are. For example, phase 1 is 2 weeks and 100 hours. Two full time employees at 40 hour work week is 160 hours for two. Pricing falls within guidelines. The schedule does indicate it will meet the timeline and budget requirements.

Maureen Rischitelli: 20

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 9

Alex Corona: 8

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

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

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Understanding of Project | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Responsiveness to Questions | Points Based | 40 Points (10%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Project Manager | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 0
Alex Corona: 0
Maureen Rischitelli: 0
Other Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)
Alex Corales: 0
Alex Corona: 0
Maureen Rischitelli: 0

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Alex Corales	Sr. Fiscal Assistant	Apr 4, 2024 6:13 PM
Alex Corona	Financial management analyst	Mar 20, 2024 5:19 PM
Maureen Rischitelli	Budget Manager	Mar 22, 2024 10:35 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability and Competency of the Consultant	Points Based	50 (25% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did the Consultant provide a brief statement of background, organization, and size?
- B. Does the Consultant have experience with past work of similar scope and budget?
Has the Consultant recently done this type of work for a state, or local government in the past?
- C. Does the Consultant’s workload and ability satisfy County requirements for this project?
- D. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 21-30 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 11-20 points - Average Experience
- C. 0-10 points - Minimal Experience

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications	Points Based	30 (15% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was a project team identified?
- B. Do the Project Manager, Project Team and Key Staff have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?
- C. Do the Project Manager, Project Team and Key Staff have experience with state or local government?
- D. Does the Project Manager have a stable job history?
- E. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?
- F. Are there factors, such as unique abilities, which would make a noticeable (positive) impact on the project?
- G. Was a point of contact identified?
- H. Was there an alternate to the point of contact identified?
- I. Are the subcontractors, if any, identified?
- J. Does the subcontractor have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. If the work was acceptable, award up to ten (10) points.
- B. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
- C. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.

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

Description:

- A. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project, the scope, and objectives through a concise narrative?
- B. Did the Consultant describe the approach to the provision of services as required and the specific work plan to be employed to implement it?
- C. Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?
- D. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?
- E. Does the proposal specifically address the County's needs or is it "generic" in content?

- F. Does the proposal indicate how this project fits into the total workload of the Consultant during the project period?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. If the work was acceptable, award up to twenty-five (25) points.
- B. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.
- C. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements	Points Based	30 (15% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did Consultant provide a draft project schedule that includes: milestones, individual tasks and major deliverable deadlines?
- B. Is the draft project schedule reasonable based on quantity of personnel assigned to the project?
- C. Did the Consultant provide the Project Manager, Project Team, and Key Staff’s percentage of involvement, tasks and/or hours assigned?
- D. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?
- E. Is the pricing provided reasonable for the project’s tasks?
- F. Is the pricing in line with the County’s budget?
- G. Does the information contained in the proposal indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time and budget requirement?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Proposal Organization	Points Based	10 (5% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was proposal organization per the RFP? Did Consultant include a letter of interest?
- 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.?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County	Points Based	5 (2.5% of Total)

Description:
Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Location	Points Based	10 (5% of Total)

Description:
Points Provided by Procurement.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE)	Points Based	15 (7.5% of Total)

Description:
Points Provided by Procurement.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Alex Corales	Alex Corona	Maureen Rischitelli	Total Score (Max Score 200)
Matrix Consulting Group	160	138	155	151
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	153	124	95	124
American MindTrust	134	125	65	108

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (15%)	Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Points Based 30 Points (15%)
Matrix Consulting Group	42.7	24.7	41	28.3

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Vendor	Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (15%)	Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (25%)	Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Points Based 30 Points (15%)
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	39	24	33.3	17.3
American MindTrust	27.3	12.7	33.7	22

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%)	Location Points Based 10 Points (5%)	Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%)
Matrix Consulting Group	9.3	5	0	0
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	5.3	5	0	0
American MindTrust	7.3	5	0	0

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 200)
Matrix Consulting Group	151
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	124
American MindTrust	108

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

American MindTrust

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 40

Alex Corona: 32

They have financial and operational background but it does not seem that they have worked directly in the fee study. Some of the peer reviewed papers are different quarters which does show Raheem has an understanding of economics and labor. Keifer has a logistical background with maintenance records and reports which indicates they probably worked in the S4 maybe the G4 office. This can lead to having the skills of attention to detail.

Maureen Rischitelli: 10

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 20

Alex Corona: 18

The project team was identified, the staff do have some experience that can equate somewhat to this project, they have experience with state and local government, POC was identified but no other POC identified. There were no subcontractors identified.

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 40

Alex Corona: 36

The firm does demonstrate an understanding of the program. The firm does seem to have somewhat of a tailored approach to the project. The firm does state that they will have two working full time on the project but they do not state how it fits with other projects that they have if they have other projects. Without the demonstration of other projects it does not indicate the workload of the firm. I understand that the firm stated they would have two working full time it does not mean that they might not end up getting pulled away for other projects.

Maureen Rischitelli: 25

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 20

Alex Corona: 26

The schedule does show the different milestones. The schedule is reasonable in accordance with the work that needs to be done. It also allows leeway if needed in case additional hours are needed for a particular week. The project manager and project team are not necessarily indicated in the schedule of services but it indicated throughout the proposal. The hours are not assigned and have to be assumed but with two members working full time you can only assume what the number of hours are. For example, phase 1 is 2 weeks and 100 hours. Two full time employees at 40 hour work week is 160 hours for two. Pricing falls within guidelines. The schedule does indicate it will meet the timeline and budget requirements.

Maureen Rischitelli: 20

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 9

Alex Corona: 8

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

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

Alex Corales: 5
\$16,700 paid in FY23

Alex Corona: 5
\$16,700 paid in FY23

Maureen Rischitelli: 5
\$16,700 paid in FY23

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Matrix Consulting Group

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 43

The company has a brief statement of their background, work completed and the size of their group. They demonstrated that they have the experience to take on the task of the fee study not only in the state of Florida but in other states as well. The work load of two being in the final report does indicate that they should be able to have staff available to commit to our project. These two projects in final report are a part of six projects in total. The group mentioned that this work will not be subcontracted out.

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 25

Alex Corona: 19

The project team was identified being three members. The staff combined do have enough experience to take on the project; however, one area of concern is the resume of Abnash does not match up with experience mentioned on page 5 or PDF page 8. This denotes attention to detail was clearly missed. The

job history seems stable and the three members have worked on several projects together which indicate that they are used to working together. The team does seem appropriate for the project. There is a Liaison which is the President of the group and Courtney Ramos the senior vice president as the POC for the proposal. There are no subcontractors.

Maureen Rischitelli: 30

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45

Alex Corona: 38

The proposal did provide a thorough understanding of the project. The proposal went through each section of how they would approach each section of the project. These are broken down into tasks. I did feel that part of the proposal was sort of generic in nature. However, the groups work in fee studies allows for them to have a basic template and then tailor it to their client. The one area of concern is the project timeline. The entity states it takes approximately 4-5 months to complete and we are looking for a faster turn around. The group states that they are able to make it happen but the timeline would be based off of starting on April 1st.

Maureen Rischitelli: 40

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 30

Alex Corona: 25

The group provided all the information for all of the questions provided, pricing fell in line and that they would meet the timeline IF it started April 1st.

Maureen Rischitelli: 30

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 10

Alex Corona: 8

Maureen Rischitelli: 10

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

Alex Corales: 5

No Prior Payments

Alex Corona: 5

No Prior Payments

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

No Prior Payments

Location Points Based 10 Points (2.5%)
Alex Corales: 0
Alex Corona: 0
Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (3.8%)
Alex Corales: 0
Alex Corona: 0
Maureen Rischitelli: 0

MGT of America Consulting, LLC

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45
Alex Corona: 42

The MGT firm does have plenty of experience amongst its many employees. They have even shown an attachment of a previous job completed in the region. Non of the work will be subcontracted out. However, a lot of the key highlighted work has been outside of the state of Florida.

Maureen Rischitelli: 30

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 25
Alex Corona: 22

The project team was identified. The amount of experience amongst the staff is extensive and in the right areas. They do have a lot of experience with local and state governments. There is a point of contact identified.

Maureen Rischitelli: 25

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (12.5%)

Alex Corales: 45
Alex Corona: 30

The project did demonstrate what a fee study in general would undertake. I do not feel that proposal fully undertakes the full understanding of the project. The consultant described the approach and outlaid that approach in the project schedule. The project schedule does outlay the various tasks and emphasizes on what needs to be done and when. The proposal addresses everything in more of a

generic content. Although the narrative mentions that they will meet the June 30th timeline there is no mention of other ongoing projects.

Maureen Rischitelli: 25

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (7.5%)

Alex Corales: 25

Alex Corona: 22

The consultant provided overall tasks that are further broken down into subtasks to be completed. The schedule is reasonable to the amount of staff that are proposed to be assigned to the project. The roles including the project manager, team and key staff were identified but not their percentage. However, the actual project time breakdown is provided. The pricing is more than double the allotted amount. The information contained does state it will meet the time frame.

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 8

Alex Corona: 3

The organization included a LOI, all paper work was provided but there was a lot of resumes and boilerplates

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

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

Alex Corales: 5

No Prior Payments

Alex Corona: 5

No Prior Payments

Maureen Rischitelli: 5

No Prior Payments

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Alex Corales: 0

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (3.8%)

Alex Corales: 0

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 24-479-PM

Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Alex Corona: 0

Maureen Rischitelli: 0

Public Meeting Minutes (Start Recording)

RFP 24-479-PM Alachua County Fee Schedule for Cost-Revenue Analysis

Date: Monday, May 6, 2024

Start Time: 11:00 AM

Location: 12 SE 1 Street
3rd Floor Conf. Room
Gainesville, FL 32601

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

- 2.1. Good morning, I am **Precious Merriweather** with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Maureen Rischitelli, Alex Corona, Alexandra Corales.
- 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 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 with the negotiated contract(s) for approval.

3. RFP Committee Members Process Instructions

- 3.1. **First**, in OPENGOV, all evaluators have certified that they have no Conflict of Interest, and I will show them on screen, discuss if necessary.
- 3.2. **Second**, due to the cone-of-silence imposed on the committee members, this is the first occasion members have been able to talk and work together as a committee.
- 3.3. *As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.*
- 3.4. **Third**, provide procurement points to members for the – Volume of Previous Work (VOW), Location, and Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points.
- 3.5. **Fourth**, we will record and discuss the preliminary scores on the screen. Call for validation of scores to ensure they are the scores the members entered in OPENGOV.

Vendor	Alex Corales	Alex Corona	Maureen Rischitelli	Total Score (Max Score 400)
Matrix Consulting Group	355	262	350	322.33
MGT of America Consulting, LLC	338	249	250	279
American MindTrust Excluded	129	120	60	103

- 3.6. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals one by one. Starting with the team leader allow each member to give feedback. (**Encourage dialog**)
 - 3.6.1. Discuss scores and make Changes if pertinent.
 - 3.6.2. Discussion record and Update: **Evaluation Scores**
 - 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 Evaluation Scores for the Team's Final Ranking and verify if the committee needs Oral presentations or not.

4. Motion: Maureen Rischitelli motioned to approve the above ranking and 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 in order of ranking until an agreement is reached, and so forth; Alex Corona seconded.

Vote 3-0

5. Public Comments (3 minutes)

6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Maureen Rischitelli moved to approve the Minutes, Alex Corona seconded the motion.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

7. Meeting Adjourn at – 11:12 a.m.









ITA RFP 24-479-PM

Final Audit Report

2024-05-17

Created:	2024-05-17
By:	Precious Merriweather (pmerriweather@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA1CH3pvx8Hhn5oGv3CR3zOIDd-mB9NUBd

"ITA RFP 24-479-PM" History

-  Document created by Precious Merriweather (pmerriweather@alachuacounty.us)
2024-05-17 - 3:59:00 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Precious Merriweather (pmerriweather@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2024-05-17 - 3:59:08 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Precious Merriweather (pmerriweather@alachuacounty.us)
2024-05-17 - 5:07:24 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Precious Merriweather (pmerriweather@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2024-05-17 - 5:07:42 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2024-05-17 - 5:07:43 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
2024-05-17 - 6:15:31 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2024-05-17 - 6:18:32 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Agreement completed.
2024-05-17 - 6:18:32 PM GMT