



# ALACHUA COUNTY

## Budget and Fiscal Services

---

### Procurement

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB  
Procurement Manager

Thomas J. Rouse  
Contracts Supervisor

June 7, 2024

### MEMORANDUM

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

**From:** Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB, Procurement Agent III *L Cruz Caliz*

**SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD**  
**RFP 24-480-LC Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility**

<u>Solicitation Deadline:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, April 17, 2024
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	966 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Downloads:</u>	63 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Submissions:</u>	5 Vendors

### Vendors:

Borrelli & Partners, Inc.  
Orlando, FL 32804

Brame Heck Architects Inc.  
Gainesville, FL 32601

Superlative Architecture & Development  
(d.b.a.Level Architecture & Interiors)  
Gainesville, FL 32608

Walker Architects, Inc.  
Gainesville, FL 32653

PGAL, Inc.  
Boca Raton, FL 33487

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The board approves the Evaluation Committee's award ranking below for RFP 24-480-LC Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility.

1. Borrelli & Partners, Inc.
2. PGAL, Inc.
3. Walker Architects, Inc.
4. Brame Heck Architects Inc.
5. Superlative Architecture & Development (d.b.a. Level Architecture & Interiors)

Approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate an agreement top ranked firm and with the second ranked vendor should negotiations with the top ranked vendor fail.

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



---

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

TW/lc

**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](mailto: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](mailto: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 (Start Recording)

### RFP 24-480-LC Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

Date: Tuesday, June 4, 2024

Start Time: 2:00 PM

Location: 12 SE 1 Street  
3<sup>rd</sup> 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 **Leira Cruz Cáliz** with Procurement and Mandy Mullins, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Danny Moore, Matthew Fultz, Greg Creel, Julie Johnson.
- 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).
- 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	Greg Creel	Matthew Fultz	Julie Johnson	Danny Moore	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Borrelli + Partners, Inc.	130	161	175	153	154.75
www.PGAL.com	134	164	145	143	146.5
Walker Architects	128	167	84	155	133.5
Brame Heck Architects Inc.	127	162	78	151	129.5
Superlative Architecture + Dev...	110	150	76	148	121

- 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 Oral Presentations: Danny Moore motioned to not have Oral Presentations, seconded by Greg Creel.

Vote 4-0

Motion to Award Rankings (RFP): Julie Johnson motion to recommend the final rankings be approved and then start contract negotiations the with the top ranked firm and with the second ranked vendor should negotiations with the top ranked vendor fail, seconded by Danny Moore.

Vote 4-0 in favor of the motion.

5. Public Comments (3 minutes) Borrelli and Partners.

6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Julie Johnson moved to approve the Minutes, Greg Creel seconded the motion.

Vote 4-0 in favor.

7. Meeting Adjourn at – 2:15 pm.



Alachua County, Florida

# Procurement

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB, Procurement Manager  
 County Administration Building, Gainesville, FL 32601  
 (352) 374-5202

## EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

### Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

RESPONSE DEADLINE: April 17, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Tuesday, June 4, 2024

#### VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	Borrelli + Partners, Inc.	Brame Heck Architects Inc.	Superlative Architecture + Development (d.b.a. Level Architecture + Interiors)	Walker Architects
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	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	Pass	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



EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

Question Title	Borrelli + Partners, Inc.	Brame Heck Architects Inc.	Superlative Architecture + Development (d.b.a.Level Architecture + Interiors)	Walker Architects
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

Question Title	www.PGAL.com
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	
State Compliance	
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	
Drug Free Workplace	
Vendor Eligibility	
NON-SBE Subcontractors	
Responsible Agent Designation	
Conflict of Interest	
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	
Acknowledgement of Requirements	

## PHASE 1

### EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Greg Creel	Facilities Manager	May 15, 2024 7:43 PM

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Matthew Fultz	Capital Projects Coordinator	Apr 22, 2024 2:55 PM
Julie Johnson	Director	Apr 18, 2024 8:36 AM
Danny Moore	Project Coordinator	May 13, 2024 11:54 AM

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability and Competency of the Consultant	Points Based	50 (28.6% 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 (17.1% 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?

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

- 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 (28.6% 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.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements	Points Based	30 (17.1% 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 (5.7% 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 (2.9% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

**AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY**

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

Vendor	Greg Creel	Matthew Fultz	Julie Johnson	Danny Moore
Borrelli + Partners, Inc.	130	161	175	153
www.PGAL.com	134	164	145	143
Walker Architects	128	167	84	155
Brame Heck Architects Inc.	127	162	78	151
Superlative Architecture + Development (d.b.a.Level Architecture + Interiors)	110	150	76	148

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Borrelli + Partners, Inc.	154.75
www.PGAL.com	146.5
Walker Architects	133.5
Brame Heck Architects Inc.	129.5
Superlative Architecture + Development (d.b.a.Level Architecture + Interiors)	121

**VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Vendor	Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)	Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)
Borrelli + Partners, Inc.	41.3	27.5	44.3	27.5
www.PGAL.com	40.8	24.8	39.8	27.3
Walker Architects	36	24.3	37	24
Brame Heck Architects Inc.	37	24	35.5	22
Superlative Architecture + Development (d.b.a.Level Architecture + Interiors)	31.5	21.3	33.8	21.8

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Borrelli + Partners, Inc.	9.3	5	154.75
www.PGAL.com	9	5	146.5
Walker Architects	8.3	4	133.5
Brame Heck Architects Inc.	8	3	129.5
Superlative Architecture + Development (d.b.a.Level Architecture + Interiors)	7.8	5	121

**INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES**

**Borrelli + Partners, Inc.**

**Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 25

Matthew Fultz: 47

Julie Johnson: 50

Extensive work in Florida Municipal and Non-Profit Shelters

Danny Moore: 43

**Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 25

Matthew Fultz: 27

Julie Johnson: 30

Danny Moore: 28

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 40

Matthew Fultz: 47

Julie Johnson: 50

Danny Moore: 40

**Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

Greg Creel: 25

Matthew Fultz: 28

Julie Johnson: 30

Danny Moore: 27

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

Greg Creel: 10

Matthew Fultz: 7

Julie Johnson: 10

Danny Moore: 10

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

Greg Creel: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Matthew Fultz: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Julie Johnson: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Danny Moore: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

**Brame Heck Architects Inc.**

**Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 24

Matthew Fultz: 48

Julie Johnson: 30

Danny Moore: 46

**Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 25

Matthew Fultz: 28

Julie Johnson: 15

Danny Moore: 28

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 40

Matthew Fultz: 47

Julie Johnson: 15

Danny Moore: 40

**Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 25

Matthew Fultz: 28

Julie Johnson: 10

Danny Moore: 25

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

Greg Creel: 10

Matthew Fultz: 8

Julie Johnson: 5

Danny Moore: 9

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

Greg Creel: 3

VOW TOTAL \$161,045.60

Matthew Fultz: 3

VOW TOTAL \$161,045.60

Julie Johnson: 3

VOW TOTAL \$161,045.60

Danny Moore: 3

VOW TOTAL \$161,045.60

**Superlative Architecture + Development (d.b.a.Level Architecture + Interiors)**

**Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 20

Matthew Fultz: 43



EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

Julie Johnson: 21

Danny Moore: 42

**Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 20

Matthew Fultz: 25

Julie Johnson: 15

Danny Moore: 25

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 35

Matthew Fultz: 45

Julie Johnson: 15

Danny Moore: 40

**Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 20

Matthew Fultz: 25

Julie Johnson: 15

Danny Moore: 27

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

Greg Creel: 10

Matthew Fultz: 7

Julie Johnson: 5

Danny Moore: 9

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

Greg Creel: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Matthew Fultz: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Julie Johnson: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Danny Moore: 5  
VOW TOTAL \$0

**Walker Architects**

**Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 24  
Matthew Fultz: 49  
Julie Johnson: 25  
Danny Moore: 46

**Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 25  
Matthew Fultz: 29  
Julie Johnson: 15  
Danny Moore: 28

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 40  
Matthew Fultz: 48  
Julie Johnson: 20  
Danny Moore: 40

**Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 25  
Matthew Fultz: 28  
Julie Johnson: 15  
Danny Moore: 28

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

Greg Creel: 10  
Matthew Fultz: 9  
Julie Johnson: 5  
Danny Moore: 9

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

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

Greg Creel: 4

VOW TOTAL \$62,203.80

Matthew Fultz: 4

VOW TOTAL \$62,203.80

Julie Johnson: 4

VOW TOTAL \$62,203.80

Danny Moore: 4

VOW TOTAL \$62,203.80

**www.PGAL.com**

**Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 26

Matthew Fultz: 47

Julie Johnson: 45

Extensive work performed, Florida connection not as strong

Danny Moore: 45

**Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 26

Matthew Fultz: 28

Julie Johnson: 20

Danny Moore: 25

**Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (28.6%)**

Greg Creel: 41

Matthew Fultz: 48

Julie Johnson: 35

Danny Moore: 35

**Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (17.1%)**

Greg Creel: 26

Matthew Fultz: 28

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-480-LC

Architecture & Engineering Services for Animal Resources & Care Facility

---

Julie Johnson: 30

Danny Moore: 25

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

Greg Creel: 10

Matthew Fultz: 8

Julie Johnson: 10

Danny Moore: 8

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

Greg Creel: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Matthew Fultz: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Julie Johnson: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0

Danny Moore: 5

VOW TOTAL \$0