



ALACHUA COUNTY

Budget and Fiscal Services

Procurement

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB
Procurement Manager

Thomas J. Rouse
Contracts Supervisor

August 23, 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 24-487 Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <u>Solicitation Deadline:</u> | 2:00 PM, Wednesday, June 26, 2024 |
| <u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u> | 1486 Vendors |
| <u>Solicitation Downloads:</u> | 42 Vendors |
| <u>Solicitation Submissions:</u> | 5 Vendors |

Vendors:

Fleetboss Global Positioning Solutions, Inc.
Altamonte Springs, FL 32701

IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax
Dothan, AL 36305

MasTrack
Danbury, CT 06811

Samsara Inc.
San Francisco, CA 94107

T-Mobile USA, Inc.
Bellevue, WA 98006

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approves the Evaluation Committee’s award ranking below for RFP 24-487 Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles.

1. IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax
2. T-Mobile USA, Inc.

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

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



Aug 28, 2024

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

Date

TW/LC/mm

Vendor Complaints or Grievances; Right to Protest

Unless otherwise governed by state or Federal law, this part shall govern the protest and appeal of Procurement decisions by the County. As used in Part A of Article 9 of the Procurement Code, the term "Bidder" includes anyone that submits a response to an invitation to bid or one who makes an offer in response to a solicitation (e.g., ITB, RFP, ITN), and is not limited solely to one that submits a bid in response to an Invitation to Bid (ITB).

- (1) *Notice of Solicitations and Awards.* The County shall provide notice of all solicitations and awards by electronic posting in accordance with the procedures and Florida law.
- (2) *Solicitation Protest.* Any prospective Bidder may file a solicitation protest concerning a solicitation.
 - (a) *Basis of the Solicitation Protest:* The alleged basis for a solicitation protest shall be limited to the following:
 - i. The terms, conditions or specifications of the solicitation are in violation of, or are inconsistent with this Code, Florida Statutes, County procedures and policies, or the terms of the solicitation at issue, including but not limited to the method of evaluating, ranking or awarding of the solicitation, reserving rights of further negotiations, or modifying or amending any resulting contract; or
 - ii. The solicitation instructions are unclear or contradictory.
 - (b) *Timing and Content of the Solicitation Protest:* The solicitation protest must be in writing and must be received by the Procurement Manager, twhite@alachuacounty.us by no later than the solicitation's question submission deadline. Failure to timely file a solicitation protest shall constitute a total and complete waiver of the Bidder's right to protest or appeal any solicitation defects, and shall bar the Bidder from subsequently raising such solicitation defects in any subsequent Award Protest, if any, or any other administrative or legal proceeding. In the event a solicitation protest is timely filed, the protesting party shall be deemed to have waived any and all solicitation defects that were not timely alleged in the protesting party's solicitation protest, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said solicitation defects in a subsequent award protest, if any, or any other administrative or legal proceeding. The solicitation protest must include, at a minimum, the following information:
 - i. The name, address, e-mail and telephone number of the protesting party;
 - ii. The solicitation number and title;
 - iii. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party has legal standing to file the solicitation Protest because:
 1. It has a substantial interest in and is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation; and
 2. That the protesting party is responsive, in accordance with the criteria set forth in the solicitation, unless the basis for the Solicitation Protest alleges that the criteria set forth in the solicitation is defective, in which case the protesting party must demonstrate that it is responsible in accordance with the criteria that the protesting party alleges should be used;
 - iv. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest;
 - v. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;
 - vi. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party's alleged basis for the protest; and
 - vii. The form of the relief requested.
 - (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Solicitation Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Solicitation Protest is untimely and, therefore, rejected. The Procurement Manager shall consider all timely Solicitation Protests and may conduct any inquiry that the Procurement Manager deems necessary to make a determination regarding a protest. The Procurement Manager shall issue a written determination granting or denying the protest. The written determination shall contain a concise statement of the basis for the determination.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- vii. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party's alleged basis for the protest; and
 - viii. The form of the relief requested.
- (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Award Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Award 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 24-487-LC Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Date: Thursday, August 22, 2024

Start Time: 3:01 PM

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 **Leira Cruz Cáliz** and Mandy Mullins, with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Patrick Boyd, Allen Betz, Donald Clifton, Kenneth Kurth.
- 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' presentations, 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), Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE), Location 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 | Allen Betz | Patrick Boyd | Donald Clifton | Kenneth Kurth | Randy Look | Total Score (Max Score 400) |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 303 | 321 | 293 | 310 | - | 306.75 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 323 | 248 | 283 | 278 | - | 283 |
| MasTrack Excluded | 129 | 122 | 138 | 71 | 153 | 122.6 |
| Samsara Excluded | 109 | 113 | 122 | 113 | 135 | 118.4 |
| Fleetboss Excluded | 88 | 82 | 110 | 111 | 144 | 107 |

- 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.
4. Motion to Approve Ranking: Kenneth Kurth 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; Patrick Boyd seconded the motion.

Vote 4-0 in favor.

5. Public Comments (3 minutes): 2 comments
6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Donald Clifton moved to approve the Minutes, Allen Betz seconded the motion.
Vote 4-0 in favor.
7. Meeting Adjourn at 3:15 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 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 26, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Friday, August 23, 2024

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

| Question Title | IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | T-Mobile USA, Inc. |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Corporate Resolution Granting Signature | Pass | Pass |
| State Compliance | Pass | Pass |
| Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request | Pass | Pass |
| 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 | Fail | Pass |
| Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Certificate | Fail | No Response |
| Small Business Enterprise Option 4: No Subcontractors | Pass | Pass |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC
Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| Question Title | IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | T-Mobile USA, Inc. |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|
| 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 |

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

| Name | Title | Agreement Accepted On |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Allen Betz | Transfer Station Manager | Jul 19, 2024 6:45 AM |
| Patrick Boyd | Safety Officer | Jul 22, 2024 8:35 AM |
| Donald Clifton | Road Superintendent | Jul 23, 2024 2:56 PM |
| Kenneth Kurth | Captain | Jul 23, 2024 4:21 PM |
| Randy Look | Fleet Service Coordinator | Jul 29, 2024 7:39 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?
- C. Has the Consultant recently done this type of work for a state, or local government in the past?
- D. Does the Consultant’s workload and ability satisfy County requirements for this project?
- E. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC
Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 50 - 40 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 39 - 20 points - Average Experience
- C. 19 - 0 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?
- 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. 30 - 20 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 19 - 10 points - Average Experience
- C. 9 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

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

Description:

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

- 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. 50 - 40 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 39 - 20 points - Average Experience
- C. 19 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

| 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?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 30 - 20 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 19 - 10 points - Average Experience
- C. 9 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC
Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| 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.?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 10 - 8 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 7 - 5 points - Average Experience
- C. 4 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

| 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) |

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.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| 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?

| 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?

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| 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 | Allen Betz | Patrick Boyd | Donald Clifton | Kenneth Kurth |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 303 | 321 | 293 | 310 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 323 | 248 | 283 | 278 |
| MasTrack Excluded | 129 | 122 | 138 | 71 |
| Samsara Excluded | 109 | 113 | 122 | 113 |
| Fleetboss Excluded | 88 | 82 | 110 | 111 |

| Vendor | Randy Looch | Total Score (Max Score 400) |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | - | 306.75 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | - | 283 |
| MasTrack Excluded | 153 | 122.6 |
| Samsara Excluded | 135 | 118.4 |
| Fleetboss Excluded | 144 | 107 |

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| 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%) |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 43.5 | 24.5 | 41.8 | 16.8 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 34 | 21.8 | 38.3 | 20.5 |
| MasTrack Excluded | 39.6 | 19.4 | 35.6 | 19.8 |
| Samsara Excluded | 40.2 | 20.4 | 34.4 | 15.6 |
| Fleetboss Excluded | 37.4 | 20.8 | 26.4 | 15.6 |

| 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%) |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 8.8 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 7.5 | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| MasTrack Excluded | 8.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Samsara Excluded | 7.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fleetboss Excluded | 6.8 | 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%) |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 40.3 | 35 | 39.3 | 44.3 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 37.8 | 28.8 | 37.8 | 34.5 |
| MasTrack Excluded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Samsara Excluded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| 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%) |
|-----------|---|--|---|--|
| Fleetboss | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Excluded | | | | |

| Vendor | Other Points Based 10 Points (2.5%) | Total Score (Max Score 400) |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 7.8 | 306.75 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 7.3 | 283 |
| MasTrack | 0 | 122.6 |
| Excluded | | |
| Samsara | 0 | 118.4 |
| Excluded | | |
| Fleetboss | 0 | 107 |
| Excluded | | |

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 39

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 50

Randy Lock: -

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

Allen Betz: 25

Patrick Boyd: 27

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 26

Randy Lock: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 40

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 42

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 20

Patrick Boyd: 16

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 15

Kenneth Kurth: 16

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 10

Patrick Boyd: 8

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 7

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 5

\$0.00

Patrick Boyd: 5

\$0.00

Donald Clifton: 5

\$0.00

Kenneth Kurth: 5

\$0.00

Randy Loock: -

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 35

Patrick Boyd: 44

18 + 16 + 16 = 50

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 42

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 35

Patrick Boyd: 38

20 + 20 = 40

Donald Clifton: 35

Kenneth Kurth: 32

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 35

Patrick Boyd: 44

16 + 18 + 16 = 50

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 38

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 40

Patrick Boyd: 50

25 + 25 = 50

Donald Clifton: 45

Kenneth Kurth: 42

Randy Loock: -

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 8

Patrick Boyd: 10

5 + 5 = 10

Donald Clifton: 6

Kenneth Kurth: 7

Randy Loock: -

T-Mobile USA, Inc.

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 21

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 30

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 25

Patrick Boyd: 21

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 21

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 34

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 34

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 25

Patrick Boyd: 22

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 25

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 10

Patrick Boyd: 7

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 6

Kenneth Kurth: 7

Randy Loock: -

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

Allen Betz: 5

Patrick Boyd: 5

Donald Clifton: 5

Kenneth Kurth: 5

Randy Loock: -

| Location Points Based 10 Points (2.5%) | |
|--|--|
| Allen Betz: 10 | 3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608 |
| Patrick Boyd: 10 | 3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608 |
| Donald Clifton: 10 | 3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 10 | 3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608 |
| Randy Loock: - | |

| Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (3.8%) | |
|---|--|
| Allen Betz: 0 | |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 | |
| Donald Clifton: 0 | |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 | |
| Randy Loock: - | |

| Understanding of Project Points Based 50 Points (12.5%) | |
|---|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 40 | |
| Patrick Boyd: 36 | 18 + 16 + 16 = 50 |
| Donald Clifton: 35 | |
| Kenneth Kurth: 40 | |
| Randy Loock: - | |

| Responsiveness to Questions Points Based 40 Points (10%) | |
|--|--------------|
| Allen Betz: 40 | |
| Patrick Boyd: 20 | 20 + 20 = 40 |
| Donald Clifton: 25 | |
| Kenneth Kurth: 30 | |
| Randy Loock: - | |

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

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

Allen Betz: 40

Patrick Boyd: 36

16 + 18 + 16 = 50

Donald Clifton: 35

Kenneth Kurth: 40

Randy Look: -

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

Allen Betz: 33

Patrick Boyd: 26

25 + 25 = 50

Donald Clifton: 35

Kenneth Kurth: 44

Randy Look: -

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 5

Patrick Boyd: 10

5 + 5 = 10

Donald Clifton: 7

Kenneth Kurth: 7

Randy Look: -

**Fleetboss
(Excluded)**

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

Allen Betz: 40

did not talk about any recent work .

Patrick Boyd: 31

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 35

Kenneth Kurth: 40

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Randy Look: 41

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

Allen Betz: 18

Did not mention any information about subcontractors

Patrick Boyd: 18

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 21

Randy Look: 27

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

Allen Betz: 15

Patrick Boyd: 12

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 35

Kenneth Kurth: 26

Randy Look: 44

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

Allen Betz: 10

did not mention in cab screens or 360 monitoring

Patrick Boyd: 15

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 15

Kenneth Kurth: 14

Randy Look: 24

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

Allen Betz: 5

Patrick Boyd: 6

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 5

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Look: 8

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

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

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 |
| Randy Look: 0 |

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 |
| Randy Look: 0 |

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

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 |
| Randy Look: 0 |

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

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 |
| Randy Look: 0 |

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

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

MasTrack
(Excluded)

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

Allen Betz: 39

Patrick Boyd: 41

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 45

Kenneth Kurth: 27

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Randy Look: 46

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

Allen Betz: 23

Patrick Boyd: 20

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30 total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 7

Randy Look: 27

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

Allen Betz: 40

Patrick Boyd: 36

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 15

Randy Look: 47

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

Allen Betz: 19

Patrick Boyd: 18

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 25

Kenneth Kurth: 12

Randy Look: 25

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

Allen Betz: 8

Patrick Boyd: 7

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 8

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Look: 8

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

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

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

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 |
| Randy Look: 0 |

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

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 |
| Randy Look: 0 |

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

| |
|-------------------|
| Allen Betz: 0 |
| Patrick Boyd: 0 |
| Donald Clifton: 0 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 0 |
| Randy Look: 0 |

**Samsara
(Excluded)**

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

| |
|--|
| Allen Betz: 40 |
| Patrick Boyd: 38 |
| Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total |
| Donald Clifton: 40 |
| Kenneth Kurth: 40 |
| Randy Look: 43 |

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

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Allen Betz: 10

Patrick Boyd: 24

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 22

Randy Loock: 26

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

Allen Betz: 36

Patrick Boyd: 30

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 26

Randy Loock: 40

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

Allen Betz: 15

Patrick Boyd: 14

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 15

Kenneth Kurth: 15

Randy Loock: 19

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

Allen Betz: 8

Patrick Boyd: 7

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 7

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Loock: 7

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

Other | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Look: 0

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

| Name | Title | Agreement Accepted On |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Allen Betz | Transfer Station Manager | Jul 19, 2024 6:45 AM |
| Patrick Boyd | Safety Officer | Jul 22, 2024 8:35 AM |
| Donald Clifton | Road Superintendent | Jul 23, 2024 2:56 PM |
| Kenneth Kurth | Captain | Jul 23, 2024 4:21 PM |
| Randy Look | Fleet Service Coordinator | Jul 29, 2024 7:39 AM |

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

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?
- C. Has the Consultant recently done this type of work for a state, or local government in the past?
- D. Does the Consultant’s workload and ability satisfy County requirements for this project?
- E. 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. 50 - 40 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 39 - 20 points - Average Experience
- C. 19 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

| 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. 30 - 20 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 19 - 10 points - Average Experience

C. 9 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

| 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. 50 - 40 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 39 - 20 points - Average Experience
- C. 19 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

| 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?

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC
Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

G. Does the information contained in the proposal indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time and budget requirement?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 30 - 20 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 19 - 10 points - Average Experience
- C. 9 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

| 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.?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 10 - 8 points - Exceptional Experience
- B. 7 - 5 points - Average Experience
- C. 4 - 0 points - Minimal Experience

| 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.

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC
Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| 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 | Allen Betz | Patrick Boyd | Donald Clifton | Kenneth Kurth |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 150 | 135 | 127 | 149 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 165 | 120 | 146 | 117 |
| MasTrack | 134 | 127 | 143 | 76 |
| Samsara | 114 | 118 | 127 | 118 |
| Fleetboss | 93 | 87 | 115 | 116 |

| Vendor | Randy Look | Total Score (Max Score 200) |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 151 | 142.4 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 161 | 141.8 |
| MasTrack | 158 | 127.6 |
| Samsara | 140 | 123.4 |
| Fleetboss | 149 | 112 |

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%) |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 43.2 | 25 | 42.4 | 18.2 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 35.6 | 22.8 | 39.6 | 21.2 |
| MasTrack | 39.6 | 19.4 | 35.6 | 19.8 |
| Samsara | 40.2 | 20.4 | 34.4 | 15.6 |
| Fleetboss | 37.4 | 20.8 | 26.4 | 15.6 |

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

| 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%) |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 8.6 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 7.6 | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| MasTrack | 8.2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Samsara | 7.8 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Fleetboss | 6.8 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

| Vendor | Total Score (Max Score 200) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax | 142.4 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc. | 141.8 |
| MasTrack | 127.6 |
| Samsara | 123.4 |
| Fleetboss | 112 |

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Fleetboss

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

Allen Betz: 40

did not talk about any recent work .

Patrick Boyd: 31

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 35

Kenneth Kurth: 40

Randy Look: 41

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

Allen Betz: 18

Did not mention any information about subcontractors

Patrick Boyd: 18

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 21

Randy Look: 27

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

Allen Betz: 15

Patrick Boyd: 12

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 35

Kenneth Kurth: 26

Randy Look: 44

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

Allen Betz: 10

did not mention in cab screens or 360 monitoring

Patrick Boyd: 15

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 15

Kenneth Kurth: 14

Randy Look: 24

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

Allen Betz: 5

Patrick Boyd: 6

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 5

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Look: 8

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

Allen Betz: 5

\$0.00

Patrick Boyd: 5

\$0.00

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 5
\$0.00

Kenneth Kurth: 5
\$0.00

Randy Loock: 5
\$0.00

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

IVS, Inc. dba AngelTrax

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 39

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 50

Randy Loock: 42

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

Allen Betz: 25

Patrick Boyd: 27

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 26

Randy Look: 27

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 40

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 42

Randy Look: 45

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

Allen Betz: 20

Patrick Boyd: 16

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 15

Kenneth Kurth: 16

Randy Look: 24

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

Allen Betz: 10

Patrick Boyd: 8

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 7

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Look: 8

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

Allen Betz: 5

\$0.00

Patrick Boyd: 5

\$0.00

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 5
\$0.00

Kenneth Kurth: 5
\$0.00

Randy Loock: 5
\$0.00

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

MasTrack

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

Allen Betz: 39

Patrick Boyd: 41

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 45

Kenneth Kurth: 27

Randy Loock: 46

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

Allen Betz: 23

Patrick Boyd: 20

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30 total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 7

Randy Look: 27

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

Allen Betz: 40

Patrick Boyd: 36

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 15

Randy Look: 47

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

Allen Betz: 19

Patrick Boyd: 18

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 25

Kenneth Kurth: 12

Randy Look: 25

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

Allen Betz: 8

Patrick Boyd: 7

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 8

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Look: 8

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

Allen Betz: 5

\$0.00

Patrick Boyd: 5

\$0.00

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 5
\$0.00

Kenneth Kurth: 5
\$0.00

Randy Loock: 5
\$0.00

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

Samsara

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

Allen Betz: 40

Patrick Boyd: 38

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 40

Randy Loock: 43

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

Allen Betz: 10

Patrick Boyd: 24

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 22

Randy Look: 26

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

Allen Betz: 36

Patrick Boyd: 30

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 26

Randy Look: 40

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

Allen Betz: 15

Patrick Boyd: 14

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 15

Kenneth Kurth: 15

Randy Look: 19

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

Allen Betz: 8

Patrick Boyd: 7

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 7

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Look: 7

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

Allen Betz: 5

\$0.00

Patrick Boyd: 5

\$0.00

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Donald Clifton: 5
\$0.00

Kenneth Kurth: 5
\$0.00

Randy Loock: 5
\$0.00

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Loock: 0

T-Mobile USA, Inc.

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 21

Methodology: 10pts per category (10 x 5) = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 30

Randy Loock: 42

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

Allen Betz: 25

Patrick Boyd: 21

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 24-487-LC

Dash Cameras Installation and Services for Fleet Vehicles

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 10) = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 20

Kenneth Kurth: 21

Randy Loock: 27

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

Allen Betz: 45

Patrick Boyd: 34

Methodology: 8pts per category (8 x 6) = 48pts + 2 free points = 50pts total

Donald Clifton: 40

Kenneth Kurth: 34

Randy Loock: 45

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

Allen Betz: 25

Patrick Boyd: 22

Methodology: 4pts per category (4 x 7) = 28pts + 2 free points = 30pts total

Donald Clifton: 25

Kenneth Kurth: 10

Randy Loock: 24

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

Allen Betz: 10

Patrick Boyd: 7

Methodology: 3pts per category (3 x 3) = 9pts + 1 free point = 10pts total

Donald Clifton: 6

Kenneth Kurth: 7

Randy Loock: 8

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

Allen Betz: 5

Patrick Boyd: 5

Donald Clifton: 5

Kenneth Kurth: 5

Randy Looch: 5

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (2.5%)

Allen Betz: 10

3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608

Patrick Boyd: 10

3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608

Donald Clifton: 10

3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608

Kenneth Kurth: 10

3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608

Randy Looch: 10

3600 SW Archer Road Suite C Gainesville , FL 32608

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

Allen Betz: 0

Patrick Boyd: 0

Donald Clifton: 0

Kenneth Kurth: 0

Randy Looch: 0