



ALACHUA COUNTY

Budget and Fiscal Services

Procurement

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB
Procurement Manager

Thomas J. Rouse
Contracts Supervisor

August 15, 2024

MEMORANDUM

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

From: Mandy Mullins, Procurement Agent I *Mandy Mullins*

SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 25-11-MM Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

<u>Solicitation Deadline:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, July 3, 2024
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	700 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Downloads:</u>	24 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Submissions:</u>	3 Vendors

Vendors:

Tri-Sports, LLC dba Earl
Winter Park, FL 32792

Galls, LLC
Lexington, KY 40505

Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.
Osteen, FL 32764

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approves the Evaluation Committee’s award ranking below for RFP 25-11-MM Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing.

1. Galls, LLC
2. Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.
3. Tri-Sports, LLC dba Earl

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.

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



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

Aug 19, 2024

Date

TW/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 (Record)

Ranking for RFP 25-11-MM Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

Date: Wednesday, August 14, 2024

Start Time: 1:00 pm

Location: 12 SE 1st Street, 3rd Floor Conference Room

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

- 2.1. Good afternoon, I am Leira Cruz Cáliz along with Mandy Mullins, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Mark Shelton (Leader), Jonathan Richardson, Donna Guirate.
- 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' proposals, discussing their scores, and approving the Team's Ranking. This Team's final ranking will be submitted to the BoCC for their approval and authorization to negotiate a contract.

3. RFP Committee Members Process Instructions

- 3.1. **First**, I have collected all signed Disclosure Forms (Conflict of Interest), and I will show them on screen, discuss if necessary.
- 3.2. **Second**, provide procurement points to members for Location, SBE, VOW.
- 3.3. Due to the cone-of-silence imposed on the committee members, this is the first occasion members have been able to talk and work together as a committee.
- 3.4. *As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.*
- 3.5. **Second**, Record and Discuss the preliminary scores on the screen. Call for validation of scores to ensure they have been recorded correctly and that they match the scores on your individual score sheets.

Vendor	Donna Guirate	Jonathan Richardson	Mark Shelton	Total Score (Max Score 200)
Galls, LLC	156	161	172	163
Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.	7	68	63	46
Earl	8	59	71	46

- 3.6. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals. You have your proposal evaluation forms so now we can start discussions with the first vendor. (**Encourage dialog**)
 - 3.6.1. Discuss scores and make Changes if pertinent.
 - 3.6.2. Discussion record and Update: **Proposal Score Evaluation**
 - 3.6.2.1. Encourage discussion on the proposals, scoring and until all members are satisfied.
 - 3.6.2.2. NOTE: Agents will monitor the discussion, keep it on track; keep it on topic.
 - 3.6.3. Call for validation of RFP team **Proposal Scores** for the Team's Final Ranking.
 - 3.6.4. Discussion choose to not have Oral Presentation

4. Motion: Jonathan Richardson Motioned to forgo Oral Presentations, seconded by Mark Shelton. Vote 3-0 in favor.

5. Motion to Approve Ranking: Donna Guirate 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. Jonathan Richardson seconded the motion.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

6. Public Comments (3 minutes): No public comment

7. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Mark Shelton moved to approve the Minutes; Donna Guirate seconded the motion.

Vote 3-0 in favor.

8. Meeting Adjourn at 1:30 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 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

RESPONSE DEADLINE: July 3, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Friday, August 16, 2024

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	Earl	Galls, LLC	Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 1: SBE Proposer	Pass	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Certificate	No Response	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 2: 30% SBE Proposer Participation	Pass	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Certificate	No Response	No Response	No Response

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

Question Title	Earl	Galls, LLC	Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.
Small Business Enterprise Option 3: 15% - 29% SBE Prosper Participation	Pass	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Small Business Enterprise Certificate	No Response	No Response	No Response
Small Business Enterprise Option 4: No Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass
Consultant Small Business Enterprise Good Faith Effort Option 5.	Pass	Pass	Pass
Alachua County Government Minimum Wage	Pass	Fail	Fail
Alachua County Location Preference	Fail	Fail	Pass
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation		Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Donna Guirate	Sr. Administrative Assistant	Jul 31, 2024 1:05 PM
Jonathan Richardson	Lieutenant	Jul 31, 2024 4:11 PM
Mark Shelton	Program Manager	Aug 8, 2024 11:57 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

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

Description:

- A. Did the Consultant provide a brief statement of background, organization, and size?
- B. Does the Consultant have experience with past work of similar scope and budget?
- 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?

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

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?

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

- 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

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 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

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	Donna Guirate	Jonathan Richardson	Mark Shelton	Total Score (Max Score 200)
Galls, LLC	156	161	172	163
Earl	8	59	71	46
Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.	7	68	63	46

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%)
Galls, LLC	49.3	30	47.7	25
Earl	11.7	8.3	10.7	7.3
Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.	13.3	8.7	10	6

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%)
Galls, LLC	9	2	0	0
Earl	3	5	0	0
Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.	3	5	0	0

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 200)
Galls, LLC	163
Earl	46
Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.	46

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Earl

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Donna Guirate: 1

Consultant did not provide information pertaining to questions A, B, C, nor D. Consultant did not state they will not be using subcontractors.

Jonathan Richardson: 15

I couldn't find any specific statement regarding the background, size, or even consistent location of this vendor. Many of their links are dead or appear to link through to other businesses.

Mark Shelton: 19

A- No, B-Unknown, C-Unknown, D-No (Viewing the trisportsorlando website, associated with the physical address provided by the applicant. Website links were not working correctly, clicking on the shoe links brought up helmets and pads instead). E-Applicant has not applicable stated in their submitted form. Based on the information available, I am scoring a 19 in this section.

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (15%)

Donna Guirate: 0

Consultant did not provide project manager or team experiences or information on company. Single point of contact was not identified.

Jonathan Richardson: 10

There were generic responses to the questionnaire. There was an identified lead and back-up listed.

Mark Shelton: 15

A-No, B-Unknown, C-Unknown, D-Yes (trisportsorlando website shows a history of sporting accessories sales, although the business has been under a few different names associated with the physical address), E-Unknown, F-vendor did provide pricing for major items listed. G-Yes (no phone or website information), H- No, I- Applicant has not applicable stated in their submitted form. J-Unknown. Based on the information available, I am scoring a 15 in this section.

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Donna Guirate: 0

No additional information was provided by consultant.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

Jonathan Richardson: 17

I do not believe this vendor is offering a user portal. I think they are offering to sell us a limited inventory only.

Mark Shelton: 15

A-No, only main item pricing was given, no discounts for brands submitted or layout of possible web portal. B-No, C-No, only main pricing was mentioned. D-No, E-submittal was generic, scope of project was not addressed. F-No, only main pricing was mentioned. Based on the information available, I am scoring a 15 in this section.

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (15%)

Donna Guirate: 1

Pricing list provided by consultant. Dollar amounts provided, not percentage discount rates. All other items not referenced line discount pricing not provided.

Jonathan Richardson: 9

The proposal seemed incomplete.

Mark Shelton: 12

A-No, B-No, C-No, E- Pricing was fair but I do not believe the pricing on the shirts included the embroidery or patches. F-Pricing is fair but may not be correct (embroidery/patches should be included as part of the uniform shirts). G- Unknown (only main item pricing was submitted, no information an employee portal was provided. Based on the information available, I am scoring a 12 in this section.

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Donna Guirate: 1

Two attachments provided by consultant. Price list and portion of County RFP document with handwritten notes. Consultant did not provide any information regarding their company and what they have to offer. Consultant did not provide any information regarding online employee ordering portal.

Jonathan Richardson: 3

It seemed that there was a significant amount of generic language.

Mark Shelton: 5

A- No/No, B-Questionnaire answers were provided and major item pricing was submitted, no information about an Employee Portal was given. C- No. Based on the information available, I am scoring a 5 in this section.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.5%)

Donna Guirate: 5

Jonathan Richardson: 5

Mark Shelton: 5

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Donna Guirate: 0

Jonathan Richardson: 0

Mark Shelton: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (7.5%)

Donna Guirate: 0

Jonathan Richardson: 0

Mark Shelton: 0

Galls, LLC

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Donna Guirate: 50

Consultant provided background and organizational sizing information for Galls along with reputation and experience information. Most of the vendors customer base falls under the government sector with many formal contracts with local, State, Federal and Military agencies.

Jonathan Richardson: 48

I couldn't find any specific statement that no subcontractors would be used. However, Galls does retail from a myriad of vendors.

Mark Shelton: 50

A-Yes, B-Yes, C-Yes, D-Yes, E-No Subcontractors. Based on the information provided, I am scoring a 50.

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (15%)

Donna Guirate: 30

Project Team identified, and background information provided. All team members have experience in working with large public safety agencies. Consultant identified each individual on the team as a primary, secondary, and emergency liaison. The primary contact (Project Manager) has the least amount of experience with Galls (less than one year) but has previous experience in managing and operating a public safety uniform and equipment store servicing large public safety agencies.

Jonathan Richardson: 30

The team and team leaders were identified. The team seems well organized and the company has an extensive history implementing this type of platform.

Mark Shelton: 30

A-Yes, B-Yes, C-Yes, D-Yes, E-Yes, F- Galls already provides similar employee web portal service to other municipalities. Galls have the ability to assign stipend amounts, limit uniform selection by job

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

classification and produce individualized reports. G-Yes, H-Yes, I- No Subcontractors. J-No Subcontractors. Based on the information provided, I am scoring a 30.

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Donna Guirate: 45

Proposal provided an understanding of the employee portal and other requests within the RFP. Vendor provided specs for the eEquip custom online solution portal. Vendor included price list in exact dollar format, instead of requested percentage discount amounts. Vendor did provided percentage discount amounts for "all other items not referenced" by brand, as requested.

Jonathan Richardson: 48

Galls and eEquip check all the boxes for the Employee Store/Portal. The Galls team has confidence that the platform will be quick to integrate and has assured us of a dedicated representative until the platform is autonomous. As for generic language in the proposal, there was use of some stock language but overall the proposal felt as if it was created for Alachua County.

Mark Shelton: 50

A-Yes, B-Yes, C-Yes, D-Yes, E- proposal was specific to needs, D-Yes (percentage workload of different key individuals were indicated). Based on the information provided, I am scoring a 50.

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (15%)

Donna Guirate: 20

Consultant provided the Project Manager and Project Team percentage of involvement in project. Price list provided is in line with the County's budget.

Jonathan Richardson: 25

Galls is confident that they can meet the time and budget requirements.

Mark Shelton: 30

A-Yes, B-Yes, C-Yes, D-Yes (they seem appropriate), E-Yes (pricing was provided for all major items as well as percentage off pricing for all other brands carried by Galls). F-Yes, G- Will meet or exceed the requirements. Based on the information provided, I am scoring a 30.

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Donna Guirate: 9

Proposal provided an understanding of the employee portal and other requests within the RFP. Vendor provided specs for the eEquip custom online solution portal. Vendor included price list in exact dollar format, instead of requested percentage discount amounts. Vendor did provided percentage discount amounts for "all other items not referenced" by brand, as requested.

Jonathan Richardson: 8

The proposal was well-developed. There did appear to be some repetitive generic language but, overall the proposal felt well-designed and with Alachua County in mind.

Mark Shelton: 10

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

A-Yes/Yes, B-Yes, C-No (information received was in-line with the employee portal RFP). Based on the information provided, I am scoring a 10.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.5%)

Donna Guirate: 2

\$277,040.64

Jonathan Richardson: 2

\$277,040.64

Mark Shelton: 2

\$277,040.64

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Donna Guirate: 0

Jonathan Richardson: 0

Mark Shelton: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (7.5%)

Donna Guirate: 0

Jonathan Richardson: 0

Mark Shelton: 0

Skip's Shoes and Western Boots, Inc.

Ability and Competency of the Consultant | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Donna Guirate: 1

Consultant did not provide information pertaining to questions A, B, C, nor D. Consultant did notate they will not be using subcontractors.

Jonathan Richardson: 20

I could not find an organizational chart for this proposal for this project. Although an establishment business it doesn't seem like the vendor is wanting to offer the Employee Store/Portal only to be considered as a vendor for boots.

Mark Shelton: 19

A-No, B-Unknown (I did visit the Skipsboots.com website, it was easy to navigate and sizing options were available), C-Unknown (no major items were listed, only pricing for one shoe brand was submitted). D-No (vendor did not provide pricing or employee portal information). E-No (consultant will preform all work). Based on the information available, I am giving a score of 19.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (15%)

Donna Guirate: 1

Consultant did not provide project manager or team experiences or information on company. One point of contact was identified.

Jonathan Richardson: 10

This appears to be an established business but according to their webpage, they focus on footwear.

Mark Shelton: 15

A-No, B-Unknown, (I did visit the Skipsboots.com website, it was easy to navigate and sizing options were available), C-Unknown, D- Yes (Skipsboots.com about us section references that the company has been around since 1983). E-No (the large majority of the required items were not priced and no mention of the employee web portal). F- the Skipsboots.com website was easy to navigate and sizing options were available. G-Yes, H- No, I - No Subcontractors were identified. J- Unknown (although the Skipsboots.com website was easy to navigate and sizing options were available). Based on the information available, I am giving a score of 15.

Project Understanding and Approach | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Donna Guirate: 0

No additional information was provided by consultant.

Jonathan Richardson: 20

It does not seem like the vendor is thoroughly aware of the purpose of this proposal.

Mark Shelton: 10

A-No (major item pricing was missing and no employee portal information was submitted). B-No, C-No, D-Unknown (not submitted). E- generic proposal (no mention of employee portal). F-No. Based on the information available, I am giving a score of 10.

Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 30 Points (15%)

Donna Guirate: 0

No additional information was provided by consultant.

Jonathan Richardson: 9

I can not find information to support a timeline for rollout. There is a functional webpage where individuals can order boots.

Mark Shelton: 9

A-No, B-No (no employee portal information was provided). C-No, D-No, E- Yes (but only for a very limited item selection- not for major project). F- Yes (but only for a very limited item selection- not for major project). G-No. Based on the information available, I am giving a score of 9.

Proposal Organization | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Donna Guirate: 0

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-11-MM

Fire Rescue Request for Employee Uniform Store/Portal and Pricing

No additional information was provided by consultant. One attachment included in proposal documentation for footwear pricing only. Did not provide any information regarding online employee ordering portal, nor did the vendor offer clothing uniform items.

Jonathan Richardson: 4

I can not find any supporting documents that show experience in a Employee Store/Portal.

Mark Shelton: 5

A-No/No, B-(all questionnaire questions were completed but no information on the employee portal or pricing of major items was submitted), C-No. Based on the information available, I am giving a score of 5.

Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Based | 5 Points (2.5%)

Donna Guirate: 5

Jonathan Richardson: 5

Mark Shelton: 5

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Donna Guirate: 0

Jonathan Richardson: 0

Mark Shelton: 0

Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Based | 15 Points (7.5%)

Donna Guirate: 0

Jonathan Richardson: 0

Mark Shelton: 0