



ALACHUA COUNTY

Budget and Fiscal Services

Procurement

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. CPPB
Procurement Manager

Thomas J. Rouse
Contracts Supervisor

June 6, 2024

MEMORANDUM

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

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

SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 25-171-MM Annual Environmental Consulting Services

<u>Solicitation Deadline:</u>	2:00 PM, Wednesday, April 10, 2024
<u>Solicitation Notifications View Count:</u>	1559 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Downloads:</u>	58 Vendors
<u>Solicitation Submissions:</u>	18 Vendors

Vendors:

A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Bartow, FL 33830

CHA Consulting, Inc.
Albany, NY 12205

CPH, LLC
Sanford, FL 32771

Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32607

GLE Associates, Inc.
Tampa, FL 33609

Jones, Edmunds & Associates, Inc.
Alachua, FL 32615

Bio-Tech Consulting LLC
Orlando, FL 32803

Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.
Tampa, FL 33634

DB Environmental Laboratories, Inc.
Rockledge, FL 32955

Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32605

GSE Engineering and Consulting, Inc
Gainesville, FL 32608

NorthStar Contracting Group, Inc.
Riverview, FL 33578

NV5, Inc.
Alachua, FL 32615

Professional Service Industries, Inc.
Tampa, FL 33634

S&ME, Inc.
Tampa, FL 33610

Water & Air Research Inc.
Gainesville, FL 32608

WGI, Inc.
West Palm Beach, FL 33411

WSP USA
Kennesaw, GA 30144

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approves the Evaluation Committee's award ranking below for RFP 225-171-MM Annual Environmental Consulting Services.

1. Water & Air Research Inc.
2. GSE Engineering and Consulting, Inc
3. Jones, Edmunds & Associates, Inc.
4. Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.
5. WSP USA

Approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate agreements with the top five (5) ranked firms.

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



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

Jun 6, 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 responsive in accordance with the criteria that the protesting party alleges should be used;
 - iv. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest;
 - v. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;
 - vi. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party’s alleged basis for the protest; and
 - vii. The form of the relief requested.
 - (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Solicitation Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Solicitation Protest is untimely and, therefore, rejected. The Procurement Manager shall consider all timely Solicitation Protests and may conduct any inquiry that the Procurement Manager deems necessary to make a determination regarding a protest. The Procurement Manager shall issue a written determination granting or denying the protest. The written determination shall contain a concise statement of the basis for the determination.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- vii. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party's alleged basis for the protest; and
 - viii. The form of the relief requested.
- (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Award Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Award Protests is untimely and, therefore, rejected. The Procurement Manager shall consider all timely Award Protests and may conduct any inquiry that the county Procurement Manager deems necessary to resolve the protest by mutual agreement or to make a determination regarding the protests. The Procurement Manager shall issue a written determination granting or denying each protest. The written determination shall contain a concise statement of the basis for the determination.
- (d) Appeal:
- i. If the protesting party is not satisfied with the Procurement Manager's determination, the protesting party may appeal the determination to the County Manager by filing a written appeal, which sets forth the basis upon which the appeal is based. The scope of the appeal shall be limited to the basis alleged in the award protest. The appeal must be filed with the Procurement Manager within five business days of the date on which the Procurement Manager's written determination was mailed to the protesting party. Failure to timely file an appeal shall constitute a waiver of the protesting party's rights to an appeal of the Procurement Manager's determination, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said award defects in any administrative or legal proceeding.
 - ii. After reviewing the appeal, the County Manager will issue a written final determination and provide copies of the determination to the protesting party. Prior to issuing a final determination, the County Manager, in his or her discretion, may direct a hearing officer, or magistrate, to conduct an administrative hearing in connection with the protest and issue findings and recommendations to the County Manager. Prior to a hearing, if held, the Procurement Manager must file with the hearing officer the protest, any background information, and his or her written determination. The protesting party and the County shall equally share the cost of conducting any hearing, including the services of the hearing officer. If applicable, the County Manager may wait to issue a written final determination until after receipt of the findings and recommendations of the hearing officer. The determination of the County Manager shall be final and not subject to further appeal under this code.
- (4) *Burden of Proof:* Unless otherwise provide by Florida law, the burden of proof shall rest with the protesting party.
- (5) *Stay of Procurements during Protests.* In the event of a timely protest, the County shall not proceed further with the solicitation or with the award of the contract until the Procurement Manager, after consultation with the head of the using department, makes a written determination that the award of the solicitation without delay is:
- (a) Necessary to avoid an immediate and serious danger to the public health, safety, or welfare;
 - (b) Necessary to avoid or substantial reduce significant damage to County property;
 - (c) Necessary to *avoid or substantially reduce interruption of essential County Services; or;*
 - (d) Otherwise in the best interest of the public.

Public Meeting Minutes (Record)

Ranking for RFP 25-171-MM Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Date: Tuesday, June 4, 2024

Start Time: 9:01 am

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 morning, I am Mandy Mullins with Leira Cruz Cáliz from Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Stacie Greco (Leader), Mark Brown, Chris Gilbert, Emily Uhlmann.
- 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 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	Mark Brown	Christopher Gilbert	Stacie Greco	Emily Uhlmann	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Water & Air Research Inc.	158	135	135	159	146.75
GSE Engineering and Consulting	136	153	137	150	144
Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	135	141	146	144	141.5
Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	135	147	143	141	141.5
WSP USA Environment & Infrastru...	150	132	144	136	140.5
ECT, Inc.	133	138	128	152	137.75
DB Environmental, Inc.	150	117	141	126	133.5
WGI, Inc.	119	119	126	145	127.25
NorthStar Contracting Group	121	124	106	150	125.25
S&ME, Inc.	118	132	112	120	120.5
NV5	124	131	90	122	116.75
CPH, LLC.	50	153	111	128	110.5
Professional Service Industries, Inc.	84	134	93	125	109
Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.	48	153	95	131	106.75
American Compliance Technolog...	72	120	90	126	102
GLE Associates, Inc.	56	139	94	113	100.5
CHA Consulting, Inc.	61	125	105	109	100
Bio-Tech Consulting LLC	74	121	90	109	98.5



- 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 **have/not** have Oral Presentation

- 4. Motion: Chris Gilbert motioned to not have Oral Presentations, seconded by Mark Brown.
Vote 4-0 in favor.

Motion to Approve Ranking: Mark Brown motioned to recommend the ranking to the board and authorize staff to negotiate an agreement with the top five (5) ranked firms, seconded by Chris Gilbert.
Vote 4-0 in favor.

- 5. Public Comments (3 minutes): none
- 6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Stacie Greco moved to approve the Minutes; Emily Uhlmann seconded the motion.
Vote 4-0 in favor.
- 7. Meeting Adjourn at 9:37 am



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 25-171-MM

Annual Environmental Consulting Services

RESPONSE DEADLINE: April 10, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Tuesday, June 4, 2024

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.	Bio-Tech Consulting LLC	CHA Consulting, Inc.	CPH, LLC.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Question Title	American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.	Bio-Tech Consulting LLC	CHA Consulting, Inc.	CPH, LLC.
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Question Title	Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.	DB Environmental, Inc.	ECT, Inc.	GLE Associates, Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Question Title	Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.	DB Environmental, Inc.	ECT, Inc.	GLE Associates, Inc.
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Question Title	GSE Engineering and Consulting	Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	NV5
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Question Title	NorthStar Contracting Group	Professional Service Industries, Inc.	S&ME, Inc.	WGI, Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass		Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response	No Response	No Response	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Question Title	WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc.	Water & Air Research Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass	Pass

Question Title	WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc.	Water & Air Research Inc.
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
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 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Mark Brown	NR Program Manager	May 21, 2024 10:50 AM
Christopher Gilbert	Hazardous Materials Program Manager	Apr 17, 2024 7:53 AM
Stacie Greco	Water Resources Program Manager	May 1, 2024 10:11 AM
Emily Uhlmann	Environmental Specialist	Apr 16, 2024 10:35 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Description:

- A. Did the Consultant provide a brief statement of background, organization, and size?
- B. Does the Consultant have experience with past work of similar scope and budget?
Has the Consultant recently done this type of work for a state, or local government in the past?
- C. Does the Consultant’s workload and ability satisfy County requirements for this project?

D. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?

Based on questions above, award points as follows:

- A. 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 (17.1% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was a project team identified?
- B. Do the Project Manager, Project Team and Key Staff have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?
- C. Do the Project Manager, Project Team and Key Staff have experience with state or local government?
- D. Does the Project Manager have a stable job history?
- E. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?
- 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 (28.6% of Total)

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

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 (17.1% of Total)

Description:

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

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 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Proposal Organization	Points Based	10 (5.7% of Total)

Description:

- A. Was proposal organization per the RFP? Did Consultant include a letter of interest?
- B. Was all required paperwork submitted and completed appropriately?
- C. Did the proposal contain an excessive amount of generic boilerplate, resumes, pages per resume, photographs, etc.?

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 (2.9% of Total)

Description:

Points Provided by Procurement.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Mark Brown	Christopher Gilbert	Stacie Greco	Emily Uhlmann
Water & Air Research Inc.	158	135	135	159
GSE Engineering and Consulting	136	153	137	150
Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	135	147	143	141
Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	135	141	146	144
WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc.	150	132	144	136
ECT, Inc.	133	138	128	152

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Vendor	Mark Brown	Christopher Gilbert	Stacie Greco	Emily Uhlmann
DB Environmental, Inc.	150	117	141	126
WGI, Inc.	119	119	126	145
NorthStar Contracting Group	121	124	106	150
S&ME, Inc.	118	132	112	120
NV5	124	131	90	122
CPH, LLC.	50	153	111	128
Professional Service Industries, Inc.	84	134	93	125
Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.	48	153	95	131
American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.	72	120	90	126
GLE Associates, Inc.	56	139	94	113
CHA Consulting, Inc.	61	125	105	109
Bio-Tech Consulting LLC	74	121	90	109

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Water & Air Research Inc.	146.75
GSE Engineering and Consulting	144
Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	141.5
Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	141.5
WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc.	140.5
ECT, Inc.	137.75
DB Environmental, Inc.	133.5
WGI, Inc.	127.25
NorthStar Contracting Group	125.25
S&ME, Inc.	120.5
NV5	116.75
CPH, LLC.	110.5

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Professional Service Industries, Inc.	109
Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.	106.75
American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.	102
GLE Associates, Inc.	100.5
CHA Consulting, Inc.	100
Bio-Tech Consulting LLC	98.5

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)	Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)
Water & Air Research Inc.	43.3	24.3	42.5	23.8
GSE Engineering and Consulting	43	24.5	43	22.8
Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	40.8	22.8	41.8	24
Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	42	24.5	44.3	22.8
WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc.	42.8	24	42	22.3
ECT, Inc.	39.5	21.3	40.3	23.5
DB Environmental, Inc.	38.3	22	40.5	23.8
WGI, Inc.	38.3	19.8	36.8	20.8
NorthStar Contracting Group	35	20.5	37	20.8
S&ME, Inc.	36.8	19.3	34.3	18.8
NV5	34.8	19.3	32.8	21.3
CPH, LLC.	28.5	17.3	32.8	19.8
Professional Service Industries, Inc.	30.5	17.8	30.3	19.8

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM

Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Vendor	Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)	Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	Ability to meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)
Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.	27.8	16.5	30	20.3
American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.	27.5	15.3	29.5	19
GLE Associates, Inc.	30.8	16.8	27.8	13.5
CHA Consulting, Inc.	29.5	17.3	29.8	12.5
Bio-Tech Consulting LLC	28.8	14.3	27.5	16.8

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Water & Air Research Inc.	8	5	146.75
GSE Engineering and Consulting	8.8	2	144
Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.	8.3	4	141.5
Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.	8	0	141.5
WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc.	6.5	3	140.5
ECT, Inc.	8.3	5	137.75
DB Environmental, Inc.	7	2	133.5
WGI, Inc.	6.8	5	127.25
NorthStar Contracting Group	7	5	125.25
S&ME, Inc.	6.5	5	120.5
NV5	6.8	2	116.75
CPH, LLC.	7.3	5	110.5

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM
Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Vendor	Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5.7%)	Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.9%)	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Professional Service Industries, Inc.	5.8	5	109
Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.	7.3	5	106.75
American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.	5.8	5	102
GLE Associates, Inc.	6.8	5	100.5
CHA Consulting, Inc.	6	5	100
Bio-Tech Consulting LLC	6.3	5	98.5

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

American Compliance Technologies, Inc. dba A-C-T Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.
Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)
Mark Brown: 19
Christopher Gilbert: 35
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. No subcontractors
Stacie Greco: 20
air (monitoring and indoor) water quality monitoring Phase 1 and 2 and 3 Industrial Hygiene asbestos contamination environmental sampling
Emily Uhlmann: 36
Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)
Mark Brown: 12
Christopher Gilbert: 20
A. Yes - Mr. Jonsson B. Yes. C. Yes. D. Yes, 20+ yrs. E. Yes. F. Yes, P.E., P.G., CIH. G. Yes. H. Yes, Mr. Stump. I. No subcontractors. J. N/A.
Stacie Greco: 10
Emily Uhlmann: 19
Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 25-171-MM

Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Mark Brown: 21

Christopher Gilbert: 35

A. Yes. B. Yes, Work Authorizations & Task orders. C. Yes. D. Yes. E. Somewhat Generic. F. Yes.

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 37

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

Mark Brown: 11

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes. B. Yes. C. Yes. D. Yes. E. N/A. F. N/A. G. Yes for time, Budget-N/A.

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 20

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

Mark Brown: 4

Christopher Gilbert: 5

A. Yes. Letter of Interest included. B. Yes. C. Some boilerplate - resumes duplicated in proposal.

Stacie Greco: 5

Resumes repeated

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$0.00

Bio-Tech Consulting LLC

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

Mark Brown: 22

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes. B. Mostly. C. Yes. D. No subcontractors

Stacie Greco: 25

+ Routine Compliance Monitoring + Environmental Site Assessments + Wetland Delineations and UMAM Assessments + Terrestrial Restorations + Environmental Permitting Services

Emily Uhlmann: 28

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

Mark Brown: 11

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes. Mr. Milton. B. Yes, Mostly. C. Yes. D. Yes, 7+ years. E. Arborist, Lake Manager, Property Assessor, LEP, Gopher Tortoise Agent, Stormwater Inspector. F. Yes. G. Yes. H. Yes, Mr. Miklos. I. No subcontractors identified. J. N/A

Stacie Greco: 10

Emily Uhlmann: 16

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

Mark Brown: 19

Christopher Gilbert: 35

A. Mostly. B. Yes. C. Yes. D. Yes. E. Generic. F. Yes.

Stacie Greco: 20

Emily Uhlmann: 36

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

Mark Brown: 12

Christopher Gilbert: 15

A. Yes, web-based Gantt Chart. B. Unknown. No project breakdown shown. C. Yes. D. Yes. E. N/A F. N/A G. Yes timeline, budget-N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 15

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

Mark Brown: 5

Christopher Gilbert: 6

A. Yes B. Yes. C. No.

Stacie Greco: 5

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$31,816.96

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$31,816.96

Stacie Greco: 5

\$31,816.96

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$31,816.96

CHA Consulting, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 15

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Lab work subcontracted

Stacie Greco: 35

engineering focus columbia county lch Trace project

Emily Uhlmann: 28

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

Mark Brown: 10

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. 1 year Hx with Company E. Yes F. Yes G. Carter Belvin, cbelvin@chasolutions.com, (407) 789-2611 H. Mark Burgess, mburgess@chasolutions.com, (407) 789-1391 I. No. Subcontractor - Lab work. J. Unknown. Lab not identified

Stacie Greco: 20

Emily Uhlmann: 19

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

Mark Brown: 16

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Partially B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 38

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

Mark Brown: 10

Christopher Gilbert: 15

A. No B. N/A C. No D. No E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 15

not a lot of detail

Emily Uhlmann: 10

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

Mark Brown: 5

Christopher Gilbert: 5

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes

Stacie Greco: 5

repeat resumes

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$0.00

Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 14

Christopher Gilbert: 45

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes. Sub's appear competent.

Stacie Greco: 20

Emily Uhlmann: 32

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

Mark Brown: 10

Christopher Gilbert: 25

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Kyle Zigler, PG, Project Manager, kyle.zigler@collierseng.com, 727.221.4771 H. Greg Stevens, PE, Deputy Project Manager, greg.stevens@collierseng.com, 407.288.6147 I. Yes, Apex Companies, LLC (AC), Arrowhead Technologies, LLC Jupiter Environmental, Inc. J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 12

Emily Uhlmann: 19

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

Mark Brown: 12

Christopher Gilbert: 45

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 38

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

Mark Brown: 4

Christopher Gilbert: 25

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 27

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

Mark Brown: 3

Christopher Gilbert: 8

A. Yes B. Yes C. No

Stacie Greco: 8

Emily Uhlmann: 10

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5
\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5
\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5
\$0.00

CPH, LLC.

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

Mark Brown: 13

Christopher Gilbert: 45

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes - Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc., Connect Consulting, Inc., Intertek PSI.

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 31

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

Mark Brown: 10

Christopher Gilbert: 25

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Kurt Luman. kluman@cphcorp.com 407.322.6841 H. Amy Daly. adaly@cphcorp.com 407.322.6841 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 15

Emily Uhlmann: 19

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

Mark Brown: 12

Christopher Gilbert: 45

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 33

Emily Uhlmann: 41

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

Mark Brown: 7

Christopher Gilbert: 25

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 22

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

Mark Brown: 3

Christopher Gilbert: 8

A. Yes B. Yes. C. No

Stacie Greco: 8

Emily Uhlmann: 10

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$0.00

DB Environmental, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 45

Christopher Gilbert: 35

A. Yes B. Portion C. Yes D. Yes. GLE Associates, Inc., eda engineers-surveyors-planners, inc., Ecosystem Research Corp (ERC), Florida-Spectrum Environmental Services, Inc.

Stacie Greco: 43

Emily Uhlmann: 30

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

Mark Brown: 26

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Somewhat C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Jim Myles, jim@dbenv.com, 352-870-4565 H. Kevin Grace, kevin@dbenv.com, 352-262-8987 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 23
comprehensive team

Emily Uhlmann: 19

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

Mark Brown: 45

Christopher Gilbert: 35

A. Yes B. Yes C. Somewhat D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 43

certified in house laboratory. lots of local work with EPD, GRU, and Gainesville

Emily Uhlmann: 39

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

Mark Brown: 23

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 27

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

Mark Brown: 9

Christopher Gilbert: 5

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes

Stacie Greco: 5

resumes repeated. Long

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 2

\$295,954.49

Christopher Gilbert: 2

\$295,954.49

Stacie Greco: 2

\$295,954.49

Emily Uhlmann: 2

\$295,954.49

ECT, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 40

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes. Advanced Environmental Laboratories, Inc. (AEL), . UPPERCASE, Inc.

Stacie Greco: 35

Emily Uhlmann: 43

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

Mark Brown: 21

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Suzy Baird, Project Manager, sbaird@ectinc.com, 352-363-5635 H. Jennifer Mathia, Operations Director, jmathia@ectinc.com, 352-575-3889 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 20

Emily Uhlmann: 24

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

Mark Brown: 40

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 35

Emily Uhlmann: 46

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

Mark Brown: 20

Christopher Gilbert: 25

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. YEs E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 24

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

Mark Brown: 7

Christopher Gilbert: 8
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes
Stacie Greco: 8
Emily Uhlmann: 10

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

Mark Brown: 5
\$18,000.00
Christopher Gilbert: 5
\$18,000.00
Stacie Greco: 5
\$18,000.00
Emily Uhlmann: 5
\$18,000.00

Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 40
Christopher Gilbert: 40
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, 1. ANAMAR (local; ecological/wetlands and field support) 2. ECHO UES (local; land surveying and subsurface exploration) 3. Environmental and Geotechnical Specialists (local; geotechnical testing and support) 4. GLE Associates (local; industrial hygiene and asbestos abatement) 5. Alliance Technical Group (air quality testing and monitoring) 6. Ambient Technologies (geophysical surveys and environmental drilling)
Stacie Greco: 45
Emily Uhlmann: 38

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

Mark Brown: 22
Christopher Gilbert: 25
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Mark Ellard, PE, CFM, BC.WRE, ENV SP, Vice President. mellard@geosyntec.com. Direct line: 321.249.9360 H. Cathy Foerster, AICP, Senior Planner. cfoerster@geosyntec.com. Direct line: 904.310.1907 I. Yes J. Yes
Stacie Greco: 22
Emily Uhlmann: 22

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

Mark Brown: 40
Christopher Gilbert: 45
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes
Stacie Greco: 40
Emily Uhlmann: 42

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

Mark Brown: 20
Christopher Gilbert: 25
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A
Stacie Greco: 25
Emily Uhlmann: 26

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

Mark Brown: 9
Christopher Gilbert: 8
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes
Stacie Greco: 7
repeat resumes
Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 4
\$59,427.84
Christopher Gilbert: 4
\$59,427.84
Stacie Greco: 4
\$59,427.84
Emily Uhlmann: 4
\$59,427.84

GLE Associates, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 15
Christopher Gilbert: 43
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes. WGI
Stacie Greco: 35
Remediation
Emily Uhlmann: 30

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

Mark Brown: 10
Christopher Gilbert: 25
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G.1. Michael Harrell, mharrell@gleassociates.com, 352-335-6648 H. 2. James Elliott, PE, LEED AP, jelliott@gleassociates.com, 904-296-1880 I. Yes J. Yes
Stacie Greco: 12
Emily Uhlmann: 20

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

Mark Brown: 12
Christopher Gilbert: 42
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes
Stacie Greco: 22
Emily Uhlmann: 35

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

Mark Brown: 10
Christopher Gilbert: 15
A. No B. N/A C. No D. N/A E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A
Stacie Greco: 15
Not a lot of detail
Emily Uhlmann: 14

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

Mark Brown: 4
Christopher Gilbert: 9
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes
Stacie Greco: 5

filler of certifications

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$10,596.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$10,596.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$10,596.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$10,596.00

GSE Engineering and Consulting

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

Mark Brown: 40

Christopher Gilbert: 48

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, GLE Associates, Inc. (GLE), Resource Environmental Solutions, LLC (RES).

Stacie Greco: 40

Emily Uhlmann: 44

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

Mark Brown: 23

Christopher Gilbert: 25

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Joakim (Jay) B. Nordqvist, P.E., jnordqvist@gseengineering.com, 352-318-3313 H. Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., khill@gseengineering.com, 352-246-8784 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 22

Emily Uhlmann: 28

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

Mark Brown: 41

Christopher Gilbert: 45

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 40

Emily Uhlmann: 46

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

Mark Brown: 21

Christopher Gilbert: 25

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 20

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

Mark Brown: 9

Christopher Gilbert: 8

A. Yes B. Yes C. No

Stacie Greco: 8

Emily Uhlmann: 10

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

Mark Brown: 2

\$217,541.28

Christopher Gilbert: 2

\$217,541.28

Stacie Greco: 2

\$217,541.28

Emily Uhlmann: 2

\$217,541.28

Jones Edmunds & Associates, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 40

Christopher Gilbert: 42

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, OCH Environmental Engineering, Inc.

Stacie Greco: 45

Emily Uhlmann: 41

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

Mark Brown: 23
Christopher Gilbert: 25
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Alan Foley, PE. afoley@jonesedmunds.com 352.377.5821 H. Justin Gregory, PE. jgregory@jonesedmunds.com 352.377.5821 I. Yes J. Yes
Stacie Greco: 26
Emily Uhlmann: 24

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

Mark Brown: 42
Christopher Gilbert: 45
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes
Stacie Greco: 44
Emily Uhlmann: 46

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

Mark Brown: 21
Christopher Gilbert: 22
A. Somewhat B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A
Stacie Greco: 25
Emily Uhlmann: 23

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

Mark Brown: 9
Christopher Gilbert: 7
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes
Stacie Greco: 6
weird numbering
Emily Uhlmann: 10

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

Mark Brown: 0
\$1,253,387.27
Christopher Gilbert: 0
\$1,253,387.27

Stacie Greco: 0
 \$1,253,387.27

Emily Uhlmann: 0
 \$1,253,387.27

NorthStar Contracting Group

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

Mark Brown: 35

Christopher Gilbert: 38

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, AEL Lab, Envirosite, Research Preferred Drilling Solutions.

Stacie Greco: 23

Emily Uhlmann: 44

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

Mark Brown: 20

Christopher Gilbert: 22

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Pamela Jackson - pjackson@northstar.com - 850-661-4415 H. Crystal Smiech - csmiech@northstar.com - 850-728-4568 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 15

Emily Uhlmann: 25

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

Mark Brown: 35

Christopher Gilbert: 35

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 33

Emily Uhlmann: 45

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

Mark Brown: 18

Christopher Gilbert: 18

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 22

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

Mark Brown: 8

Christopher Gilbert: 6

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes

Stacie Greco: 5

Repeat resumes

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$0.00

NV5

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

Mark Brown: 40

Christopher Gilbert: 42

A. Yes B. Yes C. yes D. Yes, Advanced Environmental Laboratories, Inc. (AEL), Air Quality Environmental, Inc. (AQE), Cascade Environmental (Cascade), EMSL Analytical, Inc. (EMSL), GeoView, Inc. (GeoView), Jacob & Hefner Associates, Inc. (JHA), NovelEsolutions, Inc., PACE Analytical (PACE).

Stacie Greco: 24

Emily Uhlmann: 33

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

Mark Brown: 20

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes. Less than 1 yr with current firm E. Yes F. Yes G. Andy Woodruff, Andyw@CHW-inc.com, (352) 443-9351 H. Scott D. Graf, Scott.Graf@NV5.com, (813) 952-8747 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 15

Emily Uhlmann: 22

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

Mark Brown: 35

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 19

Emily Uhlmann: 37

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

Mark Brown: 20

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 20

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

Mark Brown: 7

Christopher Gilbert: 7

A. Yes B. Yes C. partial generic

Stacie Greco: 5

Referencing Scope items by letter was not helpful in reviewing.

Emily Uhlmann: 8

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

Mark Brown: 2

\$233,560.00

Christopher Gilbert: 2

\$233,560.00

Stacie Greco: 2

\$233,560.00

Emily Uhlmann: 2

\$233,560.00

Professional Service Industries, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 30
Christopher Gilbert: 40
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, CPH, Inc., Ambient Technologies, Inc. and Subsidiaries
Stacie Greco: 22
Emily Uhlmann: 30

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

Mark Brown: 15
Christopher Gilbert: 22
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Douglas Coleman, PMP, CHMM, REM (813) 886-1075 douglas.coleman@intertek.com H. Vicki B. Lewis, LEP, FLMA. (407) 304-5560 vicki.lewis@intertek.com I. Yes J. Yes
Stacie Greco: 13
Emily Uhlmann: 21

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

Mark Brown: 15
Christopher Gilbert: 40
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Partial F. Yes
Stacie Greco: 25
Emily Uhlmann: 41

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

Mark Brown: 15
Christopher Gilbert: 20
A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A
Stacie Greco: 25
Emily Uhlmann: 19

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

Mark Brown: 4
Christopher Gilbert: 7
A. Yes B. Yes C. Partial Generic

Stacie Greco: 3

Long. Repeat resumes

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$0.00

S&ME, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 37

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, Halff Associates, Inc., Environmental Science Associates, Eurofins Environment Testing, Preferred Drilling Solutions, Inc.

Stacie Greco: 35

Subcontractor (Halff) has applicable experience.

Emily Uhlmann: 35

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

Mark Brown: 20

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Richard "Rick" Hagberg, Rhagberg@smeinc.com, (727) 639-5565 H. Gustavo Toledo-Melendez, Gtoledo@smeinc.com, (813) 763-6097 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 17

Emily Uhlmann: 20

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

Mark Brown: 35

Christopher Gilbert: 41

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 36

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

Mark Brown: 15

Christopher Gilbert: 19

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 16

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

Mark Brown: 6

Christopher Gilbert: 7

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes

Stacie Greco: 5

repeat resumes. Lots of empty gray space on resumes.

Emily Uhlmann: 8

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$0.00

Water & Air Research Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 47

Christopher Gilbert: 41

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, Lou Motz, EDA, AEL, Preferred Drilling Solutions, Inc.

Stacie Greco: 38

Emily Uhlmann: 47

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

Mark Brown: 27

Christopher Gilbert: 21

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Barry L. Vance, email: bvance@waterandair.com, phone: 352-224-1558 H. Teresa C. Ayres, email: tayres@waterandair.com, phone: 352-224-1522 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 22

Emily Uhlmann: 27

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

Mark Brown: 45

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Partial Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 39

Emily Uhlmann: 46

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

Mark Brown: 25

Christopher Gilbert: 20

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 25

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

Mark Brown: 9

Christopher Gilbert: 8

A. Yes B. Yes C. No

Stacie Greco: 6

Repeat Resumes

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$44,239.85

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$44,239.85

Stacie Greco: 5

\$44,239.85

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$44,239.85

WGI, Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 36

Christopher Gilbert: 38

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes, GLE Associates, Inc.

Stacie Greco: 40

Emily Uhlmann: 39

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

Mark Brown: 18

Christopher Gilbert: 19

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Rick Harman | Rick.Harman@WGInc.com | 561.687.2220 H. John Abbott | John.Abbott@WGInc.com | 561.687.2220 I. Yes J. Yes

Stacie Greco: 20

Emily Uhlmann: 22

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

Mark Brown: 35

Christopher Gilbert: 35

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 30

Emily Uhlmann: 47

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

Mark Brown: 18

Christopher Gilbert: 17

A. Partial B. Yes C. Partial D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 23

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

Mark Brown: 7

Christopher Gilbert: 5

A. Yes B. Yes C. Generic

Stacie Greco: 6

Repeat Resumes

Emily Uhlmann: 9

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

Mark Brown: 5

\$0.00

Christopher Gilbert: 5

\$0.00

Stacie Greco: 5

\$0.00

Emily Uhlmann: 5

\$0.00

WSP USA Environment & Infrastructure Inc.

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

Mark Brown: 44

Christopher Gilbert: 42

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. No

Stacie Greco: 45

Emily Uhlmann: 40

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

Mark Brown: 26

Christopher Gilbert: 22

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Yes F. Yes G. Jennifer Sagan, jennifer.sagan@wsp.com, (352) 474-9818 H. Christine Mehle, PE, CFM, ENV SP, christine.mehle@wsp.com, (470) 991-3771 I. No J. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 23

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

Mark Brown: 45

Christopher Gilbert: 40

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. Generic F. Yes

Stacie Greco: 41

Emily Uhlmann: 42

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

Mark Brown: 25

Christopher Gilbert: 19

A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes D. Yes E. N/A F. N/A G. N/A

Stacie Greco: 25

Emily Uhlmann: 20

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

Mark Brown: 7

Christopher Gilbert: 6

A. Yes B. Yes C. Generic

Stacie Greco: 5

Repeat Resumes

Emily Uhlmann: 8

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

Mark Brown: 3

\$143,067.78

Christopher Gilbert: 3

\$143,067.78

Stacie Greco: 3

\$143,067.78

Emily Uhlmann: 3

\$143,067.78

ITA Notice RFP 25-171 Annual Environmental Consulting Services

Final Audit Report

2024-06-06

Created:	2024-06-06
By:	Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAMyzjgctCmb3MRs-CkY1_0PFFd9n3iz3

"ITA Notice RFP 25-171 Annual Environmental Consulting Services" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
2024-06-06 - 11:46:20 AM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2024-06-06 - 11:47:38 AM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Document emailed to TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2024-06-06 - 11:47:39 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
2024-06-06 - 12:53:18 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by TJ White (twhite@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2024-06-06 - 12:54:34 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Agreement completed.
2024-06-06 - 12:54:34 PM GMT