



Alachua County Procurement

Theodore "TJ" White, Jr., NIGP-CPP, CPPB
Procurement Manager

Thomas J. Rouse
Contracts Supervisor

Monday, August 25, 2025

MEMORANDUM

To: Theodore "TJ" White, Jr. NIGP-CPP, CPPB, Procurement Manager
From: Mandy Mullins, Procurement Agent I
Subject: **INTENT TO AWARD**
RFP 26-74-MM Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

Solicitation Deadline: 2:00 PM Wednesday, August 6, 2025,
Solicitation Notifications View Count: 755 Vendors
Solicitations Downloads: 36 Vendors
Solicitations Submissions: 4 Vendors

Vendors:

DebrisTech, LLC Picayune, MS 39466	Rostan Solutions LLC Valrico, FL 33596
Tetra Tech, Inc. Maitland, FL 32751	Thompson Consulting Services, LLC Maitland, FL 32751

RECOMMENDATION:

The board approves the Evaluation Committee’s award ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate agreements with the top two ranked firms. Should the staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the two top-ranked firms, negotiations with the unsuccessful firm will be terminated. Negotiations with the third ranked firm may be undertaken in the same manner in order of ranking until an agreement is reached, and so forth; for RFP26-74-MM Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services.

1. Tetra Tech, Inc.
2. Thompson Consulting Services, LLC
3. DebrisTech, LLC
4. Rostan Solutions LLC


TJ White (A 08/25/2025 16:24:36 EDT)

08/25/25

Approved

Date

Theodore “TJ” White, Jr., NIGP-CPP, CPPB

Procurement Manager

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

Public Meeting Minutes (Start Recording)
RFP 26-74-MM Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

Date: Monday, August 25, 2025

Start Time: 10:30 am

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

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting

Good morning, I am Leira Cruz Cáliz, with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member).

Introduce the Evaluation Committee (the Committee), David Wood (Leader), Brian Kauffman, David Peaton, Phil Mann, Stephanie Puhalla. Thank you, committee, for taking the time out of your busy schedule to evaluate these proposals.

Welcome to the citizens attending this Public Meeting, in person and online; this meeting is open to the public and you will have an announced time of 3 minutes for public comments. No response is required.

Please review the agenda that is on the screen.

The Committee will be evaluating vendors' proposals, discussing the submitted proposals, and approving the Committee's Ranking. The final ranking will be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners for approval and requesting authorization to move forward with negotiating contract(s).

3. RFP Committee Members Process Instructions

First The Committee has certified that they have no Conflict of Interest in OpenGov.
(show them on screen, discuss if necessary)

Second Due to the cone-of-silence imposed on the Committee, this is the first occasion they have been able to talk and work together.

Third The Committee will discuss the proposals, starting with the Committee leader allowing each member to give feedback.

The Committee has broad latitude in their discussions, deliberations and ranking provided they are not arbitrary or capricious.

During this discussion, Committee members have the option to revisit their scores, as long as their reasoning is not arbitrary or capricious.

*(Encourage discussion on the proposals until all members are satisfied.
Agents will monitor the discussion, following the RFP guidelines.)*

Fourth The Committee will determine whether to request oral presentations or not.

Motion for Oral Presentations: Phil Mann motioned to not have Oral Presentations. Seconded

by David Wood
Vote 5-0 in favor.

Fifth Procurement will review the Administrator Scores which include Volume of Previous Work

Sixth Procurement will review and confirm the scores provided by the Evaluation Committee.

Vendor	Brian Kauffman	Philip Mann	David Peaton	Stephanie Puhalla	David Wood	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Tetra Tech, Inc.	170	117	124	153	156	144
Thompson Consulting Services, ...	166	116	111	156	154	140.6
DebrisTech, LLC	156	110	117	146	155	136.8
Rostan Solutions LLC	157	108	110	134	152	132.2

- 4 Motion to Approve Ranking:** David Peaton motioned to approve the above ranking and authorize staff to negotiate agreements with the top two ranked firms. Should the staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the two top-ranked firms, negotiations with the unsuccessful firm will be terminated. Negotiations with the third ranked firm may be undertaken in the same manner in order of ranking until an agreement is reached, and so forth; David Wood seconded the motion.

Vote 5-0 in favor.

- 5 Public Comments (3 minutes):** No public comment

- 6 Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes:** Phil Mann moved to approve the Minutes, David Peaton seconded the motion.

Vote 5-0 in favor.

- 7 Meeting Adjourned at 10:49 a.m.**



Alachua County, Florida

Procurement

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 26-74-MM

Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

RESPONSE DEADLINE: August 6, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Monday, August 25, 2025

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services
Project ID	RFP 26-74-MM
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	June 18, 2025
Due Date	August 6, 2025
Procurement Agent	Mandy Mullins
Evaluators	Brian Kauffman, Philip Mann, David Peaton, Stephanie Puhalla, David Wood
Project Description	Alachua County is soliciting vendors to provide assistance with cleanup and FEMA public assistance after a declared disaster. The vendor must provide Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services within the municipalities and the un-incorporated areas of Alachua County.

Introduction

Summary

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners (hereinafter, the "County" or "Alachua County") is seeking proposals from qualified individuals or entities (hereinafter, referred to as "Consultant" or the "proposer") for the provision of RFP 26-74-MM Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services.

The following apply to this request for proposal: [Instruction to Proposers](#), [Terms and Conditions](#), [Insurance](#), [Scope of Work](#), [Proposal Requirements and Organization](#), [Request for Proposal Selection Procedures](#), [Evaluation Phases](#), [Attachments](#), [Submittals](#) and [Sample Agreement](#).

Alachua County is soliciting vendors to provide assistance with cleanup and FEMA public assistance after a declared disaster. The vendor must provide Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services within the municipalities and the un-incorporated areas of Alachua County.

Background

Location: Alachua County is located in North Central Florida. The County government seat is situated in Gainesville. Gainesville is located 70 miles southwest of Jacksonville, 129 miles southeast of Tallahassee, 140 miles northeast of Tampa - St. Petersburg and 109 miles northwest of Orlando. Alachua County has a population of over 250,000 and a regional airport. The County itself consists of a total area of 969 square miles.

Form of Government: Alachua County is governed by a Board of five (5) elected County Commissioners and operates under the established County Manager Charter form of government. In addition to the five County Commissioners, there are five elected Constitutional Officers: Supervisor of Elections, Sheriff, Clerk of the Court, Tax Collector, and the Property Appraiser. The Alachua County Attorney also reports to the Board.

Contact Information

Mandy Mullins

Procurement Agent I

Email: mmmullins@alachuacounty.us

Phone: [\(352\) 384-3090](tel:(352)384-3090)

Department:

Solid Waste & Resource Recovery

Timeline

Solicitation Release Date	June 18, 2025
Question Submission Deadline	July 27, 2025, 12:00am

<p>Solicitation Submission Deadline</p>	<p>August 6, 2025, 2:00pm The scheduled solicitation opening will occur via Teams Meeting during a public meeting; the information to join is provided below. Attendance (live viewing) of the proposals opening is not required.</p> <p>Join Microsoft Teams meeting Join on your computer, mobile app or room device Click here to join the meeting</p> <p>https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_ZTQyYzk5YzMtZDc4ZS00N2lxLTljMWUtMjAwNTQwN2NjNTNi%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22c82ab8e7-6ee1-4cd5-9191-4aa322a1828f%22%7d</p> <p>Meeting ID: 259 625 692 241 Passcode: yX9G3Q Download Teams Join on the web Or call in (audio only) +1 469-998-7938,,366862554# United States, Dallas Phone Conference ID: 366 862 554#</p> <p>If you have a disability and need an accommodation in order to participate, please contact the Alachua County ADA Coordinator at ADA@alachuacounty.us or Equal Opportunity Office at 352-374-5275 at least 7 business days prior to the event. If you are unable to notify the Office prior to the event, please inform an Alachua County employee that you need assistance. TDD/TTY users, please call 711 (Florida Relay Service).</p>
--	---

SOLICITATION STATUS HISTORY

Date	Changed To	Changed By
May 20, 2025 9:49 AM	Draft	Mandy Mullins
May 20, 2025 11:01 AM	Review	Mandy Mullins
Jun 17, 2025 8:42 AM	Final	Mandy Mullins
Jun 17, 2025 8:43 AM	Post Pending	Mandy Mullins
Jun 18, 2025 6:00 AM	Open	OpenGov Bot
Aug 6, 2025 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Aug 7, 2025 9:01 AM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	DebrisTech, LLC	Josh Daffern jdaffern@debristech.com	Aug 5, 2025 7:00 PM
Submitted	Rostan Solutions LLC	Travis Mays tmays@rostan.com (813) 333-7042	Aug 6, 2025 11:14 AM
Submitted	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Alex Renaux tdr.mktg@tetrattech.com (321) 441-8564	Aug 5, 2025 3:55 PM
Submitted	Thompson Consulting Services, LLC	Hannah Fleming bbastian@thompsoncs.net (407) 792-0018	Aug 6, 2025 12:10 PM
No Bid	Tidal Basin Government Consulting, LLC	Marcie Bartnick airfp@aidrc.com	Jun 30, 2025 7:43 AM

PRICING RESPONSES

FEE SCHEDULE FOR ANNUAL MONITORING POSITIONS (Table 1 of 2)

Fee Schedule for Annual Monitoring Positions			DebrisTech, LLC			Rostan Solutions LLC		
Line Item	Description	Unit of Measure	\$/Hour	\$/10 Hour Day	\$/12 Hour Day	\$/Hour	\$/10 Hour Day	\$/12 Hour Day
1	Project Manager	Hour	\$60.00	600.00	720.00	\$80.00	800.00	960.00
2	Operations Manager	Hour	\$55.00	550.00	660.00	\$70.00	700.00	840.00
3	Field Supervisor	Hour	\$50.00	500.00	600.00	\$50.00	500.00	600.00
4	Field Monitor	Hour	\$38.00	380.00	456.00	\$36.50	365.00	438.00
5	Tower Monitor	Hour	\$38.00	380.00	456.00	\$36.50	365.00	438.00

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 26-74-MM
Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

Fee Schedule for Annual Monitoring Positions			DebrisTech, LLC			Rostan Solutions LLC		
Line Item	Description	Unit of Measure	\$/Hour	\$/10 Hour Day	\$/12 Hour Day	\$/Hour	\$/10 Hour Day	\$/12 Hour Day
6	Drop-off Site Monitor	Hour	\$38.00	380.00	456.00	\$32.00	320.00	384.00
7	Billing/Invoice/Data Entry Tracking	Hour	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	\$32.00	320.00	384.00
Total			\$279.00			\$337.00		

FEE SCHEDULE FOR ANNUAL MONITORING POSITIONS (Table 2 of 2)

Fee Schedule for Annual Monitoring Positions			Tetra Tech, Inc.			Thompson Consulting Services, LLC		
Line Item	Description	Unit of Measure	\$/Hour	\$/10 Hour Day	\$/12 Hour Day	\$/Hour	\$/10 Hour Day	\$/12 Hour Day
1	Project Manager	Hour	\$60.00	\$600	\$720	\$65.00	650.00	780.00
2	Operations Manager	Hour	\$45.00	\$450	\$540	\$0.00	FEMA scrutinizes multiple layers of management during reimbursement review and consideration. The Operations Manager position is a duplicate management position within the provided rate schedule therefore, tasks associated with the Operations Manager will be performed by the Project Manager.	
3	Field Supervisor	Hour	\$45.00	\$450	\$540	\$47.00	470.00	564.00
4	Field Monitor	Hour	\$34.00	\$340	\$408	\$32.00	320.00	384.00
5	Tower Monitor	Hour	\$34.00	\$340	\$408	\$32.00	320.00	384.00
6	Drop-off Site Monitor	Hour	\$29.50	\$295	\$354	\$32.00	320.00	384.00
7	Billing/Invoice/Data Entry Tracking	Hour	\$40.00	\$400	\$480	\$55.00	550.00	660.00
Total			\$287.50			\$263.00		

FEE SCHEDULE EQUIPMENT (Table 1 of 2)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 26-74-MM
Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

Fee Schedule Equipment			DebrisTech, LLC			Rostan Solutions LLC		
Line Item	Description	Unit of Measure	\$/Day	\$/Week	\$/Month	\$/Day	\$/Week	\$/Month
8	Monitoring vehicle (Midsize or smaller per Enterprise)	Day	\$50.00	350.00	1500.00	\$60.00		
9	Digital camera	Day	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
10	Laptop computer	Day	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
11	Cellular phone with GPS capabilities	Day	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
12	Staff lodging per person per diem per FS 112.061	Per diem	\$80.00	n/a	n/a	\$110.00	n/a	n/a
13	Food per diem per person per diem per FS 112.61	Per diem	\$36.00	n/a	n/a	\$68.00	n/a	n/a
14	Operating license for GIS app. (per County computer) PER UNIT	Unit	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
15	Load ticket (box of 10,000) (BOX OF 10,000)	Box	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
16	Scale min. 20,000 pounds per pad	Day	\$0.00	0.00	0.00	\$300.00		
Total			\$166.00			\$538.00		

FEE SCHEDULE EQUIPMENT (Table 2 of 2)

Fee Schedule Equipment			Tetra Tech, Inc.			Thompson Consulting Services, LLC		
Line Item	Description	Unit of Measure	\$/Day	\$/Week	\$/Month	\$/Day	\$/Week	\$/Month
8	Monitoring vehicle (Midsize or smaller per Enterprise)	Day	\$50.00	At cost, no mark-up	At cost, no mark-up	\$58.66	Rental vehicle charges will be billed to the County at cost with no markup	
9	Digital camera	Day	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	No Charge	
10	Laptop computer	Day	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	No Charge	

Line Item	Fee Schedule Equipment		Tetra Tech, Inc.			Thompson Consulting Services, LLC		
	Description	Unit of Measure	\$/Day	\$/Week	\$/Month	\$/Day	\$/Week	\$/Month
11	Cellular phone with GPS capabilities	Day	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$66.00	Cellular phone with GPS capabilities charge applies to positions that require the use of an ADMS handheld device and hip printer.	
12	Staff lodging per person per diem per FS 112.061	Per diem	\$110.00	n/a	n/a	\$110.00	n/a	n/a
13	Food per diem per person per diem per FS 112.61	Per diem	\$68.00	n/a	n/a	\$68.00	n/a	n/a
14	Operating license for GIS app. (per County computer) PER UNIT	Unit	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	No Charge	
15	Load ticket (box of 10,000) (BOX OF 10,000)	Box	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	No Charge	
16	Scale min. 20,000 pounds per pad	Day	\$260.00	To be determined (TBD)	To be determined (TBD)	\$0.00	No Charge	
Total			\$488.00			\$302.66		

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. Re-Solicitation Clarification Request

Jun 20, 2025 4:22 PM

Question: The County issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Debris Monitoring Services in May 2024, resulting in the award of a five-year contract to Tetra Tech. Could the County kindly provide the rationale for issuing a subsequent RFP just one year later?

Jun 20, 2025 4:22 PM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: The County released this RFP to allow municipalities to be included in the process and allow all entities to have individual agreements with selected vendor(s). This will ensure compliance with FEMA requirements for reimbursement

Jun 30, 2025 3:55 AM

2. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Question: Please describe your level of satisfaction with your current or recent vendor(s) for the same purchasing activity, if applicable.

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Satisfactory

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

3. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Question: Are bidders permitted to deviate in any way from any manner of quoting fees you may be expecting? For example, if there is a pricing page in the RFP, can bidders submit an alternate fee structure? If there is no pricing page in the RFP, do you have any preference for how bidders should quote fees or can bidders create their own pricing categories?

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: NO

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

4. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Question: Can you please provide greater details regarding your bid bond and/or performance bond requirements related to this contract? For example, what is required with the proposal, and what is required to comply during the term of the contract?

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Not required.

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

5. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Question: When is the anticipated award date?

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: October 2025

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

6. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Question: Why has this bid been released at this time?

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: The County released this RFP to allow municipalities to be included in the process and allow all entities to have individual agreements with selected vendor(s)

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

7. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Question: If there was a previous solicitation for these services, what was its title, number, release date, and due date?

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: RFP 25-74-MM Annual Monitoring of Disaster Debris and Recovery Activities <https://procurement.opengov.com/portal/alachuacounty/projects/88683>

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

8. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Question: How many times have the incumbent's services been utilized in the previous five years?

Jun 18, 2025 11:32 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: 1 in the last five years

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

9. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Question: Who is the incumbent, and how long has the incumbent been providing the requested services?

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Tetra Tech for one year

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

10. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Question: To what extent will the location of the bidder's proposed location or headquarters have a bearing on any award?

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: None

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

11. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Question: Are any specific professional credentials required to qualify for the contract?

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Appropriately FEMA trained staff

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

12. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Question: When/what was the most recent event that precipitated the activation of the existing or previous contract?

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Hurricane Helene

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

13. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Question: Approximately how many cubic yards of debris were collected from the most recent event?

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: 200000

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

14. No subject

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Question: What estimated or actual dollars were paid to the incumbent(s) after the most recent event?

Jun 18, 2025 11:31 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: 1.5 million dollars

Jul 7, 2025 10:39 AM

15. ADMS Rate

Jul 11, 2025 2:38 PM

Question: The manual process of filling out load tickets can jeopardize proper FEMA reimbursement if human error occurs. Utilizing electronic load tickets, computer tablets, and systems employing electronic contractor IDs with an Automated Debris Management System (ADMS) has become the industry standard and is critical for any successful debris operation. Because of the factors listed, we would like to confirm that any charges for the use of an ADMS are to be fully burdened in the proposed debris monitoring positions hourly rates provided and not as a separate hourly rate or separate position, separate flat rate, or substitutional charge for any listed position.

Jul 11, 2025 2:38 PM

Answered by David Wood: Yes- that is correct. Costs for the ADMS should be included in the position's hourly rate and not a separate line item.

Jul 14, 2025 2:18 PM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

Addendum #1

Jul 18, 2025 9:41 AM

Solicitation Submission Deadline Extended

Question Submission Deadline: July 27, 2025, 12:00am

Solicitation Submission Deadline: August 6, 2025, 2:00pm

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

Addendum #2

Jul 25, 2025 11:58 AM

This addendum adds required Byrd Anti-Lobbying certification Form to Submittals, updated sample agreement and updated to include SB180 House Bill language released on July 2025.

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

ADDENDA ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Addendum #1

Proposal	Confirmed	Confirmed At	Confirmed By
Tetra Tech, Inc.	X	Jul 31, 2025 3:23 PM	Alex Renaux
DebrisTech, LLC	X	Jul 18, 2025 11:38 AM	Josh Daffern
Rostan Solutions LLC	X	Jul 30, 2025 10:43 PM	Denise Jankauskas
Thompson Consulting Services, LLC	X	Aug 6, 2025 7:06 AM	Hannah Fleming

Addendum #2

Proposal	Confirmed	Confirmed At	Confirmed By
Tetra Tech, Inc.	X	Jul 31, 2025 3:23 PM	Alex Renaux
DebrisTech, LLC	X	Aug 3, 2025 10:06 AM	Josh Daffern
Rostan Solutions LLC	X	Jul 30, 2025 10:43 PM	Denise Jankauskas
Thompson Consulting Services, LLC	X	Aug 6, 2025 7:06 AM	Hannah Fleming

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Aug 6, 2025 2:10 PM

Submitted Responses

Attachments:

· [BT RFP 26-74 Disaster Debris Monitoring Services](#)

Notice #2

Aug 7, 2025 9:50 AM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Monday, August 25, 2025**, 10:30 AM to discuss and update of the proposals for competitive solicitation RFP 26-74-MM Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services. The final recommendations will be sent to the Alachua County Board of County Commissioners.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 26-74-MM Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

Time: **Monday, August 25, 2025** at 10:30 am Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Administration Building

3rd Floor Conference Room

12 SE 1st Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

Via Microsoft Teams

Meeting ID: 234 834 711 045 4

Passcode: g7V7BF9L

https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_YzRmOGY4OGUtMzMwNC00NjBmLWFiMzAtZWNmODNhMTE2YjY5%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%2290fc851d-766d-4d7b-a09c-bfbf1d2dac94%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22c82ab8e7-6ee1-4cd5-9191-4aa322a1828f%22%7d

Dial in by phone

+1 469-998-7938,,348894824# United States, Dallas

Phone conference ID: 348 894 824#

These meetings are subject to change and/or cancellation. If you have any questions regarding these meetings, please call 352.384.3090. All persons are advised that, if they decide to contest any decision made at any of these meetings, they will need a record of the proceedings and, for such purpose, they may need to ensure that verbatim record of the proceedings is made which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. If any accommodations are needed for persons with disabilities, please contact the County’s Equal Opportunity Office at (352)374-5275 or (TTD) (352)-374-5284.

Attachments:

· [PM Notice 26-74 Disaster Debris Monitoring Services](#)

EVALUATION

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Brian Kauffman	Assistant Public Works Director	Aug 19, 2025 4:40 PM
Philip Mann	Special Project Administrator	Aug 8, 2025 1:11 PM
David Peaton	Asst. Director of Emergency Management	Aug 20, 2025 8:34 AM

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Stephanie Puhalla	City of Newberry - Purchasing Specialist	Aug 20, 2025 10:14 AM
David Wood	Professional Geologist	Aug 7, 2025 4:10 PM

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?
- 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 (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)

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)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 26-74-MM

Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

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

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)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
RFP No. RFP 26-74-MM
Annual Disaster Debris Monitoring Services

Description:
Points Provided by Procurement.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Brian Kauffman	Philip Mann	David Peaton	Stephanie Puhalla
Tetra Tech, Inc.	170	117	124	153
Thompson Consulting Services, LLC	166	116	111	156
DebrisTech, LLC	156	110	117	146
Rostan Solutions LLC	157	108	110	134

Vendor	David Wood	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Tetra Tech, Inc.	156	144
Thompson Consulting Services, LLC	154	140.6
DebrisTech, LLC	155	136.8
Rostan Solutions LLC	152	132.2

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%)
Tetra Tech, Inc.	44	25	42.2	24.2
Thompson Consulting Services, LLC	43	23.6	37.2	24.4
DebrisTech, LLC	42	23.4	37	22
Rostan Solutions LLC	39.6	22	37.4	21.2

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)
Tetra Tech, Inc.	8.6	0	144

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)
Thompson Consulting Services, LLC	7.4	5	140.6
DebrisTech, LLC	7.4	5	136.8
Rostan Solutions LLC	7	5	132.2

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

DebrisTech, LLC	
Ability and Competency of the Consultant Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	
Brian Kauffman:	45
Philip Mann:	35
David Peaton:	40
Stephanie Puhalla:	45
David Wood:	45
Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)	
Brian Kauffman:	25
Philip Mann:	20
David Peaton:	22
Stephanie Puhalla:	24
David Wood:	26
Project Understanding and Approach Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)	
Brian Kauffman:	48
Philip Mann:	30
David Peaton:	21
Stephanie Puhalla:	41
David Wood:	45
Ability to Meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)	
Brian Kauffman:	25

Philip Mann: 15
David Peaton: 21
Stephanie Puhalla: 23
David Wood: 26

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

Brian Kauffman: 8
Philip Mann: 5
David Peaton: 8
Stephanie Puhalla: 8
David Wood: 8

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

Brian Kauffman: 5
No previous work
Philip Mann: 5
No previous work
David Peaton: 5
No previous work
Stephanie Puhalla: 5
No previous work
David Wood: 5
No previous work

Rostan Solutions LLC

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

Brian Kauffman: 47
Philip Mann: 30
David Peaton: 38
Stephanie Puhalla: 40
David Wood: 43

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

Brian Kauffman: 25
Philip Mann: 20
David Peaton: 20
Stephanie Puhalla: 20
David Wood: 25

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

Brian Kauffman: 47
Philip Mann: 30
David Peaton: 22
Stephanie Puhalla: 42
David Wood: 46

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

Brian Kauffman: 25
Philip Mann: 20
David Peaton: 17
Stephanie Puhalla: 19
David Wood: 25

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

Brian Kauffman: 8
Philip Mann: 3
David Peaton: 8
Stephanie Puhalla: 8
David Wood: 8

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

Brian Kauffman: 5
No previous work
Philip Mann: 5
No previous work
David Peaton: 5
No previous work

Stephanie Puhalla: 5

No previous work

David Wood: 5

No previous work

Tetra Tech, Inc.

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

Brian Kauffman: 50

Philip Mann: 35

David Peaton: 42

Stephanie Puhalla: 46

David Wood: 47

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

Brian Kauffman: 30

Philip Mann: 20

David Peaton: 22

Stephanie Puhalla: 27

David Wood: 26

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

Brian Kauffman: 50

Philip Mann: 35

David Peaton: 35

Stephanie Puhalla: 45

David Wood: 46

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

Brian Kauffman: 30

Philip Mann: 20

David Peaton: 17

Stephanie Puhalla: 26

David Wood: 28

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

Brian Kauffman: 10

Philip Mann: 7

David Peaton: 8

Stephanie Puhalla: 9

David Wood: 9

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

Brian Kauffman: 0

VOW \$1,351,707.30

Philip Mann: 0

VOW \$1,351,707.30

David Peaton: 0

VOW \$1,351,707.30

Stephanie Puhalla: 0

VOW \$1,351,707.30

David Wood: 0

VOW \$1,351,707.30

Thompson Consulting Services, LLC

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

Brian Kauffman: 50

Philip Mann: 35

David Peaton: 38

Stephanie Puhalla: 47

David Wood: 45

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

Brian Kauffman: 27

Philip Mann: 20

David Peaton: 20

Stephanie Puhalla: 27

David Wood: 24

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

Brian Kauffman: 47

Philip Mann: 30

David Peaton: 22

Stephanie Puhalla: 42

David Wood: 45

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

Brian Kauffman: 29

Philip Mann: 20

David Peaton: 19

Stephanie Puhalla: 27

David Wood: 27

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

Brian Kauffman: 8

Philip Mann: 6

David Peaton: 7

Stephanie Puhalla: 8

David Wood: 8

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

Brian Kauffman: 5

No previous work

Philip Mann: 5

No previous work

David Peaton: 5

No previous work

Stephanie Puhalla: 5

No previous work

David Wood: 5

No previous work