



ALACHUA COUNTY Procurement

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

Thomas J. Rouse
Contracts Supervisor

February 6, 2026

MEMORANDUM

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

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

**SUBJECT: INTENT TO AWARD
RFP 26-243-MM Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO**

Solicitation Opening Date: 2:00 PM, January 7, 2026

Solicitation Notifications View Count: 1032 Vendors

Solicitations Downloaded by: 59 Vendors

Solicitations Submissions: 5 Vendors


Vendors:

AtkinsRealis USA, Inc. Tampa, FL 33607	Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc. Springfield, IL 62702	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. Orlando, FL 32801
North Florida Professional Services, Inc. Lake City, FL 32025-2904		The Corradino Group, Inc. Miami, FL 33178

RECOMMENDATION:

The Board approves the ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate an agreement with the top two ranked firms. Should the staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with the top-ranked firm(s), negotiations with the unsuccessful firm(s) will be terminated. Negotiations with the third-ranked firm may be undertaken in the same manner until an agreement is reached.

1. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
2. AtkinsRealis USA, Inc.
3. The Corradino Group, Inc.
4. Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.
5. North Florida Professional Services, Inc.


TJ White (Feb 10, 2026 08:00:03 EST)

02/10/26

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 responsible in accordance with the criteria that the protesting party alleges should be used;
 - iv. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest.
 - v. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;
 - vi. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party’s alleged basis for the protest; and
 - vii. The form of the relief requested.

- (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Solicitation Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Solicitation Protest is untimely and, therefore, rejected. The Procurement Manager shall consider all timely Solicitation Protests and may conduct any inquiry that the Procurement Manager deems necessary to make a determination regarding a protest. The Procurement Manager shall issue a written determination granting or denying the protest. The written determination shall contain a concise statement of the basis for the determination.
 - (d) *Appeal:* If the protesting party is not satisfied with the Procurement Manager's determination, the protesting party may appeal the determination to the County Manager by filing a written appeal, which sets forth the basis upon which the appeal is based, including all supporting documentation. The scope of the appeal shall be limited to the basis alleged in the Solicitation Protest. The appeal must be filed with the Procurement Manager within five business days of the date on which the Procurement Manager's written determination was sent to the protesting party. Failure to timely file an appeal shall constitute a waiver of the protesting party's rights to an appeal of the Procurement Manager's determination, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said Solicitation defects in a subsequent award protest, if any, or any other administrative or legal proceeding. After considering the appeal, the County Manager must determine whether the solicitation should stand, be revised, or be cancelled, and issue a written determination and provide copies of the determination to the protesting party. The determination of the County Manager shall be final and not subject to further appeal under this code.
- (3) *Award Protest.* Any Bidder who is not the intended awardee and who claims to be the rightful awardee may file an award protest. However, an award protest is not valid and shall be rejected for lack of standing if it does not demonstrate that the protesting party would be awarded the Solicitation if its protest is upheld.
- (a) *Basis of the Award Protest:* The alleged basis for an Award Protest shall be limited to the following:
 - i. The protesting party was incorrectly deemed non-responsive due to an incorrect assessment of fact or law;
 - ii. The County failed to substantively follow the procedures or requirements specified in the solicitation documents, except for minor irregularities that were waived by the County in accordance with this Code, which resulted in a competitive disadvantage to the protesting party; and
 - iii. The County made a mathematical error in evaluating the responses to the solicitation, resulting in an incorrect score and not protesting party not being selected for award.
 - (b) *Timing and Content of the Award Protest:* The Award Protest must be in writing and must be received by the Procurement Manager, twhite@alachuacounty.us by no later than 3:00 PM on the third business day after the County's proposed Award decision was posted by the County. Failure to timely file an Award Protest shall constitute a total and complete waiver of the Bidder's right to protest or appeal the County's proposed Award decision in any administrative or legal proceeding. In the event an Award Protest is timely filed, the protesting party shall be deemed to have waived any and all proposed Award defects that were not timely alleged in the protesting party's Award Protest, and the protesting party shall be forever barred from subsequently raising or appealing said Award defects in any administrative or legal proceeding. The Award Protest must include, at a minimum, the following information:
 - i. The name, address, e-mail and telephone number of the protesting party;
 - ii. The Solicitation number and title;

- iii. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party's response was responsive to the Solicitation;
 - iv. Information sufficient to establish that the protesting party has legal standing to file the Solicitation Protest because:
 - 1. The protesting party submitted a response to the Solicitation or other basis for establishing legal standing;
 - 2. The protesting party has a substantial interest in and is aggrieved in connection with the proposed Award decision; and
 - 3. The protesting party, and not any other bidder, should be awarded the Solicitation if the protesting party's Award Protest is upheld.
 - v. A detailed statement of the basis for the protest;
 - vi. References to section of the Code, Florida Statutes, County policies or procedure or solicitation term that the protesting party alleges have been violated by the County or that entitles the protesting party to the relief requested;
 - vii. All supporting evidence or documents that substantiate the protesting party's alleged basis for the protest; and
 - viii. The form of the relief requested.
- (c) *Review and Determination of Protest:* If the Award Protest is not timely, the Procurement Manager shall notify the protesting party that the Award 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 substantially 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.



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 26-243-MM

Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO

RESPONSE DEADLINE: January 7, 2026 at 2:00 pm

Friday, February 6, 2026

SOLICITATION OVERVIEW

Project Title	Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO
Project ID	RFP 26-243-MM
Project Type	Request For Proposal
Release Date	November 19, 2025
Due Date	January 7, 2026
Procurement Agent	Mandy Mullins
Evaluators	Deborah Leistner, Alison Moss, Anoch Whitfield
Project Description	<p>The Gainesville/Alachua County Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO) requires the services of two or more consultants to provide professional planning and production support. It is the specific intent of the MTPO to select firms with a broad range of services.</p> <p>The consultant(s) will assist the MTPO staff by providing technical resources to accomplish tasks outlined in the adopted Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) on an as-needed basis. This scope identifies the types of tasks assigned to consultants under General Planning Consultant contracts.</p>

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 "Proposer") for the provision of RFP 26-243-MM Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO.

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](#).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Request For Proposal - Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO

Page 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 26-243-MM

Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO

The Gainesville/Alachua County Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO) requires the services of two or more consultants to provide professional planning and production support. It is the specific intent of the MTPO to select firms with a broad range of services.

The consultant(s) will assist the MTPO staff by providing technical resources to accomplish tasks outlined in the adopted Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) on an as-needed basis. This scope identifies the types of tasks assigned to consultants under General Planning Consultant contracts.

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:3523843090)

Department:

Growth Management

Timeline

Solicitation Release Date	November 19, 2025
2nd Advertisement Date	November 26, 2025
Question Submission Deadline	December 28, 2025, 12:00am

<p>Solicitation Submission Deadline</p>	<p>January 7, 2026, 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%22id%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
Oct 23, 2025 9:30 AM	Draft	Mandy Mullins
Oct 23, 2025 9:47 AM	Review	Mandy Mullins
Nov 19, 2025 8:57 AM	Final	Mandy Mullins
Nov 19, 2025 8:58 AM	Post Pending	Mandy Mullins
Nov 19, 2025 9:01 AM	Open	Mandy Mullins
Jan 7, 2026 2:00 PM	Pending	OpenGov Bot
Jan 15, 2026 9:25 AM	Evaluation	Mandy Mullins

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Status	Vendor	Contact Info	Submission Date
Submitted	AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.	Aimee Larson aimee.larson@atkinsrealis.com	Jan 7, 2026 11:42 AM
Submitted	Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	Ali Williams procurement@cmtengr.com (217) 787-8050	Jan 7, 2026 11:33 AM
Submitted	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Erin Athas florida.marketing@kimley-horn.com (321) 754-0910	Jan 7, 2026 1:03 PM
Submitted	North Florida Professional Services, Inc.	Daina Mirsch-Wenner dwenner@nfps.net (386) 752-4675 Ext: 104	Jan 7, 2026 10:24 AM
No Bid	Patterson Veterinary	Gregory Pounds pvs.orders.gov-institute@pattersonvet.com	Nov 19, 2025 9:49 AM
Submitted	The Corradino Group, Inc.	Larry Johnson ljohnson@corradino.com (305) 594-0735 Ext: 1029	Jan 7, 2026 10:45 AM

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.	Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	North Florida Professional Services, Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
State Compliance	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 26-243-MM

Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO

Question Title	AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.	Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	North Florida Professional Services, Inc.
Upload completed Exhibits A-F	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
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	The Corradino Group, Inc.
Corporate Resolution Granting Signature	Pass
State Compliance	Pass
Upload completed Exhibits A-F	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	Pass
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response

Question Title	The Corradino Group, Inc.
Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request	No Response
Drug Free Workplace	Pass
Vendor Eligibility	Pass
NON-SBE Subcontractors	Pass
Responsible Agent Designation	Pass
Conflict of Interest	Pass
Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation	Pass
Acknowledgement of Requirements	Pass

PRICING RESPONSES

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Approved, Unanswered Questions

Approved, Answers Provided

1. Attachments

Dec 9, 2025 11:39 AM

Question: The RFP does not provide for the type of work for the Professional Services Commitment form (e.g., 13.1, 13.2). How would the County like us to complete this form?

Dec 9, 2025 11:39 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Link to fillable form located <https://pdl.fdot.gov/api/form/downloadAttachment/10980573>

Dec 10, 2025 10:42 AM

2. DBE requirement

Dec 9, 2025 11:43 AM

Question: Can you confirm whether the Country's DBE requirement is 10.54%?

Dec 9, 2025 11:43 AM

Answered by Leira Cruz Cáliz, NIGP-CPP, CPPB: Gainesville/Alachua County Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization is funded through Federal Highway Administration Metropolitan (FHWA) Planning

Funds and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for the completion of work and requirements. Vendors are responsible for following requirements set forth by FHWA and FDOT.

Dec 10, 2025 10:42 AM

3. Evaluation Criteria

Dec 10, 2025 10:16 AM

Question: On the evaluation criteria, for both section "7.2 Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications" and "7.4 Ability of Proposer's Professional Personnel", the County is requesting resumes for the Project Manager, Project Team, and Key Staff. Can the County confirm if resumes should be included in both sections? Also, can the County confirm if resumes are required for the entire project team or just the Project Manager and Key Staff?

Dec 10, 2025 10:16 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: Per the RFP, please include the resumes in appropriate sections/tabs.

Dec 10, 2025 10:42 AM

4. Work Types

Dec 12, 2025 10:21 AM

Question: Can you please specify which work types are required to be input into the Professional Services Commitment form?

Dec 12, 2025 10:21 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: See addendum # 1 to remove Attachment A and Attachment F

Dec 22, 2025 11:41 AM

5. No subject

Dec 17, 2025 4:45 PM

Question: Can the County provide the Proposal ID / LAP Agreement ID for this effort?

Dec 17, 2025 4:45 PM

Answered by Alison Moss: There is no Proposal ID / LAP Agreement ID for this effort. Please note that the following forms, which may have contained such a field, are being removed via a forthcoming addendum: Attachment A- DBE Information 275-30-11 and Attachment F Professional Services Commitment Form 375-030-83.

Dec 22, 2025 11:41 AM

6. Sample Agreement

Dec 19, 2025 10:09 AM

Question: Would the MTPO please remove the requirement for the professional to be responsible for maintaining safety precautions, programs and materials, as stated in section G, page 44 of the sample contract? As design professionals, we should not be responsible for safety and materials. This is a contractor responsibility.

Dec 19, 2025 10:09 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: The agreement is a sample. This would be addressed during negotiations with the MPTO. this is a sample agreement. These terms will be addressed during negotiations.

Dec 22, 2025 11:41 AM

7. Sample Agreement

Dec 19, 2025 10:09 AM

Question: Would the MTPO please remove the requirement for the professional to pay for permits and permit application fees as stated in section I, page 44 of the sample contract? These fees, building permit fees, etc., should be paid by the MTPO.

Dec 19, 2025 10:09 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: The agreement is a sample. This would be addressed during negotiations with the MPTO. this is a sample agreement. These terms will be addressed during negotiations.

Dec 22, 2025 11:41 AM

8. Sample Agreement

Dec 19, 2025 10:10 AM

Question: As currently worded, we believe that the indemnity provision section E on page 46 of the sample contract is not in compliance with FL Statute 725.08 and is unenforceable. Section 3 of Florida Statute 725.08 defines planning contracts as a "Professional services contract" and as such planning contracts are to adhere to this Statute. Would the MTPO please consider rewording same to conform with the statute? Suggested language per FL Statutes 725.08: "The Professional shall indemnify and hold harmless the MTPO, and its officers and employees, from liabilities, damages, losses, and costs, including, but not limited to, reasonable attorneys' fees, to the extent caused by the negligence, recklessness, or intentionally wrongful conduct of the Professional and other persons employed or utilized by the Professional in the performance of the contract."

Dec 19, 2025 10:10 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: The agreement is a sample. This would be addressed during negotiations with the MPTO. this is a sample agreement. These terms will be addressed during negotiations.

Dec 22, 2025 11:41 AM

9. Project Schedule Clarification

Dec 18, 2025 12:14 PM

Question: On Page 24, it states, "7.5. Ability to Meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements Provide the Project Manager, Project Team, and Key Staff's percentage of involvement, tasks and/or hours assigned to various team members. Proposers should include a draft project schedule, including key milestones, individual tasks, and major deliverable deadlines." On Page 19, it states, "6.1. Services The Consultant will perform professional transportation planning analyses to develop specific recommendations and products, to assist the MTPO in performing various tasks." A "Project Schedule" would be difficult to create since this is not really a "project" but an assistance to MTPO. How would you like us to address the 7.5 request when it concerns the schedule?

Dec 18, 2025 12:14 PM

Answered by Alison Moss: Please provide general schedule and budget controls and practices utilized by the firm to manage budget and schedule. You may also include a sample, detailed schedule for a transportation planning project to demonstrate "ability to meet project schedule and budget requirements."

Dec 22, 2025 11:41 AM

10. Evaluation Criteria

Dec 18, 2025 8:24 AM

Question: In section 9.1 Evaluation Criteria in the RFP, under Ability to Meet Project Schedule and Budget Requirements, E-F shows "Is the pricing provided reasonable for the project's tasks?" and "Is the pricing in line with the County's budget?". This criterion was not reflected in Section 7.5 of the RFP. Can the County confirm if including pricing is a requirement?

Dec 18, 2025 8:24 AM

Answered by Mandy Mullins: See addendum #1

Dec 22, 2025 11:41 AM

ADDENDA & NOTICES

ADDENDA ISSUED:

Addendum #1

Dec 22, 2025 11:42 AM

This addendum removes all criterion for budget and pricing from Evaluation and removes Attachments A and F have been removed. .

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
North Florida Professional Services, Inc.	X	Jan 7, 2026 10:15 AM	Daina Mirsch-Wenner
The Corradino Group, Inc.	X	Jan 6, 2026 10:20 AM	Larry Johnson
Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	X	Jan 6, 2026 3:52 PM	Ali Williams
AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.	X	Jan 7, 2026 11:23 AM	Aimee Larson
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	X	Jan 7, 2026 12:14 PM	Erin Athas

NOTICES ISSUED:

Notice #1

Jan 7, 2026 2:16 PM

Bid Tab

Attachments:

· [Bid Tab 26-243-MM Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO](#)

Notice #2

Jan 26, 2026 10:26 AM

Alachua County Procurement announces a public meeting to which all persons are invited to attend an Evaluation Committee Meeting on **Thursday, February 5, 2026**, 11:00 AM to discuss and evaluate the proposals for competitive solicitation RFP 26-243-MM Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO. The final recommendations will be sent to the MPTO Board.

Topic: Public Notice of Evaluation Committee Meeting for RFP 26-243-MM Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO

Time: **Thursday, February 5, 2026** at 11:00 am Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Location: Alachua County Administration Building
 3rd Floor Conference Room
 12 SE 1st Street, Gainesville, FL 32601

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join: <https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/24095768391549?p=4UJFd0lljwFHsS9doG>

Meeting ID: 240 957 683 915 49

Passcode: Rx6x6kg2

[Need help?](#) | [System reference](#)

Dial in by phone

[+1 469-998-7938,,208716317#](#) United States, Dallas

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 208 716 317#

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 26-243-MM Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO](#)

EVALUATION

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Deborah Leistner	Transportation Planning Manager, City of Gainesville	Jan 26, 2026 12:13 PM
Alison Moss	Sr Transportation Planner	Feb 4, 2026 1:34 PM
Anoch Whitfield	Executive Director • Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization	Jan 30, 2026 10:03 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Description:

- A. Did the Proposer provide a brief statement of background, organization, and size?
- B. Does the Proposer have experience with past work of similar scope?
- C. Has the Proposer recently done this type of work for a state, or local government in the past?
- D. Does the Proposer’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:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 26-243-MM

Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO

- A. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project, the scope, and objectives through a concise narrative?
- B. Did the Proposer 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 Proposer 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 Requirements	Points Based	30 (17.1% of Total)

Description:

- A. Did Proposer 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 Proposer 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. Does the information contained in the proposal indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time 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 Proposer 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	Deborah Leistner	Alison Moss	Anoch Whitfield	Total Score (Max Score 175)
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	156	150	154	153.33
AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.	135	148	166	149.67
The Corradino Group, Inc.	154	146	113	137.67
Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	121	134	73	109.33
North Florida Professional Services, Inc.	95	102	74	90.33

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RFP No. RFP 26-243-MM

Annual General Planning Consultant to MTPO

Vendor	Ability and Competency of the Proposer 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 Requirements Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	45.3	26.3	46.3	26.3
AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.	46	27.7	44.7	18
The Corradino Group, Inc.	41.7	23.3	41	21.7
Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	34	20.7	25	17.3
North Florida Professional Services, Inc.	23.3	14.7	21.7	18.3

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)
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	9	0	153.33
AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.	8.3	5	149.67
The Corradino Group, Inc.	5	5	137.67
Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	7.3	5	109.33
North Florida Professional Services, Inc.	7.3	5	90.33

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

AtkinsRéalis USA, Inc.
Ability and Competency of the Proposer Points Based 50 Points (28.6%)
Deborah Leistner: 48
Alison Moss: 45
Anoch Whitfield: 45
Project Manager and Project Team's Competency and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (17.1%)
Deborah Leistner: 28

Alison Moss: 25

Anoch Whitfield: 30

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

Deborah Leistner: 45

Alison Moss: 40

Anoch Whitfield: 49

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

Deborah Leistner: 1

Alison Moss: 25

Anoch Whitfield: 28

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

Deborah Leistner: 8

Alison Moss: 8

Anoch Whitfield: 9

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

Deborah Leistner: 5

0.00

Alison Moss: 5

0.00

Anoch Whitfield: 5

0.00

Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.

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

Deborah Leistner: 40

Alison Moss: 42

Anoch Whitfield: 20

Proposal did not include sufficient information in this Section to speak to the proposer's abilities and competency for this GPC.

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

Deborah Leistner: 25
Alison Moss: 22
Anoch Whitfield: 15

Team experience in requirements and expectations of MPOs and TPOs not that strong.

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

Deborah Leistner: 30
Alison Moss: 35
Anoch Whitfield: 10

Multimodal transportation and complete streets projects included but no information on status or timing of these projects.

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

Deborah Leistner: 15
Alison Moss: 22
Anoch Whitfield: 15

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

Deborah Leistner: 6
Alison Moss: 8
Anoch Whitfield: 8

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

Deborah Leistner: 5 0.00
Alison Moss: 5 0.00
Anoch Whitfield: 5 0.00

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

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

Deborah Leistner: 46

Alison Moss: 45

Anoch Whitfield: 45

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

Deborah Leistner: 28

Alison Moss: 26

Anoch Whitfield: 25

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

Deborah Leistner: 48

Alison Moss: 46

Anoch Whitfield: 45

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

Deborah Leistner: 25

Alison Moss: 25

Anoch Whitfield: 29

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

Deborah Leistner: 9

Alison Moss: 8

Anoch Whitfield: 10

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

Deborah Leistner: 0

VOW Total \$766,629.00

Alison Moss: 0

VOW Total \$766,629.00

Anoch Whitfield: 0

VOW Total \$766,629.00

North Florida Professional Services, Inc.

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

Deborah Leistner: 20

Alison Moss: 30

Anoch Whitfield: 20

Proposal did not include evidence of experience or familiarity with role and responsibilities of an MPO/TPO.

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

Deborah Leistner: 19

Alison Moss: 15

Anoch Whitfield: 10

No evidence of MPO/TPO experience in terms of example projects and contracts

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

Deborah Leistner: 30

Alison Moss: 25

Anoch Whitfield: 10

No MPO/TPO work experience/history provided in proposal

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

Deborah Leistner: 15

Alison Moss: 20

Anoch Whitfield: 20

Majority of current/previous work experience is in development review and assisting in daily operations/functions of city/county zoning/planning functions, so it is likely they can meet deadlines. However, the listed projects were not relevant to MPO/TPO work products/deliverables.

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

Deborah Leistner: 6

Alison Moss: 7

Anoch Whitfield: 9

Organization of proposal included LOI and forms and not excessive amount of resumes.

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

Deborah Leistner: 5

0.00

Alison Moss: 5

0.00

Anoch Whitfield: 5
 0.00

The Corradino Group, Inc.

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

Deborah Leistner: 45

Alison Moss: 45

Anoch Whitfield: 35

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

Deborah Leistner: 26

Alison Moss: 25

Anoch Whitfield: 19

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

Deborah Leistner: 46

Alison Moss: 42

Anoch Whitfield: 35

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

Deborah Leistner: 24

Alison Moss: 22

Anoch Whitfield: 19

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

Deborah Leistner: 8

Alison Moss: 7

Anoch Whitfield: 0

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

Deborah Leistner: 5

0.00

Alison Moss: 5

0.00

Anoch Whitfield: 5

0.00