

SUMMARY OVERVIEW EVALUATION CRITERIA

2023-847C

INTRODUCTION:

The evaluation team, employed the use of the City of Gainesville Professional & Other Services Evaluation Handbook (revised January 21, 2016). The evaluations of the proposals were based on the Suppliers' responses to Minimum Qualifications and Evaluation Criteria identified below.

ITN Minimum Qualifications:

1. Respondents must provide the current, verified name and address of similar projects completed within the past three (3) years – use Exhibit C for this purpose.
2. Respondents shall demonstrate through their responses that their company has no less than three (3) years of progressively responsible experience in the development and implementation of Heritage Trails.
3. Respondents shall demonstrate through their responses that they have worked on a minimum of three (3) projects in the last seven (7) years.
4. Respondents shall have three (3) years of experience working with state or local governments on cultural projects.
5. Respondents to this ITN shall demonstrate breadth of experience in working with diverse communities, hosting workshops and implementing community engagement strategies.
6. Respondents to this ITN shall demonstrate experience working with community members that are engaged in the project as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), and providing compensation for engaged community members that can assist in leading the project.
7. Through their responses, respondent must demonstrate that they are a Responsible agency as defined in Part 1, 1.6 (*This refers to respondent's capability to perform/meet all requirements as prescribed within the solicitation.*)
8. Through their responses, respondent must demonstrate that they are a Responsive agency as defined in Part 1, 1.7 (*This section refers to the submission requirements been met by the respondent as outlined in the ITN.*)

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND OUTCOME

The evaluators used the City of Gainesville "Professional Services Evaluation Handbook" (Handbook) as customized for the Heritage Trail project, to guide them through the evaluation process. The evaluations of the proposals were based on the Suppliers' responses to Minimum Qualifications identified in the ITN and summarized in Backup 2023-847B. After each Evaluator scored and documented their findings independent of outside influence and other Evaluators, the Evaluation Team convened in a public meeting to discuss the results of their evaluations.

Dr. Anthony Dixon, President of Dix Holdings is a highly respected historian and documentarian who possesses deep knowledge and experience in researching and documenting African

SUMMARY OVERVIEW EVALUATION CRITERIA

American neighborhoods in Florida. Dr. Dixon, has written numerous peer-reviewed publications and documentaries, and has been a guest at countless speaking engagements.

However, the company did not respond to the following four (4) of the eight (8) minimum requirements:

- Did not provide a detailed timeline
- Did not submit a budget that represented the entirety of the work they proposed.
- The company's project team did not demonstrate the knowledge to complete all project tasks.
- Did not demonstrate experience in managing projects with the scope and breadth envisioned by the Fifth Avenue Pleasant Street Heritage Trail project.

The Principals of "Community Planning Collaborative, LLC" (CPC), Mr. Ennis Davis, AICP, and Ms. Adrienne Burke, AICP, Esq., possess over 30 years of collective experience in cultural heritage projects, trails, and interpretive markers in African American communities. Some of the projects they have worked on or are currently working on, all within Florida, include the American Beach Neighborhood Planning and Cultural Heritage Plan, Cosmo Gullah Geechee Interpretative Markers, LaVilla Neighborhood Cultural Heritage Trail, Johnson Commons Historic Marker Trail, and Florida state historical marker applications. Mr. Davis and Ms. Burke have extensive experience in community outreach and historical research of African American neighborhoods in Florida.

CPC's submittal contained a response to each of the Minimum Requirements. They demonstrated experience in Project Management within the last three years, and described projects currently underway. CPC provided a detailed, comprehensive plan of how they would approach the project - providing specific detail in all the areas requested by the ITN, including a definitive budget and timeline. The team assembled for the project demonstrated knowledge, experience and capability to successfully complete the Project.

Refer to Appendix I – Summary Overview and Evaluation Criteria for additional qualification summary, and evaluation outcome.

The cost proposals from each supplier was as follows:

Community Planning Collaborative	\$151,380.00
Dix Holdings	\$ 90,000.00

Dix Holdings' proposal came in \$61,380.00 lower than CPC's. The difference due in part to mathematical error in the calculation presented by Dix Holdings in their proposal, and not accounting for specific aspects within the scope of the project.

In performing staff's due diligence, a reference check of the highest scoring supplier was conducted. Feedback was received from the following references listed by the supplier:

1. Mr. Taco Pope, Nassau County Manager – Project: The American Beach Plan

SUMMARY OVERVIEW EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. Ms. Ina Mezini, Strategic Initiatives Coordinator, Downtown Investment Authority
– Project: LaVilla Neighborhood Cultural Heritage Trail
3. Mr. Theodore B. Johnson, Community Engagement Specialist, National Park
Service – Project: Cosmo Freedom Park Trail

Two of the three references received were in writing and are included in the backup.

Moreover, the evaluation process was based on three criteria as outlined in the Professional & Other Services Evaluation Handbook and as further described:

- I- Technical Qualifications (100 points maximum)
 - A. Ability of Professional Personnel – 55 points maximum
 - B. Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements – 45 points maximum
- II- Written Proposal Evaluation (100 points maximum)
 - A. Understanding of the Project Scope of Work – 30 points maximum
 - B. Project Approach – 30 points maximum
 - C. Project Manager – 15 points maximum
 - D. Project Team – 15 points maximum
 - E. Project Schedule – 5 points maximum
 - F. Proposal Organization – 5 points maximum
- III- Presentation / Interview (Orals) (100 points maximum)
 - A. Understanding of Project Scope of Work – 40 points maximum
 - B. Responsiveness to Questions – 15 points maximum
 - C. Project Team – 25 points maximum
 - D. Project Manager – 20 points maximum

Score:

Community Planning Collaborative received the highest score of the two companies (2023-847I and 2023-847J). The table below describes the point differences between suppliers.

	Technical	Written	Oral Presentation	Total	Ranking
CPC, LLC	371	381	390	1,142	1
Dix Holdings, LLC	268	233	291	792	2

SUMMARY OVERVIEW EVALUATION CRITERIA

Experience Assessment:

Criteria	Community Planning Collaborative, LLC	Dix Holdings, LLC
Historical Research	✓	✓
Community Engagement	✓	✓
Heritage Trail	✓	
Technical	✓	
Organizational	✓	
Team Assembled	✓	