



ALACHUA COUNTY

Budget and Fiscal Services

Procurement

Larry M. Sapp, CPPB
Procurement Manager

Darryl R. Kight, CPPB
Procurement Supervisor

August 1, 2022

MEMORANDUM

To: Larry M. Sapp, Procurement Manager

Via: Darryl R. Kight, Procurement Supervisor

From: Mandy Mullins, Procurement Agent I Darryl Kight (Aug 1, 2022 12:14 EDT)

Subject: **** REVISED, 08.01.22** Intent to Award**
RFP 23-151-mm Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and
General Public Education Services

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>Solicitation Opening Date:</u> | 2:00 PM, Wednesday, June 8, 2022 |
| <u>Solicitation View Count:</u> | 416 Vendors |
| <u>Solicitations Downloaded by:</u> | 16 Vendors |
| <u>Solicitations Submissions:</u> | 3 Vendors |

Firms:

Frankel
Gainesville, FL

Strategic Digital Services
Tallahassee, FL

Uppercase, Inc.
Tampa, FL

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the Evaluation Committee's aggregate scores and approve the ranking below for **RFP 23-151-mm Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services**.

1. Uppercase, Inc. (primary)
2. Frankel (secondary)
3. Strategic Digital Services

Authorize staff to negotiate agreements with the top two (2) ranked firms. Should the staff be unable to negotiate a satisfactory agreement with either of the top ranked firms, negotiations with that firm will be terminated.

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

Larry M. Sapp
Larry M. Sapp (Aug 2, 2022 14:54 EDT)

Aug 2, 2022

Approved
Larry M. Sapp, CPM, CPPB
Procurement Manager

Date

Disapproved
Larry M. Sapp, CPM, CPPB
Procurement Manager

Public Meeting Minutes

RFP 23-151-MM Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

Date: July 19, 2022

Start Time: 12:37 PM

Location: Environmental Protection 408 W. University Ave., Suite 106, Conference Room A, Gainesville, FL

1. **Call Meeting to Order**

2. **RFP Process Overview for Today's Meeting**

- 2.1. Good morning, I am Mandy Mullins with Procurement, and I will be administrating this meeting as the Committee Chair (non-voting member), introduce committee, Stacie Greco (Leader), Eliana Bardi, Joshua Prouty(Remote)
 - 2.1.1. Stacie Greco motioned that extraordinary circumstances exist that allow for Joshua Prouty to participate in today's committee meeting remotely Eliana Bardi seconded
Vote 2 - 0.
- 2.2. Thank you, committee for taking the time out of your busy schedule to evaluate these proposals. Welcome to the citizen attending this Public Meeting; this meeting is open to the public and you will have an announced time (3 minutes; no response required) for public comments. Please review the agenda that is on the screen.
- 2.3. The RFP team will be evaluating vendors' proposal, discussing their scores, and approving the Team's Ranking. This Team's final ranking will be submitted to the BoCC for their approval and authorization to negotiate a contract.

3. **RFP Committee Members Process Instructions**

- 3.1. **First**, in OPENGOV, all evaluators have certified that they have no Conflict of Interest, and I will show them on screen, discuss if necessary.
- 3.2. **Second**, due to the cone-of-silence imposed on the committee members, this is the first occasion members have been able to talk and work together as a committee.
- 3.3. *As committee members you have broad latitude in your discussions, deliberations and ranking provided you are not arbitrary and capricious.*
- 3.4. **Third**, we will record and discuss the preliminary scores on the screen. Call for validation of scores to ensure they are the scores the members entered in OPENGOV.

| Vendor | Eliana Bardi | Stacie Greco | Joshua Prouty | Total Score (Max Score 200) |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Frankel | 139 | 128 | 129 | 132 |
| Strategic Digital Services | 88 | 84 | 139 | 103.67 |
| Uppercase, Inc. | 166 | 166 | 158 | 163.33 |

Click a vendor's name to view the scorecard submitted by each evaluator for that proposal.
Click an evaluator's score to view the detailed scorecard for each proposal reviewed by that evaluator.

- 3.5. The team will discuss, evaluate, and rank all vendor submittals one by one. Starting the team leader allow each member to give feedback. (**Encourage dialog**)
 - 3.5.1. Discuss scores and make Changes if pertinent
 - 3.5.2. Discussion record and Update: **Evaluation Scores**
 - 3.5.2.1. Encourage discussion on the proposals, scoring and until all members are stratified
 - 3.5.2.2. NOTE: Agents will monitor the discussion, keep it on track; keep it on topic.
 - 3.5.3. Call for validation of RFP team Technical and Written Scores for the Team's Final Ranking.

4. Motion Joshua Prouty to accept aggregate scores and not have Oral Presentations, Stacie Greco seconded the motion.
Vote 3-0
5. Public Comments (3 minutes)
6. Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes: Stacie Greco moved to approve the Minutes, Eliana Bardi seconded the motion.
Vote 3-0 in favor.
7. Meeting Adjourn at 1:05 PM.



Alachua County, Florida
Procurement
Larry M. Sapp, Procurement Manager
County Administration Building, Gainesville, FL 32601

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services
RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 8, 2022 at 2:00 pm
Report Generated: Tuesday, July 19, 2022

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

| Question Title | Frankel | Network Craze | Strategic Digital Services | Uppercase, Inc. |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Corporate Resolution Granting Signature | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Acknowledge that you have reviewed all Addendum(s) issued with this solicitation. | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Public Record Trade Secret or Proprietary Confidential Business Information Exemption Request | No Response | No Response | Fail | No Response |
| SBE Option 1: SBE Proposer | Fail | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| SBE Option 2: 30% SBE Proposer Participation | Fail | No Response | | Pass |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Question Title | Frankel | Network Craze | Strategic Digital Services | Uppercase, Inc. |
|--|---------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| SBE Option 3: 15% - 29% SBE Prosper Participation | Fail | No Response | Fail | Pass |
| SBE Option 4: No Subcontractors | Fail | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Option 5: Consultant SBE Good Faith Effort. | Fail | No Response | Fail | Pass |
| Alachua County Government Minimum Wage | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Drug Free Workplace | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| State Compliance | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Vendor Eligibility | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| List all subcontractor's being utilized on this BID, (NON-SBE) IF no sub contractor are being utilized respond N/A | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Responsible Agent Designation | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Conflict of Interest | Pass | No Response | Pass | Pass |
| Request for Proposal Submittal Documentation | Pass | No Response | Pass | |
| You have reviewed and completed all the required submittal requirements.. | Pass | No Response | Pass | |

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

| Name | Title | Agreement Accepted On |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eliana Bardi | Senior Planner | Jun 10, 2022 2:38 PM |
| Stacie Greco | Water Resources Program Manager | Jun 9, 2022 5:06 PM |
| Joshua Prouty | Hazardous Waste Coordinator | Jun 13, 2022 6:26 AM |

EVALUATION CRITERIA

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm

Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Criteria | Description | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|----------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|
|----------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Ability of Professional Personnel | <p>A. Resumes of the key staff support the firm's Competency in doing this type of work? Key staff includes the Project Manager, and other project team professionals.</p> <p>B. Has the firm done this type of work in the past?</p> <p>C. Is any of this work to be subcontracted? If so, what are the abilities of the firm(s) to be subcontracted?</p> <p>D. Based on questions above, award points as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 21-30 points - Exceptional Experience 2. 11-20 points - Average Experience 3. 0-10 points - Minimal Experience <p>E. Has the company or key staff recently done this type of work for the County, the State, or for local government in the past?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the work was acceptable, award up to ten (10) points. | Points Based | 50 (25% of Total) |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|-------------------|
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|-------------------|

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm

Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Criteria | Description | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|----------|--|----------------|-----------------|
| | <p>2. If the firm has not done this type of work, award zero (0) points.</p> <p>3. If the work was unacceptable, deduct up to ten (10) points and note why.</p> <p>F. Are there factors, such as unique abilities, which would make a noticeable (positive) impact on the project?</p> <p>1. If the answer is yes, award from one (1) to ten (10) points and note reasons.</p> <p>2. If the answer is no, award zero (0) points.</p> | | |

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Criteria | Description | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------|
| Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | <p>A. Does the level of key staffing and their percentage of involvement, the use of subcontractors (if any), office location, and/or information contained in the transmittal letter indicate that the firm will, or will not, meet time and budget requirements?</p> <p>B. To your knowledge, has the firm met or had trouble meeting time and budget requirements on similar projects?</p> <p>C. Have proof of insurability and other measures of financial stability been provided?</p> <p>D. Are time schedules reasonable?</p> <p>E. Current Workload.</p> <p>F. This factor is designed to determine how busy a firm is by comparing all Florida work against Florida personnel.</p> | Points Based | 20 (10% of Total) |
| Location | Points Provided by Procurement. | Points Based | 10 (5% of Total) |
| Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) | Points Provided by Procurement. | Points Based | 15 (7.5% of Total) |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Criteria | Description | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|--|---|----------------|---------------------|
| Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County | Points Provided by Procurement. | Points Based | 5 (2.5% of Total) |
| Written - Understanding of Project | <p>A. Did the proposal indicate a thorough understanding of the project?</p> <p>B. Is the appropriate emphasis placed on the various work tasks?</p> | Points Based | 25 (12.5% of Total) |
| Written - Project Approach | <p>A. Did the firm develop a workable approach to the project?</p> <p>B. Does the proposal specifically address the County's needs or is it "generic" in content?</p> | Points Based | 25 (12.5% of Total) |
| Written - Project Manager | <p>A. Does the project manager have experience with projects comparable in size and scope?</p> <p>B. Does the Project Manager have a stable job history? Has he/she been with the firm long, or have there been frequent job changes?</p> | Points Based | 10 (5% of Total) |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Criteria | Description | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------|
| Written - Project Team | <p>A. Was a project team identified?</p> <p>B. Is the team makeup appropriate for the project?</p> <p>C. Do the team members have experience with comparable projects?</p> <p>D. Are there any sub contracted firms involved? Will this enhance the project team?</p> <p>E. Are the hours assigned to the various team members for each task appropriate?</p> | Points Based | 20 (10% of Total) |
| Written - Project Schedule | <p>A. Is the proposed schedule reasonable based on quantity of personnel assigned to the project?</p> <p>B. Are individual tasks staged properly and in proper sequence?</p> | Points Based | 10 (5% of Total) |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Criteria | Description | Scoring Method | Weight (Points) |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------|
| Written - Proposal Organization | <p>A. Was proposal organization per the RFP?</p> <p>B. Was all required paperwork submitted and completed appropriately?</p> <p>C. Did the proposal contain an excessive amount of generic boilerplate, resumes, pages per resume, photographs, etc.?</p> | Points Based | 10 (5% of Total) |

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

| Vendor | Eliana Bardi | Stacie Greco | Joshua Prouty | Total Score (Max Score 200) |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Frankel | 139 | 128 | 129 | 132 |
| Strategic Digital Services | 88 | 84 | 139 | 103.67 |
| Uppercase, Inc. | 166 | 166 | 158 | 163.33 |

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

| Vendor | Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (25%) | Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (10%) | Location Points Based 10 Points (5%) | Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%) | Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%) | Written - Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (12.5%) | Written - Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (12.5%) | Written - Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5%) | Written - Project Team Points Based 20 Points (10%) | Written - Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5%) |
|---------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Frankel | 29.3 | 15.7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 6 | 16 | 9 |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

Frankel has delivered unacceptable results to the HHW program in the past through billing a retainer for every month even if no work was done. They do have the current contract with Solid Waste and Resource Recovery so messaging could be unified easier.

| Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements Points Based 20 Points (10%) | |
|--|--|
| Eliana Bardi: 17 | |
| Stacie Greco: 15 | |
| Joshua Prouty: 15 | |
| Per hour billable is one of the highest rates overall. | |
| Location Points Based 10 Points (5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 10 | |
| Stacie Greco: 10 | |
| Joshua Prouty: 10 | |
| Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 0 | |
| Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line. | |
| Stacie Greco: 0 | |
| Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line. | |
| Joshua Prouty: 0 | |
| Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line. | |
| Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 0 | |
| Stacie Greco: 0 | |

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm

Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

Joshua Prouty: 15

Make up of team and distribution of work load seems to indicate no one person will be in charge of project.

Written - Project Schedule | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Eliana Bardi: 9

Stacie Greco: 10

Since our projects have various schedules which we did not share in the RFP, I gave all applicants the full 10 points here.

Joshua Prouty: 8

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

Eliana Bardi: 10

Stacie Greco: 10

Joshua Prouty: 8

There was a lot of generic boilerplate and resumes even for individuals who would not directly be related to project.

Strategic Digital Services

Ability of Professional Personnel | Points Based | 50 Points (25%)

Eliana Bardi: 20

Stacie Greco: 15

Does not appear to have social marketing behavior change experience. Did not see applicable examples.

Joshua Prouty: 35

I have no direct knowledge of unique abilities that would be brought to this project that others could not.

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

Page 14

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| | Eliana Bardi: 10 |
| | Stacie Greco: 5 |
| Rates would limit budget available for media buys | |
| While key staffing percentage seems appropriate the per hour billable hours at 300/hr is almost twice that of nearest competitor leaving fewer budget dollars for ad campaigns. | Joshua Prouty: 13 |
| Location Points Based 10 Points (5%) | |
| No location in Alachua county | Eliana Bardi: 0 |
| No location in Alachua county | Stacie Greco: 0 |
| No location in Alachua county | Joshua Prouty: 0 |
| Small Business Enterprise Participation (SBE) Points Based 15 Points (7.5%) | |
| Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line. | Eliana Bardi: 10 |
| Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line. | Stacie Greco: 10 |
| Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line. | Joshua Prouty: 10 |
| Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%) | |
| | Eliana Bardi: 5 |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| |
|---|
| Stacie Greco: 5 |
| Joshua Prouty: 5 |
| Written - Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (12.5%) |
| Eliana Bardi: 12 |
| Stacie Greco: 15 |
| Did not focus on behavior change. |
| Joshua Prouty: 20 |
| Written - Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (12.5%) |
| Eliana Bardi: 10 |
| Stacie Greco: 10 |
| The approach was not clear for our campaigns. |
| Joshua Prouty: 15 |
| Mostly generic content on largerer state wide campaigns. |
| Written - Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5%) |
| Eliana Bardi: 3 |
| Stacie Greco: 2 |
| Seems to have more experience with political campaigns, not citizen behavior change. Resume was not provided, so I don't know total experience and longevity. |
| Joshua Prouty: 8 |
| Written - Project Team Points Based 20 Points (10%) |
| Eliana Bardi: 8 |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| | |
|---|--|
| Stacie Greco: 10 | |
| Lots of political campaign experience, not behavior change. | |
| Joshua Prouty: 16 | |
| Written - Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 4 | |
| Stacie Greco: 10 | |
| Since we have multiple campaigns with their own schedules which we did not share in the RFP, I gave each proposal the full 10 points here. | |
| Joshua Prouty: 9 | |
| Written - Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 6 | |
| Stacie Greco: 2 | |
| Proposal had a lot of jargon and relic mistakes from past proposals. | |
| Joshua Prouty: 8 | |
| Some generic boilerplate | |
| Uppercase, Inc. | |
| Ability of Professional Personnel Points Based 50 Points (25%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 50 | |
| Stacie Greco: 50 | |
| UCI has done great work on past projects and has developed most existing campaigns, which gives them a unique ability to continue to work on them. They hold all of the creative assets and have historical knowledge for EPD and Hazwaste campaigns. | |

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm

Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

Joshua Prouty: 45

Firm currently does this project for Alachua County EPD and HHW and the service has been excellent. Past knowledge of program requirements and knowledge of similar programs and advertising campaigns like GRU sets them apart.

Capability to Meet Time and Budget Requirements | Points Based | 20 Points (10%)

Eliana Bardi: 19

Stacie Greco: 20

Joshua Prouty: 20

Current workload may be similar or smaller than other vendors but key staff has proven to be very reachable in the past. Budget is appropriate for project and is the lowest price on a per billable hour for the work leaving more dollars available for ad campaigns.

Location | Points Based | 10 Points (5%)

Eliana Bardi: 0

No location in Alachua County

Stacie Greco: 0

No location in Alachua County

Joshua Prouty: 0

No location in Alachua County

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

Eliana Bardi: 0

Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line.

Stacie Greco: 0

Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line.

Joshua Prouty: 0

Not a current SBE vendor per the Small Business Directory on-line.

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| | |
|---|--|
| Volume of Previous Work (VOW) awarded by the County Points Based 5 Points (2.5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 0 | |
| Stacie Greco: 0 | |
| Joshua Prouty: 0 | |
| Written - Understanding of Project Points Based 25 Points (12.5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 25 | |
| Stacie Greco: 25 | |
| Proposal focused on behavior change and social marketing techniques. Mentioned existing campaigns and potential synergies with other departments. | |
| Joshua Prouty: 23 | |
| Has thorough understanding of project as they are the current contract holder. | |
| Written - Project Approach Points Based 25 Points (12.5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 25 | |
| Stacie Greco: 25 | |
| Joshua Prouty: 23 | |
| Written - Project Manager Points Based 10 Points (5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 10 | |
| Stacie Greco: 10 | |
| Joshua Prouty: 10 | |
| The assigned project manager is part owner of the company so is invested in the success of each project. | |

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. RFP 23-151-mm
Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

| Written - Project Team Points Based 20 Points (10%) | |
|--|--|
| Eliana Bardi: 20 | |
| Stacie Greco: 18 | |
| Joshua Prouty: 19 | |
| Written - Project Schedule Points Based 10 Points (5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 8 | |
| Stacie Greco: 10 | |
| Since campaigns all have their own schedules which we did not include in the RFP, I gave all proposals the full 10 points. | |
| Joshua Prouty: 9 | |
| Written - Proposal Organization Points Based 10 Points (5%) | |
| Eliana Bardi: 9 | |
| Stacie Greco: 8 | |
| Some explanation were lengthy, but did provide good information. | |
| Joshua Prouty: 9 | |
| Proposal submitted relevant similar project in size and scope. | |










ITA 23-151 REVISED Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services

Final Audit Report

2022-08-02

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Created: | 2022-08-01 |
| By: | Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us) |
| Status: | Signed |
| Transaction ID: | CBJCHBCAABAAJ5pYGPNlgYUeDa2b5uOqYidRcpmAIRQ6 |

"ITA 23-151 REVISED Annual Social Marketing Campaign Development and General Public Education Services" History

-  Document created by Mandy Mullins (mmmullins@alachuacounty.us)
2022-08-01 - 5:12:35 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.69
-  Document emailed to Darryl Kight (dkight@alachuacounty.us) for signature
2022-08-01 - 5:13:47 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Darryl Kight (dkight@alachuacounty.us)
2022-08-01 - 5:14:13 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document e-signed by Darryl Kight (dkight@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2022-08-01 - 5:14:40 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document emailed to lsapp@alachuacounty.us for signature
2022-08-01 - 5:14:42 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by lsapp@alachuacounty.us
2022-08-02 - 3:04:29 AM GMT- IP address: 104.28.39.155
-  Signer lsapp@alachuacounty.us entered name at signing as Larry M. Sapp
2022-08-02 - 6:54:45 PM GMT- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Document e-signed by Larry M. Sapp (lsapp@alachuacounty.us)
Signature Date: 2022-08-02 - 6:54:46 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 163.120.80.11
-  Agreement completed.
2022-08-02 - 6:54:46 PM GMT