City of Port St. Lucie
Procurement Management Division
121 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd,, Port St. Lucie, FL 34984

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFQu No. 20250143

Progressive Design-Build of the Rangeline Road Water Treatment Facility

RESPONSE DEADLINE: November 4, 2025 at 3:00 pm

Report Generated: Friday, December 19, 2025

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Tab No. 1/Criteria No. 1 - Project Team Structure	Points Based	50 *(16.7% of Total)*

Description:
This criterion assesses the Project Team Structure in terms of contractual relationships as well as lines of communication within the Project Team, and between the Project Team and City staff.

Project Teams will be evaluated based on the clarity of the contractual structure, the organization of resources and interfaces, the efficiency of the reporting structure within the Team, and the cumulative scope of services provided by all the partners.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Tab No. 2/Criteria No. 2 - Project Team Key Personnel Relevant Experience	Points Based	50 *(16.7% of Total)*

Description:
This criterion assesses the experience of the Project Team's Key Personnel. Project Teams will be evaluated based on relevant experience, expertise, credentials, and the value that the Key Personnel add to the Project.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Tab No. 3/Criteria No. 3 - Project Team Experience with Similar Projects	Points Based	100 *(33.3% of Total)*

Description:
This criterion assesses the Project Teams experience with similar projects and components. Project Teams will be evaluated based on their experience with projects like this Project.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Tab No. 4/Criteria No. 4 - Approach to Meet Project Objectives	Points Based	100 *(33.3% of Total)*

Description:
This criterion assesses how well the Project Team understands the scope of the project and the City's goals and objectives. Project Teams will be evaluated on their proposed approach to deliver the project through design and construction and how the approach meets the City's objectives.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Total Score (Max Score 300)
Jacobs	244	281	282	250	286	**268.6**
PCL Construction	260	291	273	235	276	**267**
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	262	280	263	200	289	**258.8**
The Haskell Company	240	288	276	210	278	**258.4**
PC Construction Company	237	278	274	185	269	**248.6**

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Tab No. 1/Criteria No. 1 - Project Team Structure Points Based 50 Points (16.7%)	Tab No. 2/Criteria No. 2 - Project Team Key Personnel Relevant Experience Points Based 50 Points (16.7%)	Tab No. 3/Criteria No. 3 - Project Team Experience with Similar Projects Points Based 100 Points (33.3%)	Tab No. 4/Criteria No. 4 - Approach to Meet Project Objectives Points Based 100 Points (33.3%)	Total Score (Max Score 300)
Jacobs	42.8	45.2	87.8	92.8	**268.6**
PCL Construction	46.4	44.8	83.8	92	**267**
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	43.4	43.4	84.4	87.6	**258.8**
The Haskell Company	41.6	41.4	85.2	90.2	**258.4**
PC Construction Company	44.4	41.6	79.2	83.4	**248.6**

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Jacobs

Tab No. 1/Criteria No. 1 - Project Team Structure | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 38

Showed (6) Key Project Partners. Many partners of the project team has worked with the City in the past. Team has clarity in its contractual structure.

Evaluator 2: 48

The idea of using an integrated firm has its merits, hoping that one point of contact is responsible for marshaling all the forces and can help City staff stay well-informed. Alongside the single point of contact, Jacobs also specifically names the responsible person for each of the "divisions" set up to make this project happen. Although a partnership with another big firm may seem attractive, the prospect of two engineering behemoths on one project can bring with it conflicts, each claiming they have the right answer. This idea also conflicts a bit with Jacobs' claim of a fully integrated structure.

Evaluator 3: 46

-Jacobs has a proven teaming history with Tetra Tech, CROM, ISS, Ardaman, and others. All of whom have worked together on prior projects. -Fully integrated single-entity design-build model (Jacobs-led) where design, construction, commissioning, and operations are all under one contract providing a single point of accountability -Clear organizational structure with defined roles and responsibilities include a detailed organizational chart showing including reporting relationships, firm affiliations, and roles. -Jacobs self-performs key scopes such as process and electrical equipment procurement, SCADA/I&C integration, and commissioning. - The team has experience with the City's systems, having worked on the JEA and Prineville WTPs, the Desalination Feasibility Study, and the McCarty Ranch Water Supply Plan. -Jacobs is the sole point of responsibility, streamlining communication and accountability. Self-Performance of Critical Scopes: -The proposal does not clearly outline how the team would handle the loss or unavailability of key personnel during the project lifecycle.

Evaluator 4: 35

-Integrated PDB firm. -Local subs clearly outlined. -Org chart is clearly defined and meets criteria as outlined. -ODP mentioned as part of the best value procurement process. -Large Florida based team. -Experience with subs on prior projects, though extents not clear in this section. -Would like to have seen clearer definition on approach and resources availability. Stated as integrated and resources available, with some breakdown in org chart on Page 11. -Funding integrated into Jacobs.

Evaluator 5: 47

Team structure proposed appears very sound.

Tab No. 2/Criteria No. 2 - Project Team Key Personnel Relevant Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 42

Extensive experience of the teams key personal. Provided resumes for all key personal as well as support staff. Has a licensed operator on staff to help with the transition from construction to operations.

Evaluator 2: 47

Jacobs' key personnel are eminently qualified. Many hold DBIA certifications in a time when the City is hoping to use this delivery method more often. Veronica Llaneza adds unique insight via her Florida Class A Operator's License in Water Treatment. This is a clue that the Operator's opinions will be considered during design, construction, training, etc. One criticism is that I would have liked to have seen more direct connections to building a 10 MGD (or similar number) in the key resumes. Several of the top people do have this, but many of the other resumes referred to projects in other sides of the industry.

Evaluator 3: 48

- proposal shows a deep Florida experience across all key roles. -Strong resumes with relevant project delivery (PDB, CMAR, DBB). -Provided table showing each key person's percentage of time dedicated to the project during preconstruction and construction phases. -proposal demonstrated the teams collaboration across multiple projects. -included a matrix showing years of experience, years with the firm, and shared project history. -Key personnel average 25+ years of experience, with deep Florida-specific RO WTP expertise. -The proposal does not explicitly address contingency plans if key personnel become unavailable during the project. +50 operational facilities in florida

Evaluator 4: 40

-General Note: The key project numbering on the resumes is helpful. -Perhaps some clarification on how the Project Director and Exec. Sponsor function. -Project Manager: Large scale PDB project experience. -Exec. Sponsor: Looks like this is equivalent to the Project Director based on the org chart. Medium to large scale experience with RO projects noted. -Project Director: Large scale PDB project experience, including RO. -Quality Manager (QA/QC): Large scale PDB project experience, including RO. -Safety Manager: Large scale PDB project experience, including RO. -Project Controls Manager: Medium scale PDB project experience, including RO. -Design Manager: Relevant RO expierence. Curious as to why the Prospect Lake WTP project is not a key project. Looks relevant to Rangeline. -Design Production Manager: Support to Design Manager? Large scale project experience, though mostly WRF. -WTP Design Lead: Extensive RO experience in Florida. -Post-Treatment Lead (Tetra Tech): RO experience. Would like to see more recent projects. -Site Master Planning: Would like to have seen larger scale projects noted. -Preconstruction Manager/Lead Estimator: Mentions of ODP and open book GMP. Medium to large scale PDB experience, including RO - all on key projects. -Construction Manager: Medium to large scale projects, largest being PDB. Was Lake Worth project RO? -Site Super: Relevant project experience, including RO - all on key projects. -Start-up & Commissioning Manager: Licensed operator. Small to medium scale projects listed, but does have the education and licensing to show experience. -Other Technical Leads/Support Staff: Noted in smaller bios are electrical, mechanical, prestressed concrete, HVAC, I&C, procurement, funding, etc. Overall Thoughts: Well rounded team with extensive Florida based experience in PDB and RO in general.

Evaluator 5: 49

Very seasoned key personnel staff with many similar projects.

Tab No. 3/Criteria No. 3 - Project Team Experience with Similar Projects | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 80

30 years of experience working with the City. Which my not be a good thing as we are looking for new ideas. Extensive experience with similar projects. Mostly all projects on time and on budget.

Evaluator 2: 93

In their submittal, Jacobs' demonstrates extensive experience in Florida RO. It speaks to their institutional knowledge and the ability of their staff to provide their library of knowledge for the benefit of PSL. The Jacobs' team history includes the managing of high value projects in Progressive Design-Build, exactly where the City needs assistance. One critique is that out of the projects provided, many are wastewater related as opposed to water.

Evaluator 3: 90

- Projects meet the requirements: Jacobs has completed multiple progressive design-build projects and RO facilities over 10 mgd. - Most projects are in Florida, demonstrating familiarity with FDEP permitting, Local geology and hydrology, Regional construction market and Community engagement . - proposal shows complexity and Integration of RO with other treatment processes (e.g., IX, lime softening), phased construction and early work packages, tight sites and operational constraints - provided examples of cost-saving and performance-enhancing innovations: High-recovery RO skids, energy optimization using modeling, modular design for future expansions, and early capacity delivery options. - some of the projects high lighted are still under construction, so full performance outcomes are unknown.

Evaluator 4: 80

-General Note: The sidebar with the breakdown in phases for each design and construction amount is extremely helpful and give valuable insight into the projects. Provides a good overview connecting back to the resumes of key staff with key projects. -Norwood Project: Funding support included WIFIA. -Green Meadows Project: Grant support. Interesting narrative on the Award despite weather and other setbacks. -Overall Thoughts: Extensive experience in Florida and on collaborative delivery methods.

Evaluator 5: 96

Extensive experience related to similar projects. Many of which occurred in Florida.

Tab No. 4/Criteria No. 4 - Approach to Meet Project Objectives | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 84

Project team understands the scope of the project. The time line of the project seems a little out of reach with no odor control systems for 4mgd or rental units for 10mgd. Third stage at JEA?? Fusion piping, plant layout, CO2 system, 600 psi rated skids, 6mg

GST, 85 percent recovery, and replace Cl2 gas are all great concepts. Communicative approach to the project. Good safety record.*** Early permitting, Replica, No chemicals in clearwell are all great concepts

Evaluator 2: 93

Jacobs' approach includes three ideas to achieve at least partial capacity well before the intended date. Their offer to bring in software solutions like "Replica" to help optimize design, costs, and to serve as a basis to help train operators. The idea of creating a digital twin to help reach the above goals is intriguing and will present the City with a smooth handover of the finished product. One concern is that propriety nature of the software discussed. The City prefers open-source solutions that are not tied to a single point.

Evaluator 3: 98

-The proposal states the City's goals: phased delivery (4 MGD by 2028, 10 MGD by 2029), future expandability to 30–40 MGD, integration with DIWs and raw water supply, and operational continuity. -Team demonstrates institutional knowledge of Port St. Lucie's water system, referencing past work on JEA and Prineville WTPs. -Single-entity design building - maintaining direct control under one roof. -Offers 15+ innovations/ideas (e.g., high-recovery RO skids, dynamic modeling with Replica™, modular design, in-pipe disinfection, adaptive planning) showing the benefits of each and where it is being used. Presents three early capacity options to achieve 4 MGD before 2029, including temporary mobile RO units and JEA WTP upgrades. Alternative site layouts ideas along with ultimate buildout. Alternative processing layouts ideas. -primary project schedule - GST by June 2027, 4 MGD by Dec 2028, and 10 MGD by May 2029. - Multiple GMP packages to enable onsite work and procurement of high-priority/long lead equip. -preliminary schedule outlining GMP packages and schedule for each phase of work. -multiple options for achieving 4 MGD to include permanent facilities, Temporary RO Units, and additional improvements at JEA. -Identifies 13 top risks (10 Design-Builder, 3 City/3rd party) with mitigation strategies. Risks include supply chain, permitting, water quality variability, and coordination with DIW/well contractors. Includes using a Monte Carlo analysis for contingency planning. -Emphasizes collaborative workshops, decision logs, and real-time tools like Bluebeam Studio and SharePoint. -Team uses a five-step Project Delivery System (PDS) with integrated cost, schedule, risk, and document control for project management. -Transparent GMP and Cost Control Using continuous cost modeling. -Detailed QA/QC and safety plans, including BeyondZero® culture and third-party testing. -Design approach - adaptive master planning, lifecycle cost analysis, and early stakeholder engagement. -Provided desktop stormwater analysis of site. -Design RO systems with operator in mind using real-world operations experience. -Addressed funding support and public outreach. -startup, commissioning, and training using their WTP operators to provide a seamless transition, can also provide temp. staffing if needed. +preforms critical components of project +3 MGPs +4 MGD by 2028 13 permits identified +lime/CO2 for alk. +JEA reduce recovery in existing and add seperate skid for additional recovery

Evaluator 4: 95

-Page 75: Coordination with the DIW and RW Well teams. -Page 78: Chart breaking down ideas, benefits with a benefit key and where these ideas have been implemented on other projects. -Page 78 - Item No. 7: Repurposing of the chlorine gas shell that was never used. -Page 78 - Item No. 8: Replica tool mentioned throughout proposal. Would like to see in action. -Page 78 - Item No. 13: Community engagement for the long term. Would like to see how that worked at the projects notes under Relevant Experience. -Page 78-83: Noting larger ground storage tanks to save on overall space. Layout options with keys provide good visual of current and future potential for site. -Page 82: Appreciate layouts taking into account potential for some sort of additional space for maintenance or the use. -Page 83: In house can perform the for 13 months of critical path work. Milestones and critical path noted. -Page 85: The sample schedule highlighting key items makes it easier to get a quick overview. -Page 86: Three options showing advantages and disadvantages to each. Appreciate taking into account the addition of the JEA wells as a way to buy time at Rangeline if necessary and the schedule comparison. Very clean and easy to follow. -Page 87: Takes into account keeping the repump online as a risk. -Page 87: Takes into account the projections not meeting future needs and keeping the project flexible. -Page 89-95: Real emphasis on project controls, including cost, schedule, documents, etc. Includes owner's rep in the process. -Page 93: Like the decision log. -Page 93: Incident rate is impressively low. Did look at the EMR chart on page 123 and it's well below criteria and also impressive. The note on Page 94 about verifying subs also meet this criteria is appreciated. -Page 95: QA/QC process flow provides good visual on the design and construction sides with a central point of contact. Like the quality issues log for transparency. -Page 97-98: Flexibility in the process to adapt to changes during design to future proof the final result as best as possible. -Page 99-100: A lot of emphasis on storm water discharge, ERP, and noting the changes to Discovery Way and how that will affect site plans. -Page 102: Like that the Replica program has a similar for operators to play in a sandbox while training. Seems like this would allow for flexible training schedules as well. Would be interested to hear more. Like reference to use on other projects. -Page 103: Designing for operators and maintenance staff as the end users. -Page 104: Note of the BSU RO WTP project looking at lifecycle cost and not low bid on membrane selection. -Page 106: Big emphasis on corrosion control, which is problematic. -Page 108: Staff dedication to the project during the initial preconstruction phase is a good visual. -Page 111: GMP process and real world success on projects. -Page 112: GMP delivery options depending on our wants/needs. Flexibility to decide best approach. -Page 113: Overall GMP options laid out well with a great deal of thought put into this section of the proposal. -Page 115-116: ODP equipment identified and lead times charted. Very clear process and understanding of the value. -Page 116: Job fairs - note the Tampa example used to draw more firms attention. -Page 118: Previous slides go into open-book GMP. -Page 119: Funding options and real example of federal funds obtained for GRU. -Page 120: Public and subcontractor outreach noted. Public outreach not as robust. -Page 121: Construction truck traffic maintained and coordinated. -Page 122: GRU example of sub coming in with much lower bid, confirming all items were accounted for, planning a contingency in case of

time delays, and executing those contingencies to keep to the schedule. Good example of trust but verify and plan for the worst. -Page 123: PIMS to keep staff and owner's rep informed for field conditions. Beyond Zero seems to be an effective safety program. -Page 125: Like the ODP management. -Page 126: Construction sequencing including pre-identified areas of concern including the existing locations of piping, drainage, FPL, keeping the repump functioning, etc. -Page 126: Great visual of the construction site logistics and the sequencing plan. Shows a great deal of due diligence and forethought. -Page 128-129: Showing Jacobs and Crom can cover the first six months of construction. Also, case study in Tampa working around critical infrastructure. -Page 134-End: Required documentation, including OSHA data, sample GMP, risk register. -Overall Thoughts: The real world examples throughout this section are helpful in seeing how plans are implemented to the benefit of the project. * Operates 250 WTP * $3B in DB projects in the last 20 years. * Provide 6MGD storage by June 2027. * 3 GMPs for the schedule. * Jacobs performs in house the items USD found most critical. * GRU saved $4.7 million in value engineering. * Won some awards for corrosion control studies. * Replica to run scenarios for treatment and pump selection. * Can fit 6MGD tank to give 10MGD of storage quickly. * Space for another 6MGD tank. * $2 billion in WIFIA and $4B in grants. * GRU $22.5 million in grants. * Tracking permits required for the project. *Identified nearby residential stakeholder and mentioned job fairs. *High percentage self-performance. Their self-perform was more of the I&C, etc. Opposite other firms. Already gave bid packages.

Evaluator 5: 94

Well thought out plan. Self performance of critical path components by Jacobs is appealing. Multiple GMP's including ODP to expedite the schedule is desirable. Commissioning activities under single, transparent framework is a plus.

PC Construction Company

Tab No. 1/Criteria No. 1 - Project Team Structure | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 40

Showed (5) Key Project partners with experience working together. Team has clarity in its contractual structure.

Evaluator 2: 44

Small leadership among the two main companies to funnel information to the City. $1.5 billion across 18 projects together. Brought in local teams from Pacifica and EDS to supplement their local presence. Not many of the 18 projects provided are direct experience to Water Treatment which may bring up issues of the ability to adapt to local needs and regulations.

Evaluator 3: 45

-Team shows a strong history together, PC and HDR have partnered on 18 projects including multiple progressive design-build efforts which demonstrates a high level of trust, communication, and integration between the firms. -Clear defined role and responsibility assignments. -shows a detailed organizational chart that identifies key personnel. includes each team member's responsibilities. -The team emphasizes a cooperative partnership with the City. -The structure includes clear leadership for both phases, with defined lines of authority and coordination between design, construction, and City staff. The team's approach includes early procurement, risk management, and constructability reviews to ensure smooth transitions between phases. -While roles are well-defined, the proposal could better address how team members will adapt if responsibilities shift during the project

Evaluator 4: 50

-General Note: Owner's Rep mentioned in intro letter. -Text duplication error on Page 2 (intro letter). -Scoring criteria at top of each tab was helpful - cost the proposer space but added value to committee review. -Clear breakdown of known primes and subs (as known) and projects on which PC and HDR have worked together. Notes which projects were PDB. -Would like to have seen Florida examples. -Org chart is clearly defined and meets criteria as outlined. -Owner's Rep mentioned in the Preconstruction Phase coordination. -Clear approach and summary of resources.

Evaluator 5: 43

Adequate proposed structure.

Tab No. 2/Criteria No. 2 - Project Team Key Personnel Relevant Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 42

Extensive experience of the teams key personnel. Provided resumes for all key personal as well as support staff. Has a licensed operator on staff to help with the transition from construction to operations.

Evaluator 2: 45

Design Manager Cristina Ortega possesses the relevant experience with Norwood. Civil Technical Lead brings valuable experience in complex water projects on active sites. We will need more time from him during construction, if selected. Startup Lead brings the Operator's experience necessary to the City. Several of the resumes concentrate on either wastewater projects or projects in other aspects of the industry. I would have appreciated more direct experience from the personnel provided for in the proposal.

Evaluator 3: 45

- The proposal includes resumes for all 15 key personnel, each with extensive experience in large, complex water and wastewater projects. Many team members have direct experience with reverse osmosis (RO) systems, progressive design-build (PDB) delivery, and Florida-based projects. -Their local knowledge supports permitting, regulatory compliance, and familiarity with the Floridan Aquifer. -Provided table showing each key person's percentage of time dedicated to the project during preconstruction and construction phases. -Team shows a diverse technical coverage that should ensure all technical aspects of the project are covered by experienced professionals. -Many of the key personnel have worked together on previous PC-HDR projects, this continuity supports team chemistry and efficient project execution. - they could better address how team members will adapt if responsibilities shift or if personnel changes are needed mid-project. -4,000 operators -50 operational facilities that they operate

Evaluator 4: 30

-Teams members show specific relative experience on Florida based projects. -Project Manager: Shows extensive water treatment plant experience but does not highlight RO specifically. -Design Manager: Looks to be working in varied RO projects, with some innovative technologies. -Technical Lead WTP: Would like to hear more about the NEWPP Expansion project. Wasn't clear until bottom notes that there was RO involved, but would be interested in hearing more given the scale of the project. Also appears to have varied RO experience with newer technologies. -Technical Lead RO: Work with innovative RO technologies. -Technical Lead Electrical: Experience in working with existing infrastructure, which would include keeping systems online while performing upgrades and expansion, however, two of the highlighted projects are very new. One project began in August and cannot necessarily provide a good baseline. -Technical Lead Civil: Work experience shows taking active site operations into consideration. -Technical Lead I&C: Interested in the JXN project from an resiliency standpoint as well as maintaining operations during construction. Also interested in the Miami-Dade project regarding "complete automation" of the filter process. -Preconstruction Manager: Would liked to have seen RO projects, but in general has large scale plant experience. -Construction Manager: Shows some RO experience but overall the projects do not seem to be to the scale and scope of Rangeline. -Health & Safety Manager: Large construction project experience. -Startup & Commissioning Lead: Good to see a Class A license on the team. Projects are not comparable to the Rangeline in type and scope. -Project Controls Manager: Of note, has collaborate with owner's reps, work with open-book GMP, document control. -Site Super: Scope and scale of the highlighted projects does not comparable to the Rangeline project. -Lead Estimator: Experience in collaborative PDB, open-book GMP, and complex construction. Would like to see a larger project highlighted in the #2 spot. would have expected something regarding ODP here. -QC/QA Manager: Highlighted projects do not seem comparable to the scope and scale of Rangeline. Overall Thoughts: Missing any reference to ODP, some of the highlighted experience was for smaller projects that may or may not have been RO related. Certain team members have experience with newer RO technologies that may help in water recovery rates, which would be highly beneficial if proven cost effective.

Evaluator 5: 46

Strong engineering background of key personnel. JY- New Smyrna Beach WTP, Daytona Beach WTP Upgrades, Stuart RO Facility. CO - Norwood WTP RO, Clayton County Water Authority (PFAS Removal).

Tab No. 3/Criteria No. 3 - Project Team Experience with Similar Projects | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 80

Seems to have more experience with upgrades and expansions. Mostly all projects on time and on budget.

Evaluator 2: 94

PC regularly self-performs a large portion of the scope of work. They cited several PDB complex projects in both water and wastewater, directly in Florida: Bonita Springs, Sawgrass. The Biosolids project, although large and complex, may not bear much relevance to the project herein. Only one of the projects provided involved both PC and HDR as builder and engineer, respectively. The work-together aspects are very important to the City.

Evaluator 3: 89

- Projects meet the requirements: PC has completed multiple progressive design-build projects and RO facilities over 10 mgd, including in Florida. - The proposal includes projects that were over $100M, with complex scopes, community impacts, and innovative delivery methods. -Multiple projects showing RO Experience. -While some projects mention community engagement, the proposal could provide more detail on how past teams addressed neighborhood concerns (e.g., noise, traffic, aesthetics). - Team has worked together mult. years.

Evaluator 4: 45

-What are the start dates for the Arlington and CCWA projects? The end dates are projects for 2031. Would like to know what stage in the process the projects are in do understand how to gauge success. How will these project schedules affect staffing on the Rangeline project? -CCWA is highlighted as the required one RO plant, but also states "a tight NF or RO system".

Evaluator 5: 88

PC Construction partnered with HDR on 18 projects of which all out of the State of Florida. Only one out of 10 relevant projects listed in Florida.

Tab No. 4/Criteria No. 4 - Approach to Meet Project Objectives | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 75

Team does understand the scope of this project. Liquid CL2 & NH3, use of spaces(control room, lab, education center, open workspace, & infrastructure), operating from a co-location, future proofing, flow reversal RO, solar power, and no pilot testing are all great concepts. No odor control for 4mgd, generators outside, and knock down wall for 30mdg expansion are concepts that are questionable. They didn't go into much detail for plant operations.

Evaluator 2: 95

The innovation concerns were addressed by proposing to investigate technologies such as Closed-Circuit RO and Flow Reversal RO. Both or can help increase recovery rates to over 90%. These technologies, however, are not widely adopted as yet. Their proposal shows that PC/HDR understands the goals set by the City of reaching 10 MGD as soon as possible and additionally provided information on how to get at least a partial capacity ahead of time.

Evaluator 3: 95

-Proposal identifies the city's needs to deliver a 10 MGD facility with an issue capacity of 4 MGD, plan for future 30 MGD and 10 MGD surface water plant. -Ensure regulatory compliance, schedule to deliver 4 MGD, design to support future expansions, prioritize operational reliability, funding support, real time cost estimating to achieve project budget, cooperative partnership with City. - proposal includes a site layout with internal layouts -Kick off using a team chartering method that includes alignment workshops to define goals, roles, and behaviors upfront. -Team Chartering: Formal alignment workshops to define goals, roles, and behaviors -Early engagement with FPL to discuss initial and future needs, Evaluate power quality, provided examples of what could be done to mitigate concerns. -Backup Power - design to accommodate future needs. -reviewed preliminary water quality data, bypass blend could be possible (5-8%). -procure long lead items including materials for 4 MGD. -A preliminary risk register was included, with mitigation strategies for power availability, equipment lead times, and labor shortages. -a detailed quality control process was include with outline showing process from start to finish using a Plan To Check method. - Does not foresee the need to do pilot testing due to extensive history and performance of RO treatment around the southeast. -Early coordination with FDEP, SFWMD, and City departments. -operator usability for SCADA system. -PC to self preform more than half of project if needed and cost value. - Transparent GMP and Cost Control Using real-time cost tracking, bid-leveling tools, and a structured GMP development process. - Offers Owner Direct Purchase (ODP) support and open-book pricing. -providing training starting in the preliminary testing phase includes EOR sessions, vender led instructions, classroom and field-base learning, equipment training, observe testing and engage with vendors. -provided a detailed project schedule showing 4 MGD by June 2029 and 10 MGD by Dec 2029. 3 GMPs Jacobs will preform the critical components of the projects. -No acid possibility. -13 permits already identified Lime or COs for Alk.

Evaluator 4: 60

-Page 57: Water is from lower Floridan aquifer, not upper. -Page 59: Under Co-Location there is a grammatical error with 'at the near the City'. The idea is sound though - to be closer to the staff during the planning stages to keep the project moving forward. -Page 60: Appreciate including the owner's rep in the process. -Page 61: The walk thru video gives a good visual. Also noted the future areas surrounding the site that must be taken into considering. -Page 62: The general power issues and long lead times are noted as items of concern to be addressed early. Good notes on the existing generator room space restrictions. -Page 63: Space being allocated for surface water plant. -Page 64-65: The explanations of CCRO and FRRO are clear and helpful in understanding the benefits. appreciate that the proposer has been running pilots on these technologies. Appreciate the breakdown of potential pilot study in decision making, especially given time constraints. -Page 65: Long lead items noted. Would have expected some mention of ODP here. -Page 64: Noting again that CPSL USD pulls from the lower Floridan. -Page 66: Dedicated a section to working with the community and integrating the site with the neighbors. -Page 67: Integrating the owner's rep into the design workshops and decision making process. -Page 68: Small leadership team. Page 68-69: Project Controls, Document Control, Risk Register. Like the takt planning in lean construction. -Page 71: EMR of .81. Over all the five year track rate is below industry averages. Incident rate meets requirements. Page 72: Quality issue logs to act upon problems. Page 75: Operator friendly SCADA, including training and future readiness. Page 75-76: BMI - being able to have operators and staff walk through the project do assist in decisions on construction. Page 77: Under Work Packages - Can appreciate attempts to avoid sole sources to give the best quality and value to the Utility. Page 78: Self-perform work as a cost savings measure. Page 81: ODP mentioned as a cost/time savings. Page 85: Clear phased approach to meet the scope. Page 89-93: Identification of key risks to the schedule including a basic risk register. Top three risks have strategies to mitigate against the risk, with benefits and examples of how this has worked on other projects. Would like to have more clearly seen who holds the risk as noted in the criteria. Page 106-End: Required schedule, GMP example, OSHA paperwork, etc. Page Requirement Met

Evaluator 5: 92

June 2029 4 MGD Capacity Reached. December 2029 completion. Duration 941 days proposed. Mobilization proposed March 2027.

PCL Construction

Tab No. 1/Criteria No. 1 - Project Team Structure | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 45

50+ years of working together. Clear line of communication between key Key Project Partners.

Evaluator 2: 48

This team of PCL and Stantec addresses one of the City's concerns right away. We wanted a team that had worked together for a long time, and 50 years qualifies. Contractors and Engineers have big conflicting egos, and so the length of time ameliorates that concern. A high rate of self-perform is also a positive quality. This can help reduce costs by the mere action of the team already being in place; onboarded is reduced (or at least lessened). A mild criticism would be that the process design role introduces yet another firm. This introduces an extra level of complexity that may not be necessary.

Evaluator 3: 45

-The proposal presents a well-defined team structure with clearly assigned roles and responsibilities across PCL, Stantec, and specialty subconsultants. The reporting lines and communication pathways are clearly illustrated. - single point of contact, which simplifies communication and ensures continuity throughout the life of the project. -Proven Teaming History between PCL and Stantec have a 50+P year history shows a longstanding collaborative relationship backed by a strong Florida presence. -Developed a detailed manpower curve with aligned project phases, confirming adequate staffing throughout the project. -Key personnel are committed from preconstruction through commissioning, ensuring seamless knowledge transfer and consistent leadership.

Evaluator 4: 50

-General Note: Owner's Rep mentioned by name in intro letter. Site walk through video provided. A very useful visual of the project and shows due diligence. -Prime Firm/Lead Design identified immediately. -Appreciate Owner's Rep inclusion in the org chart in Figure 1-1 and 1-4. -Org chart includes funding specialist and community relations. -Bringing a funding specialist firm with team. -Page 10: The sub breakout provides useful information. -Page 13: Case study of real world application of early engagement of subs to integrate into design process. Appreciate the evaluation selection matrix. -Sub noted for I&C with Electrical/I&C manager under proposers umbrella. -Page 15: Timeline of partnership useful visual with clear partnership between firms. Page 16: Clear collaboration between Stantec and MBC. -Page 17: Management structure chart is clear useful tool for understanding roles, responsibilities, and reporting. -Has own project management software along with other platforms for collaboration. -Notes the Keep PSL Beautiful program. -Large Flordia base but good use of case study on Page 22 to highlight problem solving. -Appreciate the manpower graph in Figure 1-5 (Page 23). Not sure why it goes to -5 on available resources?

Evaluator 5: 44

Adequate structure. Key personnel proposed includes individuals from PCL, Stantec, and MBC.

Tab No. 2/Criteria No. 2 - Project Team Key Personnel Relevant Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 45

Extensive experience of the teams key personal as well as support staff.

Evaluator 2: 48

Highly experienced team lead by a single point of contact. Excellent safety record of 0.54 EMR. The critical roles are headed by highly qualified individuals. I appreciate the inclusion of a funding specialist near the top of the proposal. The key personnel resumes refer to many wastewater projects, but I would appreciated a more direct concentration in water to address the main topic of this advertisement. We're going to need a lot more than 20% of Mr. Link Mueller's time during construction as a nod to O&M staff.

Evaluator 3: 44

- Shows Florida-Specific experience, the team includes professionals with experience in Florida's regulatory environment, aquifer systems, and permitting processes. -The proposal includes well-qualified individuals for all required positions, including a RO Process Expert -Resumes show relevant project delivery methods such as CMAR, and PB. -Many team members have worked together on similar projects, which supports collaboration. - Team includes a funding specialist that has a 53% grant success rate. -The team includes utility professionals who have worked in operations, ensuring that design decisions are practical and maintainable. -Some resumes are overly detailed and lengthy. -There is some uncertainty in how responsibilities are divided among QA/QC, safety, and commissioning roles. +3 operators on staff

Evaluator 4: 40

-Page 25: Asterisk about staff being available 100% of the time noted. -Project Manager: First project highlighted, would like further clarification on the closeout as this is a new and ongoing process for the PM on that specific project. Looks like highlighted rolls are construction and operations managers. Would like to see how that segues into overall PM. Projects seem about half or less of Rangeline cost. -Design Manager: Projects scale seem comparable, though scope more towards sewer on #2 and #3, though no doubt complex given the location. -WTP Design Lead/RP Process Lead: Project scales mostly comparable, though Pompano is only a year in and still several years from completion. Hard to gauge success. Experience with varied processes. -Pumps Design Lead: Definite experience on scale, with varied applications. -Design QA/QC: Projects of comparable size. -Surface Water Treatment Process Lead: Projects of a smaller scale, however, if a technically advisor for the future surface water needs, then this is a valuable asset to add in the design process to allow for that future expansion. -Preconstruction Manager: Projects of comparable size. The El Paso project looks interesting (direct potable RO). -Construction Manager: Norwood project using technology that has a large annual cost savings ($500K). Scale of projects smaller than Rangeline. -Health & Safety: Appears to have a good safety record. -Startup & Commissioning Manager: El Paso project not at startup, but appreciate the early input in design to ensure that everything runs smoothly in the end. -

Project Controls Manager: Projects appear to be on much smaller scale than the Rangeline project. -Site Super: Scope and scale with varied projects, however the Weber West Campus project appears to be in early stages. How will this affect availability on the Rangeline project? -Lead Estimator: Gilbert North project savings in both time and cost of interest. Would be interested in how this was achieved. -QA/QC Manager: Projects of a smaller scale than Rangeline. -O&M Integrator: Good team addition. -Others: Included other positions that would round out team such as Funding, Membrane Constructability, Electrical/I&C. Special mention for the Supply Wells & DIW Coordination Lead as this is something to take into consideration.

Evaluator 5: 47

Blend of construction and professional engineering credentials. Sufficient design building experience.

Tab No. 3/Criteria No. 3 - Project Team Experience with Similar Projects | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 85

Extensive experience with similar projects. Most projects completed on time.

Evaluator 2: 97

History of 65+ RO projects. $3 billion in membranes. Expertise in PDB, especially in larger scale construction. North Lee County RO, Clifton WTP. A critique would that several of the projects are outside the jurisdiction of the FDEP and may require some adaptation.

Evaluator 3: 89

- Team provided multiple projects that meet or exceed the 10 MGD RO requirement. Several of the projects are within Florida. State they have done 65+ RO projects. -Several projects provided that show either CMAR or PDB as delivery method. State they have done 75+ using PDB delivery method. - 150 Florida based projects show relevance and regulatory familiarity. - repeat clients. - Demonstrated ability to maintain operations during construction. - While community impacts are mentioned, there is limited detail on public outreach or stakeholder coordination in some examples -A few of the projects are over 10 years old or close to the cutoff i.e. Hood Road WTP. - A few examples rely heavily on individual team member experience rather than full team collaboration

Evaluator 4: 55

- Reference Project 1: Appreciate the innovation to off-site pre-fab to cut down on the timeline. -Reference Project 2: Note use of ODP for cost savings. Adaptive scheduling to address FPL delays. High risk item on this project. -Reference Project 5: 600 page cost model is impressive at 30%, but hard to gauge overall project success withe end date in 2029. -Reference Project 4: Use of 3D modeling to provide better visualization. -Overall Thoughts: The testimonials on the projects is a good touch, as well as the adjusted value due to

inflation which may make pre-2020 projects appear significantly lower than they would be in current market conditions. However, highlighted projects do not reflect PCL-Stantec as working on the same project, whether as DB or tradition DBB. This would have been useful to gauge team success. There were some projects shown on the map on Page 75 where the firms worked together - would like to have seen more information on those projects outside of the resumes. Project noted on Page 76 as a collaboration between PCL-Stantec that was presented at the DB Conference not a highlighted project? -Page 77: Highlights previous collaboration between PCL and the Owner's Rep (Hazen). *Did quasi address question regarding 50 years experience working together but not shown well in proposal. Mentioned proposal parameters as limiting factor.

Evaluator 5: 93

Some of the proposed PCL specialty subcontractors are currently committed to other project teams. Should PCL be selected, it appears that multiple vendors would need to be brought up to speed. 4 of the 10 relevant projects located in Florida.

Tab No. 4/Criteria No. 4 - Approach to Meet Project Objectives | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 85

Project team understands the scope of this project. 4MGD by Aug 2029(With Odor Control?). Dedicated O&M Integrator, Optimizing existing generator building, Corrosion control strategy, Split design layout, advanced RO design, Permeate flush, blend basin design, Victaulic connections(including fuel lines), Pre-cast wall, Prestressed concrete clear well, Energy recovery concepts, and future proofing are all great concepts. Murals on the tanks and 75% recovery for RO skids??. Good working relationship with owners representative. Good safety record.

Evaluator 2: 98

A strategy to provide the full 10 MGD four months ahead of time via schedule acceleration. They commit to this by leaning on their ability to self-perform a large portion of the project. They commit to helping the City in funding necessities through grants, federal loans, etc. They will provide support on such endeavors. A nod to our Sandhill Cranes by offering to wrap the necessary tanks with the City's favorite bird. The section on innovation provides several options on dealing with the generator building, system corrosion, precast wall systems, etc. Several of the projects shown as relevant to this particular PDB occurred outside the 10 year window.

Evaluator 3: 95

-Identified the challenges that the City is facing with growth and the need to provide capacity. The team recognizes the importance of balancing infrastructure expansion with environmental stewardship and community character. -It emphasizes the plant’s role in supporting sustainable growth, enhancing system reliability, protecting natural resources, and reflecting community values -The team

demonstrates awareness of the site's location and its integration with adjacent residential and recreational developments. -The proposal discusses how the facility will harmonize with nearby neighborhoods through thoughtful design and landscaping. -Proposal provides several innovative ideas (9), providing how each idea applies to the project objectives through schedule, costs, safety and O&M. - Preconstruction/Design approach - collaborative workshop/meeting with all project stakeholders to identify potential risks, communication, framework, etc. for guide throughout project. Provides one primary contact for all matters. Provided a chart identing the pathway from start to construction -Design Development - included coordination with designers/contractors for wells and deep inj. wells. Liked that they listed corrosion control and stabilization as a task that will need to be completed. Pilot testing for optimizing chemicals, energy-efficient system and membrane life. -Design - design depicts future expansion, provided site plan, along with several layouts for the different components. Liked them bring up different sized skids and redundancy for the City to consider. -Permitting- Stated they maintain a live permitting matrix for tracking purposes. Proposes to conduct early and frequent coordination with FDEP and other agencies. -Schedule does include using early work packages, phase commissioning strategy bring on 4 MGD followed by 10 MGD ahead of schedule. PCL stating they could self perform most of the work (70%) which gives them direct control over schedule-critical activities. -Flexibility/Future Exp.- Design infrastructure for 30 MGD plus 10 MGD Surface plant exp. -O&M - Includes operator participation in design workshops and reviews. Have a dedicated O&M integrator that ensures operational needs are embedded into the design, included challenges identified from JEA site visit and how they would resolve the issues. -Funding subconsultant on team has a 53% grant success rate. would assist with compliance requirements. -Costs - Transparent GMP development with full visibility into their labor, materials and production rates, Power BI Dashboard to be used to provide real-time cost tracking. Already identified long-lead items -Risk Management - Provided a preliminary risk register with strategies to help mitigate and examples of previous successes. -Community Engagement - I like the idea of hosting a local contest for tank mural designs and providing some time of educational opportunities. -QA/QC - implementing a Quality Management plan for both design and construction to help meet performance requirements. Digital tracking includes using a QR code for each piece of equipment. -Proposal provides how the contractor will preform commissioning and startup using PLC's dedicated commissioning and startup department. Provided a step by step process. including classroom training, hands on implementation, and working side-by-side during startup and testing, also includes support after completion. Final documents include video documentation, troubleshooting guides and SOPs for equipment. +Well field management +3 MGD skids +6 MG tanks at 25% savings vs 2 4 MG +min. air +reverse direction cleaning

Evaluator 4: 90

-Page 83-84: Appreciate the visual demonstration of the community surrounding the project site. -Page 85: Incorporating operators into the process with VR walk through. -Page 86: Innovations on the generator building with real world example of using existing

space. Corrosion study to address issues in the system. -Page 87: Vertical bottom-up feed flow with previous implementation example. Would like to hear more on this case study. -Page 88: Testimonial from Boca operator attesting to long term benefits. -Page 89: Precast structure to expedite construction and reduce costs. Would like to know if there are any downsides. -Page 90: Energy recovery concepts with clear initial costs, yearly savings, and payback period. Would be curious as to long term maintenance costs and how those might offset the expected payback. -Page 91-93: A great deal of emphasis on funding assistance. -Page 95-97: Preconstruction process flow and lines of communication with testimonial from former Boynton Beach client. Note early equipment procurement. -Page 98: Workshop breakdown with DB team attendees and USD attendees at each phase. -Page 99: Breakdown of existing challenges in our plants and how they can be addressed at Rangeline, including limited storage for maintenance staff. -Page 100-102: Interface between the well hydro and DB team hydro to establish water quality for design purposes. Includes pilot testing. Also coordination with DIW team for startup and commission to "align testing". -Page 104: Conceptual process flow schematic to show design concepts as previously discussed in proposal. Provides good visual. -Page 105-110: Some good conceptual ideas which have storage and office space, along with a training room. Not sure about the control room/process lab but this is conceptual. -Page 112: Clear permitting plan, including possible phased permitting, to avoid delays with FDEP. -Page 113: Value engineering ideas. Like the dashboard to see options with price models. -Page 114: Constructability and operability reviews. Takes the operators and maintenance staff into consideration as the end users and ultimate clients. Case study with PBC and achieving ISO 55001 Certification in asset management. Would like to know more. -Page 115: Ability to self perform approximately 70% of the work. -Page 116: Clear subcontract process and list of expected sub disciplines. -Page 118: Example of 30% GMP estimation vs. final in real case scenarios. -Page119: Open book with Power BI dashoard. -Page 121: Run down of long lead items and delivery time frames. -Page 122: Noting that the scheduling must take into account keeping the repump station functional during construction operations. -Page 123-124: Public outreach team included with case study in Tampa and other similar projects. Tank renderings take City branding into account. Notes coordination with the adjacent developer. -Page 125: PCL has proprietary project management software as well as standard tools such as Autodesk Construction Cloud. -Page 126-127: EMR and incident rates consistently below industry averages. PCL received safety award in 2025 and 2025. Rangeline safety considerations identified. -Page 129: Appreciate showing case study and areas of improvement that were internally identified. -Page 130-131: Clear phasing plan. -Page 132-135: Really like the commissioning and startup, with training plan taking into account support after the project is completed and in service. -Page 140-End: Supporting documentation as requested, including OSHA, Risk Registers, Sample GMP * Worked on 150 WTP in Florida. * Tracking costs real time to get ahead of problems. * Never been off-ramped. * Can self-perform up to 70%. * Keeping access in mind for maintenance staff. * 6MGD first quarter 2029. * 6MGD tank can save up to $2 million over two 4MGD. * Precast walls in Miami cut 4 months off schedule.

* Three licensed operators on the team. * Rehab chlorine building for storage and maintenance. * Pompano $21 million in grants. * Project hotline, email, website. * High percentage self-perform. Power BI dashboard for GMP.

Evaluator 5: 92

Phased commission strategy to being 10 MGD into operation by August 2029 (4 moths ahead of schedule). Three-pronged funding approach concept. Energy efficiency evaluations, operational staff involvement through the process.

The Haskell Company

Tab No. 1/Criteria No. 1 - Project Team Structure | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 40

Long working relationship between key partners. Clear contractual structure.

Evaluator 2: 47

Three seemingly disparate entities join forces with the goal of providing a great product. This combination, according to their proposal, allows a large portion of the work to be performed "in-house". All with a seasoned engineering firm to help guide the design, and with a local hydrogeological expert for coordination and familiarity with applicable rules and regulations. Carollo: 93 years. Haskell: 60 years Globaltech: Florida, 30 years A critique is that this structure, with at least three strong personalities, will necessitate a veritable strong Project Manager/point-of-contact for the City to communicate with, Mr. Kantor.

Evaluator 3: 46

-There is a strong history of collaboration between Globaltech and Haskell; however, the collaboration with the lead designer, Carollo does not seem as strong. -have completed several projects in south Florida, brings local Knowledge. -Well-defined organizational structure indicating firm affiliations.

Evaluator 4: 30

-General Note: Intro letter discusses options to alleviate JEA in the immediate and coordination on the well and DIW projections with McNabb-Miller. -Page 10: Relationship between firms, with roles, contractual relationships, and responsibilities defined. -Included USD operations staff as part of the org chart. -Comes with public relations. -Prior projects experience missing or unclear between joint venture firms. -Would like to see the resources fleshed out to be clearer as to what is done in house vs. what is subbed out.

Evaluator 5: 45

Sufficient organizational structure proposed to meet the complex nature of the project.

Tab No. 2/Criteria No. 2 - Project Team Key Personnel Relevant Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 40

Extensive experience of the teams key personal as well as support staff. Provided resumes of key and support staff.

Evaluator 2: 47

Nice to see a nod to the Operations staff right at the top of the hierarchy. I would caution against inflating egos, but it is noted and appreciated. The leadership team is experienced in delivering large, complex projects through alternative delivery. Many of them are DBIA certified. We will need a lot more than 15% and 5% from the Design Manager and the Technical Advisor on this project, respectively.

Evaluator 3: 46

-The team includes nationally recognized experts in RO, membrane systems, and PDB delivery. -Multiple personnel have led or supported projects over $100M. -Many resumes highlight work in South Florida, that show familiarity with local permitting, aquifer conditions, and regulatory agencies. -Many team members are transitioning from the FPUA project, ensuring continuity and immediate availability. Proposal provides a table showing time allocations across design, preconstruction, and construction phases. -licensed operators and startup specialists ensures practical, maintainable solutions. -The team is led by seasoned professionals with DBIA credentials and decades of collaborative delivery experience. - some key personnel have limited time at the current employer.

Evaluator 4: 30

-Project Manager: Large scale PDB project experience but does not highlight RO specifically. -Executive Support: Closest project in scale would be FPUA. Note that this position is to ensure maintenance of operations of the repump station during construction as well as coordinate with the ancillary well projects under separate contract. -Design Manager: Projects do not overall seem to scope/scale of Rangeline. -Design Lead: Impressive resume with large scale and complex RO projects. Would like to see more about the San Diego project with indirect potable and how the projects that are still in production are currently going. -Interim RO Production: Highlighted projects should be more RO focused for the RO project management as noted in the write up. -Technical Advisor: Comparable RO experience. -Electrical Technical Lead: RO retrofits and expansions. -Preconstruction Manager: Would liked to have seen RO projects, but in general has large scale plant experience. -Construction Manager: Comparable scale in projects, however last project listed completed in 2011 (outside 10 year time frame). -Health & Safety Manager: Large construction project experience. -Startup &

Commissioning Manager: Impressive resume with large scale and complex RO projects. -Site Super: Comparable scale in projects, however first project listed completed in 2005 (outside 10 year time frame). -Lead Estimator: Large scale plant experience. Would have expected to see something about ODB, openbook GMP, etc. here. -QA/QC: Mid to comparable scale to Rangeline.

Evaluator 5: 44

Good blend of engineering and contracting backgrounds for key personnel. Seasoned individuals with decades of experience.

Tab No. 3/Criteria No. 3 - Project Team Experience with Similar Projects | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 80

Extensive experience with similar projects. Most projects completed on time and on budget.

Evaluator 2: 97

Haskell recent experience at a neighboring municipality allows them to possibly transition staff from that project to this one just as it nears completion. The have extensive experience in 10 MGD plants including in Lee County and Palm Beach County. Their also recent experience with the JEA Water Purification Center is testament to their ability to work on difficult project both in the technical aspects and in the communications game. I would have appreciated many more mentions of the direct Water Treatment experience as opposed to wastewater. The requirements are different and the provided projects should have attested to that directly.

Evaluator 3: 89

- Team provided multiple projects that meet or exceed the 10 MGD RO requirement. Several of the projects are within Florida. - Several projects provided that show either CMAR, DB or PDB as delivery method. - Florida based projects show relevance and regulatory familiarity. - shows emphasis on noise control and public engagement. Experience in working in residential areas. -Many of the same personnel transitioning from FPUA to Range line. -Familiarity with local conditions, permitting, and City staff. -A few of the projects are over 10 years old. +70% self preforming

Evaluator 4: 65

-Appreciate the project criterion at the top. -Project similarities are in a clearly defined format on some projects. Bounces between bullet points and narrative depending on project. -San Diego project of interest. The process, including energy recovery appears to be innovative. -FPUA project has large ODP, which is a big tax savings. Also, solutions to geotechnical issues. -Pilot testing on JEA to determine best process. -Boca Raton end date? Outside the 10 year mark? -The surface water treatment projects could prove useful for future Rangeline considerations. -Would like to have seen more projects where this teams worked together successfully.

Evaluator 5: 95

Many similar design-build projects spread across Florida.

Tab No. 4/Criteria No. 4 - Approach to Meet Project Objectives | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 80

Project team seems to understand the scope. Did not go to much in depth with the treatment plant itself. Future proofing, split flow layout, keep voltage at 480V, being a good neighbor concepts, brine concentrators and 3.5 MGD skids are all great concepts. Brine to lime plant, plant layout, 5mg GST, & rental unit for 2MGD??? Bio Scrubber, Liquid CL2 & NH3 and skid setup were all great ideas.

Evaluator 2: 97

The approach here fits the stated requirements almost exactly. Their "five great ideas" address the needs of the City holistically, to use their word. It is the City's goal to future proof the new water plant so as to avoid mistakes made in the existing plants. Two additional ideas that stand out: 1. Use of larger capacity skids; and a 2 MGD temporary plant on wheels. Both of these take into the account both the urgency of this project and the City's desire to ring as much water as possible from the RO system.

Evaluator 3: 95

-Proposal identifies the city's needs for additional capacity by 2029. -provides multiple items that that will need to be addressed for project to be successful now and in the future. i.e. production well decline in capacity & quality. Example - JEA plant. Incorporating items that have been used before on previous projects. -sequencing strategy to ensure repump station stays operational throughout construction. -Expansion from 10 to 30 - design for initial capacity of 15 MGD in leu of 30 MGD to reduce initial capital cost. right-sizing control/admin for final buildout, electrical equipment at 480 -Mentions maximizing train size, "off the shelf" manifolds and piping to avoid customized parts. -sound walls to minimize noise. referenced city having poor experience in past, assuming Westport. -Sending brine to existing lime plant? Interesting concept. could be costly to run pipe between plants. But could this be used for future surface water plant. -project execution plan at begin to defines roles, responsibilities, communication protocols and milestones. -use of Early work packages including developing a staging and delivery strategy. - use of project management software for resource tracking and controls to stay transparent and keep project aligned. -provides layout for meetings and workshops with list of attendees. -Risk Management - provided a draft risk register with mitigation strategies and ownership assignments along with a framework to track and adapt throughout the project lifecycle -Real time estimating to help guide decisions throughout design. -Draft risk register with mitigation strategies and ownership assignments. Risk discipline framework to track and adapt throughout the project lifecycle - -use of cost control system, real time est. tools to be used to help guide decisions throughout design. - provided examples of long lead

item timeframes and steps to evaluation each EWP before proceeding. Schedule shows 4 MGD by end of 2028 and 10 MDG by July 2029. - possibility for a 2 MGD mobile unit to assist with JEA issues. (stated 4 MGD by 2029 not 10 MGD) provide plan to achieve in 200 days of contract. -provided construction phasing layouts to provide an idea on how project would move forward. - provided a start and commission plan -detailed Turnover Plan early outlining doc requirements. Early involvement and thorough training of operators. +Software to evaluate cost thoughout +2 MGD temp skid +Bioscrubbers +3 stage skids (3.2 MGD) 600-1200 Pressure vessels.

Evaluator 4: 85

-Page 84: Addresses issues, including salinity and how to future proof the system. Idea 1 gives real world example of Polk County salinity problems. Idea 2 of potential to go to 15 MGD to reduce future expansion issues. Idea 3 mentions coordination with the DIW team. -Page 85: Idea 4 accounts for community considerations with current and future development. Rendering of surrounding buildout. Idea 5 innovative idea on brine recovery using existing lime system. -Page 87: Real world example of cost savings at Southwest WRF. -Page 88: Includes Hazen as owner's rep in collaboration. -Page 89-91: Flow chart of integrated systems for project management, collaboration, and document control. Good breakdown of the software and tools used to keep track of all aspects of project. Real world example at Nassau WRF of Hazen and Haskell working together. -Page 92-95: Really great breakdown of managing risk, how to use a risk register, implementation at City Creek and FPUA. This section is very fleshed out with examples and explanations. -Page 96: In the interview section they discuss the salinity issues Florida is facing, incorporating the operators into the conversation. -Page 96-98: Explanations on processes and tools used in cost controls and scheduling, such as Primavera P6, with lead times on equipment. Example schedule on Page 98 with breakout of services for a clearer picture. -Page 97: EMR and incident rate meet requirements for both firms. Appreciate breakdown between firms. -Page 99-100: QA/QC process and noting having subject matter experts as each step. -Page 102: Inclusion of the OR throughout this section is noticed. Example design and shop drawing submittals from Carollo project. -Page 102: Public outreach firm with previous experience working with PSL? -Page 102-103: Value engineering savings on Southwest WRF of $7 million. -Page 103-106: Ability to self perform work. Open book pricing. Pulling in McNabb-Miller as a sub to better coordinate the wells and DIWs. Real world example of working with Hazen at Nassau WRF to save 16 weeks on schedule for electrical gear. Clear breakdown of the ODP process with understanding of the statutes. -Page 108: RFI process regarding subs - Haskell will vet the RFIs to determine if they need to be passed through to the City or if the answers already exist. Will log all RFIs via Procore. -Page 109: Monthly risk dashboard. Construction area over site to maintain safe and efficient working environment. -Page 110-111: Innovative idea to have a small mobile package plant for up to 2 MGD if we need to buy time. Can deliver within 200 days with approval. Fleshed out plan on how to make use of this service. -Page 111-112: Really thorough planning for critical systems, including upgrades and repairs to existing systems. -Page 113-114: Completely different layout than any other

proposer. Had not considered this option. -Page 116: Interactive walk thru from another project to allow staff to see layout. Takes operators and maintenance staff into account and the real client and end user. -Page 118-End: OSHA paperwork, examples of OPCC, schedule, pricing, etc. * Live tracking GMPs/budget. * Self perform 70% - including steel fabrication. * 5MGD tank, temp plant, disposing brine to FM. Provides additional 2MGD within 200 days. * Bioscrubbers * Real world accessible design for staff. * Good explanation of the issues with CCRO FRRO. * 25 licensed operators on staff and 39 RO startups. * $2.6 billions in grants/loans. $1.4 in Florida. Stacks funding from multiple sources. * Public Relations - Mentions avoiding problems reaching 1PSL and social media. Mentions FPUA and PSL projects. *Has been able to get electrical drawings in as little as 6 weeks to get ahead of the lead times. * High percentage self-performance.

Evaluator 5: 94

Interesting ideas (5) proposed. Brine recovery is an interesting idea. Lacks details regarding future surface water and/or feasibility of lime plant and organic concerns.

Wharton-Smith, Inc.

Tab No. 1/Criteria No. 1 - Project Team Structure | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 42

Showed (7) Key Project Partners. Working together since 2005 with 36 projects completed.

Evaluator 2: 45

Team has 36 projects under their belt. This serves as evidence of their ability to work together. All team members have worked with the City on prior occasions. The contractor is currently working on a Wastewater plant for the City; the engineer is on the City's continuing services list. Wharton self-performs a major portion of their work at around 50%. Several local subs are included to supplement local knowledge and needs. Preferred method of delivery seems to be CMAR, from provided projects, as opposed to PDB, which the city is attempting to transition into.

Evaluator 3: 42

-proven team history, team has delivered 36 projects together, demonstrates a high level of trust, communication, and integration between the firms. -The team has experience with the City’s systems, having worked with the city for many years. - The proposal includes a detailed org chart showing firm affiliations, reporting relationships, and roles for both preconstruction and construction

phases. - Each firm's role is clear—Wharton-Smith as Prime/Builder, Kimley-Horn as Lead Designer, AECOM and JLA as technical support, and others as specialty subs. -The team follows DBIA best practices and has a structured approach to collaboration, including a dedicated Collaboration Center and structured partnering sessions. Several members of the team are local or close by. +Local firm, several live close to city. +5 operators on staff

Evaluator 4: 40

-Clear contractual structure and list of projects completed by the DB team in a collaborative delivery method vs. DBB. -Approach is generic. -Would like to have seen more on what might be subcontracted out vs. what can be done in house.

Evaluator 5: 48

Clear structure and organizational chart. Depth of resources.

Tab No. 2/Criteria No. 2 - Project Team Key Personnel Relevant Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (16.7%)

Evaluator 1: 45

Extensive experience of teams key personal. Provided resumes for all key personal as well as support staff. One resume had wrong information submitted (Jill Hudkins). (5) operators on staff

Evaluator 2: 45

Engineer has experience in working with the City's water treatment infrastructure. Other team members have additional direct experience in delivering PDBs to nearby municipalities. A team of funding specialists has been added to the group in order to help the City with such issues. The team does not cite DBIA certified professionals in their number, including the Design-Build Project Manager, the Design Manager and the Construction Manager. I did not see a licensed operator as part of the team. Operators should be prominent in these types of projects.

Evaluator 3: 43

- proposal shows a deep Florida experience across all key roles. -Wharton-Smith shows resumes with strong relevant project delivery PDB, CMAR, however the rest of the team did not show as much experience with the relevant delivery method. -Provided table showing each key person's percentage of time dedicated to the project during preconstruction and construction phases. -proposal demonstrated the teams collaboration across multiple projects including City projects. -Team shows a diverse technical coverage that should ensure all technical aspects of the project are covered by experienced professionals. -resumes appear to be lacking in the larger projects. -5 operators on staff

Evaluator 4: 35

-General Note: Appreciate the Tab 3 reference project notation. -Project Manager: Wellington RO project not to scope/scale of Rangeline. Subsequent projects closer in scale with varying scope. -Design Manager: Projects do not overall seem to scope/scale of Rangeline. -Pilot Testing & Treatment: Relative experience for both team members. Do like to see pilot testing highlighted. -WTP Design Lead: Treatment System Team Design: Relevant RO experience for both, but scale of projects smaller than Rangeline. -Preconstruction Manager: Some RO experience shown. Scale not quite to Rangeline. -Construction Manager: Some RO experience shown. Scale not quite to Rangeline. -Health & Safety: One project to scale of Rangeline. -Startup & Commissioning: Some RO experience shown. The Fort Meyers project is relatively new and not near to completion, so difficult to gauge success. -Project Controls: RO experience with some scope and scale similar to Rangeline. -Site Super: RO experience with some scope and scale similar to Rangeline. -Lead Estimator: Experience with RO and other plant projects, but would have expected to see something about ODP, openbook GMP, etc. -Design QA/QC: Relevant RO experience, but scale of projects smaller than Rangeline. -QA/QC: Projects of a smaller scale than Rangeline. -Other: Smaller resumes for electrical/I&C/SCADA review, general super, membrane treatment review, civil piping, etc. to round out the team. *Bringing in a well driller - over 100 wells working with JLA and McNabb-Miller. *Five operators on staff in Florida. *Reasoning for not noting on proposal staff emphasized at presentation did not make sense.

Evaluator 5: 49

Seasoned key personnel relevant experience. Specific expertise with City of Port St. Lucie systems including existing facilities.

Tab No. 3/Criteria No. 3 - Project Team Experience with Similar Projects | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 85

Extensive experience with similar projects. Most projects completed on time or before, also within budget or under budget.

Evaluator 2: 95

Highly localized. Recent PDB with St Lucie County dealing with elevated TDS levels, which is a possibility at the Rangeline site. PDB Membrane experience at Tarpon Springs AWS. Many more of the projects in the lineup were delivered via CMAR and not PDB. The differences in contract and management structures are very important to the City.

Evaluator 3: 86

-Wharton-Smith has completed multiple PDB or CMAR projects -All projects are in Florida shows familiarity with FDEP, SFWMD, and local permitting. -projects shows firm have completed project that involve complexity that is similar this this project. -minimum number of project that shows a team history. -several projects list project staff involved but not included on anyone's resumes. -

Similar RO projects have not been complete yet, final outcomes have not been determined i.e. schedule, budget. -a table high-lighting similar projects with required criteria would have been nice. -experence with our plants and the local area.

Evaluator 4: 60

-Project similarities in clearly defined format at top. -Crossover project staff noted at bottom. -Mentions of ODP on Miramar project. -Do like note on startup and commissioning on Punta Gorda project so as to not negatively affect the water quality in the existing system. -Seminole project noted upgrades to SCADA and coordination required to maintain operations. -Taylor Dairy seems to be closest in scope/scale to Rangeline. In general, projects are not to the same complexity and scale. *Bringing in a well driller - over 100 wells working *Five operators on staff in Florida.

Evaluator 5: 96

Multiple project collaborations between Wharton Smith, Kimley Horn, Aecom. Many of which have also worked on past City of Port St. Lucie projects including subconsultants.

Tab No. 4/Criteria No. 4 - Approach to Meet Project Objectives | Points Based | 100 Points (33.3%)

Evaluator 1: 90

Project team understands scope of the project. ERD's, higher recovery rates, no concentrate booster pumps, dual clearwell, CO2 or lime stabilization, Closed circuit RO, Stage alternation high recovery, brine concentration, Pressure exchangers, and electric coagulation are all great concepts. Engaging operations and maintenance staff. Did not go to much in depth with the treatment plant itself. 50% or more self preforming. 10MGD by summer of 2029. ****Cleared up some things during presentation. Brought some great ideas for the future.

Evaluator 2: 95

The team seems focused on strategies to accelerate the needed by date of December 2029 by making use of Early Work Packages. They seems highly transparent via their use of Open Book GMPs to display actual costs, plus the implementation of a progressive risk register keeps the City informed as to the possible obstacles that can create additional costs and delays in the project. As the City was looking for innovative solutions, a larger and more detailed section on emerging technologies would have been appreciated. As conditions get worse for wells at our other plants, new ideas are critical when spending all this money to build a new plant.

Evaluator 3: 92

- Highly detailed and innovative approach to design, permitting, and construction. -Team demonstrates institutional knowledge of Port St. Lucie's water system, referencing past work on JEA and Prineville WTPs and water master plan. -Emphasis importance of membrane selection to prevent scaling and fouling. Pilot testing. - Importance of water stabilization to prevent distribution issue. - In-house grant and funding expertise. -pilot testing to incorporate emerging technologies. i.e. Closed Circuit RO. - Emphasis on early GMPs, long-lead procurement, and phased delivery. - Strong focus on operator engagement, virtual reality walkthroughs, and 3D modeling. -Alternative site layouts ideas along with ultimate buildout. - Pilot testing and membrane selection strategies tailored to Port St. Lucie's aquifer conditions. - Robust QA/QC, safety, and risk management plans. -construction team is capable of self-performing. Can self-perform up 50% or more. - Transparent cost control and scheduling . - Owners Direct Purchase for savings. - preliminary schedule showing completion of 10 MGD by summer 2029. -Provided risk register of of key issues with a mitigation strategy. -Could have done a better job describing the turnover process. Had little bits throughout but didn't seem to hit home. -Keep at 80% recovery but pull from the concentrate for additional capactiy. -GST 26 weeks to construct. - Make this project a benifit not a impact + 26 Weeks for GST +make project a benifit not a impact +kimley horn has tool.

Evaluator 4: 65

-Page 68: Mentions of the existing water quality issues at JEA. -Page 69-70: Mentions of 3D models and VR to help staff visualize the plant in decision making. -Page 70: Mentions energy recover and that this has been implemented in the area. -Page 71: Importance of membrane selection. -Page 72: Post treatment and stabilization to avoid system corrosion. Also noted the degasifier and odor control with the western development. -Page 73: In-house funding and grant experts. Curious as to what project received the $60 million award. -Page 74: use of pilot testing to determine best technologies for the new plant. -Page 75: Include operators in the design and construction, as well as proper operator training. -Page 76-77: Layout options. Noted that proposer takes into account potential tours of the facility in the design. -Page 78: Number and costs of projects where WS has worked with KH or AECOM. -Page 79: Breakdown of expected deliverables such as SOV, pay apps, GMP status. Of note receiving AB updated monthly is impressive - AB are often a struggle to receive and cause delays. P6 will be used for scheduling. -Page 79: MOPO is mentioned, but not fleshed out. -Page 80-81: Team plans to use RedTeam for document control. Includes online plan room, RFI, submittals, shops, etc. Willing to flex to Procore if that is the preference. Like to screenshot of the RedTeam dashboard to give example of program use. -Page 82-83: EMR rating meeting criteria. Would have been helpful to have the EMR and incident rate broken out in a clear table. Matrix of safety risks for Rangeline and mitigation strategies. -Page 83: Appreciate note that checks are done by people not responsible for the works production. -Page 85: Shows experience with federal funding and competitive bidding to remain in compliance. -Page 86: Dedicated preconstruction department from WS for collaborative delivery projects. -Page 87: Cost certainty chart of preliminary vs final costs on highlighted projects. Specific to WS. -Page 88: Hosting of outreach events to attract bidders. -Page 90: Reference projects and

percentage of self performed work. Appears to be over 50% in majority of cases. One outlier. -Page 91: Appreciate note that low bidder does not always equal best value. Lists long lead items and their current lead times and provides example bid form. -Page 92: Clearly shows what WS can self perform, what they would bid out, and some of the vendors for various tasks. -Page 93: ODP and real world examples of ODP savings. Shows understanding of the process. -Page 94: Job site layout and traffic flow, which is important to maintaining safety. -Page 96-98: Example schedule with explanations at key points. -Page 99-100: Example risks, mitigation strategies, and considerations. Would like to have seen this more tailored to the project. *$350 million in funding in the last five years. *Bay Laurel - $10 million in zero match. $35 million for construction of WTP. *Efficiency tools for managing grant documents as well as public outreach coordination. *Build at normal 80% recovery due to failure points of certain new technologies. Add electrocoagulation to assist in better recovery. Takes care of organics, PFAS, etc. May be a little untried for our purposes. *26 weeks for tanks. *Potential for $800K for pilot testing funding. *PublicCoordinate - Interactive tool for residents to keep them informed and make comments for liaison to address. *Local presence. 75% self-perform.

Evaluator 5: 96

Planned delivery of 10 MGD by Summer 2029 (August). Wharton-Smith self performance of work (70%). Exclusive partnerships with specialty subcontractors with proven track history of projects completed in the region. Presentation showed how they could save time.