



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

**EVALUATION TABULATION**

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

RESPONSE DEADLINE: March 11, 2025 at 3:00 pm

Report Generated: Tuesday, August 5, 2025

**SELECTED VENDOR**

**VENDOR RECOMMENDED BY THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

Vendor	Location
Hazen and Sawyer	Hollywood, FL

**PHASE 1**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1A. Qualification & Experience - History	Points Based	45 (5% of Total)

Description:

Include a brief history of the Proposer (years in business, annual volume of work over past five (5) years, company ownership, officers, etc.). 2 Pages Maximum

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1B. Qualification and Experience - Key Personnel	Points Based	45 (5% of Total)

Description:

Provide a resume for each key individual needed to carry out the proposal and describe their proposed role/responsibilities. Identify whether these key individuals gained experience within the design firm or outside the company, and with whom. Include years in industry. List only those directly related to this project. 1 Page Per Resume Maximum

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1C. Qualification & Experience - Licenses and Certifications	Points Based	45 (5% of Total)

Description:

Provide copies of all licenses, certifications or other documentation required in order to enable the Team to perform the work proposed. Condense to Multiple Certs/License Per Page

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1D. Qualification and Experience - Subcontractors	Points Based	45 (5% of Total)

Description:

Identify all subcontractors who will be used to carry out the work set forth in the Proposal. Describe the qualifications for employees of any such subcontractors. List only those directly related to this project. If N/A, elaborate.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1E. Qualification and Experience - Organizational Chart	Points Based	45 (5% of Total)

Description:

Include an organizational chart for key personnel who will be involved with the project.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2A. Owner's Representative Experience - Start and End Date	Points Based	25 (2.8% of Total)

Description:

Owner's Representative Experience

Include, at minimum, five (5) similar projects that have been completed in the past ten (10) years. At least one (1) must have used Design/Build as the delivery method.

2 Pages Each Project Maximum to Include:

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2B. Owner's Representative Experience - Project Description	Points Based	180 (20% of Total)

Description:

Identify relevant similarities/scope to current bid project.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2C. Owner's Representative Experience - Timeliness and Budget	Points Based	50 (5.6% of Total)

Description:

Was project completed on time and on budget? If not, why? Include change order details.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2D. Owner's Representative Experience - Subcontractor Usage	Points Based	25 (2.8% of Total)

Description:

List any subcontractors used and note if they will be used on this project. If no subcontractors, please show how your firm can meet all the project needs.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2E. Owner's Representative Experience - References	Points Based	30 (3.3% of Total)

Description:

Include name, telephone, and email.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3A. Methodology/Approach - Planning	Points Based	145 (16.1% of Total)

Description:

What due diligence will be required for successful Design

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3B. Methodology/Approach - Schedule	Points Based	60 (6.7% of Total)

Description:

Will other departments need to be involved, will public outreach be necessary, etc.

---

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal (RFP) - Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3C. Methodology/Approach -Coordination with City	Points Based	50 (5.6% of Total)

Description:

Include a reasonable estimate of project design and construction timelines. Can be a Gantt chart.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3D. Methodology/Approach - Project Challenges	Points Based	60 (6.7% of Total)

Description:

What challenges does the team foresee with the project? For example, lead times on materials and/or permitting.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3E. Methodology/Approach - Document Control	Points Based	50 (5.6% of Total)

Description:

How does the Team manage the flow of information, documents, approvals, etc.? How does the Team monitor progress and milestones?

**AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY**

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Total Score (Max Score 900)
Hazen and Sawyer	900	814	816	695	825	<b>810</b>
PMA Consultants LLC	820	763	806	733	755	<b>775.4</b>

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Total Score (Max Score 900)
Colliers Project Leaders	400	691	590	522	640	568.6

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	1A. Qualification & Experience - History Points Based 45 Points (5%)	1B. Qualification and Experience - Key Personnel Points Based 45 Points (5%)	1C. Qualification & Experience - Licenses and Certifications Points Based 45 Points (5%)	1D. Qualification and Experience - Subcontractors Points Based 45 Points (5%)	1E. Qualification and Experience - Organizational Chart Points Based 45 Points (5%)	2A. Owner's Representative Experience - Start and End Date Points Based 25 Points (2.8%)	2B. Owner's Representative Experience - Project Description Points Based 180 Points (20%)	2C. Owner's Representative Experience - Timeliness and Budget Points Based 50 Points (5.6%)	2D. Owner's Representative Experience - Subcontractor Usage Points Based 25 Points (2.8%)
Hazen and Sawyer	42.8	43.8	43.8	43	43	22.8	164	40	19
PMA Consultants LLC	41.4	42.4	43	41	41	20.6	149	31	19.4
Colliers Project Leaders	41	27.8	24	23	38	16.8	103	42	13

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

Vendor	2E. Owner's Representative Experience - References Points Based 30 Points (3.3%)	3A. Methodology/Approach - Planning Points Based 145 Points (16.1%)	3B. Methodology/Approach - Schedule Points Based 60 Points (6.7%)	3C. Methodology/Approach - Coordination with City Points Based 50 Points (5.6%)	3D. Methodology/Approach - Project Challenges Points Based 60 Points (6.7%)	3E. Methodology/Approach - Document Control Points Based 50 Points (5.6%)	Total Score (Max Score 900)
Hazen and Sawyer	28	126	53	44	52.8	44	810
PMA Consultants LLC	24.4	127	55.4	42.8	52	45	775.4
Colliers Project Leaders	26	89	37.6	33.4	26	28	568.6

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

**Colliers Project Leaders**

**1A. Qualification & Experience - History | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 45  
Firm completed this section as requested; firm history, work volume provided.

Evaluator 2: 45  
Brief history provided. Volume of work provided for the last 5 years, ownership and officers provided.

Evaluator 3: 40  
information was provided.

Evaluator 4: 45  
Firm listed their qualified in house personnel. Does not use subcontractors.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 5: 30

Has project experienced

**1B. Qualification and Experience - Key Personnel | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 10

Only one of the key personnel seems to have direct experience with water treatment facilities, if not with municipal plants exactly.

Evaluator 2: 39

Resumes provided, length within the firm provided for most individuals, and years in industry.

Evaluator 3: 40

information was provided.

Evaluator 4: 20

The Project Director lists sidewalk, roadway, and municipal complex projects. The Subject Matter Expert lists mostly storage and booster pump stations, with the exception of Floero - all based in Arizona. The Project Manager also does not show any large scale treatment plant (water or wastewater) projects. Overall, would like to have seen more plant and Florida based projects from the team as the processes can be specific to the region.

Evaluator 5: 30

Educated and licensed

**1C. Qualification & Experience - Licenses and Certifications | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 10

Licenses and certifications provided for only 2 of the key personnel.

Evaluator 2: 35

Certifications provided by some individuals. (1 page) 1 FL License PE

Evaluator 3: 25

not all certifications were included and some that were provided were expired.

Evaluator 4: 20

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

It looks like there are licenses/certifications missing.

Evaluator 5: 30

Licensed provided

**1D. Qualification and Experience - Subcontractors | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 10

Having no subs is unrealistic given that the City will need help with electrical, structural, instrumentation, controls, etc. I did not see where the firm addressed those disciplines in their submittal.

Evaluator 2: 30

No Subcontractors listed. Proposer mentioned the benefits of controlled costs by not needing Subcontractors. Proposer mentions physical help for ex: moving, does not list vendor as a sub or provide company name, but mentions procuring costs associated with this process.

Evaluator 3: 0

no such list was provided.

Evaluator 4: 45

Firm lists all disciplines are in house.

Evaluator 5: 30

Identified subs

**1E. Qualification and Experience - Organizational Chart | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 35

Chart is adequate, but I repeat that only one of the key personnel seems to have direct water treatment plant construction experience.

Evaluator 2: 45

Chart is present, qualifications and experience for the members were provided.

Evaluator 3: 35

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

information was provided.

Evaluator 4: 45

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 30

Organized chart provided

**2A. Owner's Representative Experience - Start and End Date | Points Based | 25 Points (2.8%)**

Evaluator 1: 10

Only one of the projects provided are directly related to water treatment plant construction.

Evaluator 2: 14

Owner's rep experience was provided. Minimal Water Treatment Plant experience was provided. Type of treatment was not provided. Design Build experience was provided.

Evaluator 3: 15

information was provided.

Evaluator 4: 25

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 20

Experienced provided

**2B. Owner's Representative Experience - Project Description | Points Based | 180 Points (20%)**

Evaluator 1: 120

I did not see a statement comparing the sample projects to water treatment plant construction.

Evaluator 2: 100

The Firm has sufficient Owner's Rep experience, but I did not feel they provided very much relevant Water Treatment Plant experience. In particular, No RO experience. If they have some, it should be provided with some treatment details. Small RO Treatment plant referenced. 1MGD , steel GST, Corrosion issues. Expanding to 2MGD.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 3: 100

information was provided, few comparative examples.

Evaluator 4: 55

Radiance Project - Which of this project team worked on this project? It is not listed on any resume, but is one of the treatment projects and should be highlighted. Only two of the projects are treatment related and all projects are based outside of Florida. Two were noted as design-build, but not treatment based.

Evaluator 5: 140

Documented

**2C. Owner's Representative Experience - Timeliness and Budget | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 45

All projects mentioned were completed on time and budget, but I would need more detail since this is rare in the industry.

Evaluator 2: 45

Colliers made a large emphasis on being on time and budget, and mentioned multiple project reviews to ensure project is staying within budget. All projects listed were within budget and on time.

Evaluator 3: 35

projects were documented, no extensive documentation.

Evaluator 4: 50

Projects seem to be on time and budget.

Evaluator 5: 35

Documented

**2D. Owner's Representative Experience - Subcontractor Usage | Points Based | 25 Points (2.8%)**

Evaluator 1: 10

I would appreciate a statement on each project describing how the Prime team was able to handle reviewing all disciplines involved in a water treatment plant construction project.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 2: 15

None listed. Colliers notes having team members in house to control costs.

Evaluator 3: 0

no documentation was provided.

Evaluator 4: 25

They did not use subcontractors on any projects, which is as stated earlier in the proposal.

Evaluator 5: 15

Provided

**2E. Owner's Representative Experience - References | Points Based | 30 Points (3.3%)**

Evaluator 1: 30

Information was provided.

Evaluator 2: 30

Projects attached had references and contact information.

Evaluator 3: 20

information was documented.

Evaluator 4: 30

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 20

Provided material

**3A. Methodology/Approach - Planning | Points Based | 145 Points (16.1%)**

Evaluator 1: 25

The information provided seemed to related to building of a residential or commercial sort, not a water treatment plant. The proposal keeps mentioning furniture, for example. Yes, desks will be needed in the water treatment plant, but this would be a minor concern.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

The technical review portion worries me since I did not get a sense from the key resumes or from a subcontractors statement that the proposer could review all the disciplines involved in a water treatment plant construction project.

Evaluator 2: 130

Protect the interests of Port St. Lucie through careful oversight to ensure that newly created and/or renovated spaces are functionally appropriate for the occupants, aesthetically conforming to design standards, and financially managed to the established budget. Reduce costs and maximize value throughout the project with design critiques that provide options for best value, avoid high cost change orders, and utilize bidding and contracting strategies that reap benefits from a competitive marketplace. Preserve the project schedule by establishing critical milestones throughout the design and construction process, facilitating meetings and document reviews, and identifying critical path issues that can create delays before they materialize. Maintain construction quality assurance throughout the process by confirming the proper design and construction of materials and equipment, and verifying the performance of installed systems.

Evaluator 3: 120

methodology approach was documented and presented well.

Evaluator 4: 50

Proposer refers to wrong project under Roles & Responsibilities and Reconcile sections - Calls it the New Wastewater Treatment Plant. Under Phase 2 Project Budget, the proposal mentions being realistic about costs and owners mistakenly go by construction square footage costs. This is not how plants are estimated, it is done by MGD with different costs per gallon for different treatment processes based on current industry averages. Unsure about the Mover Procurement section. This is a new treatment plant that will run in conjunction with the existing plants. While there will be some movement of staff, furniture, fixtures, and equipment will be new. Much of this section feels rather generic copy/paste and seems more about a new building than a new plant.

Evaluator 5: 120

Provided material

**3B. Methodology/Approach - Schedule | Points Based | 60 Points (6.7%)**

Evaluator 1: 30

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

A plan was proposed, but it was very vague. I would have appreciated some detail as to building department, public works, etc. and how they might be affected. How the team would communicate with these departments so that could in turn answer public questions from their specific points of view.

Evaluator 2: 48

Schedule format was present, with approximate time frames for each phase, totaling 4 years. No dates provided yet.

Evaluator 3: 40

information was documented.

Evaluator 4: 30

Again very generic.

Evaluator 5: 40

Extensive experience advising and guiding numerous municipalities through the information dissemination and public outreach

**3C. Methodology/Approach -Coordination with City | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 20

Two issues with the provided schedule: 1. The schedule seems geared to vertical construction as opposed to a water treatment plant. 2. Very detailed during design, but as much during construction which usually turns out to be the most important. This is where the majority of problems arise and where the expertise of the Owner's Rep is best applied.

Evaluator 2: 35

Schedule shows coordination with COPSL and D/B firm in rough format. Interactive project website- was mentioned and details may help with this, allowing responsible parties access to appropriate information. Approximate time frames for each phase, totaling 4 years. No dates provided yet.

Evaluator 3: 40

information was documented.

Evaluator 4: 37

Reasonable assumptions.

Evaluator 5: 35

Provided material

**3D. Methodology/Approach - Project Challenges | Points Based | 60 Points (6.7%)**

Evaluator 1: 0

Not responsive. There's a multitude of issues that could arise during the construction of a water treatment plant. Getting a few of these and how the firm would have dealt with them would have been helpful.

Evaluator 2: 35

Proposer discussed inflation, delivery of materials, and that "Every building is a prototype, therefore problems are likely. Once identified, Colliers Project Leaders will monitor the contractor's efforts to address any problems. Depending upon the type of system being corrected, additional performance testing may be the only means of insuring proper operation."

Evaluator 3: 45

information was documented.

Evaluator 4: 15

Seems focused on moving, fixtures, furniture. We are highly concerned with things like PLC's, mechanicals, generators, and other long lead and high dollar items within a tight time frame.

Evaluator 5: 35

Provided material

**3E. Methodology/Approach - Document Control | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 0

No document control plan was provided.

Evaluator 2: 45

Open and transparent communication channels between all parties is essential. This includes the exchange of project updates, clarifications on technical details, and addressing concerns or risks as soon as they arise. • Communication will also involve project management platforms, where project milestones, timelines, and deliverables can be tracked and communicated in real-time. Which platforms?

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 3: 35

information was provided but vague.

Evaluator 4: 30

This is noted under some of the projects in the previous tab, but not in this tab. \*Fleshed out this portion in the presentation phase.

Evaluator 5: 30

Provided material

### Hazen and Sawyer

#### 1A. Qualification & Experience - History | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: 45

Hazen has a long history in the industry, good volume of work in the past 5 years, company structure and officers provided.

Evaluator 2: 45

RO experience in FL. Experience with the city.

Evaluator 3: 44

extensive history as documented.

Evaluator 4: 40

Appreciate the breakdown of nationwide vs. local work. Did go over the two page maximum.

Evaluator 5: 40

Very good history

#### 1B. Qualification and Experience - Key Personnel | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)

Evaluator 1: 45

All personnel included in this section are highly qualified and experienced.

Evaluator 2: 45

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Extensive Relevant experience in DB and Membrane plants

Evaluator 3: 44

extensive qualifications as documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

Hazen resumes show extensive PDB experience in water and wastewater. Extensive water plant experience in Florida.

Evaluator 5: 40

Highly educated and experienced

**1C. Qualification & Experience - Licenses and Certifications | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 45

Question addressed adequately.

Evaluator 2: 45

Submitted extensive proof.

Evaluator 3: 44

extensive qualifications and experience, licenses and certifications as documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 40

Provided materials

**1D. Qualification and Experience - Subcontractors | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 45

Subcontractor is highly qualified and experienced. Would have appreciated a statement on how long they've worked with Hazen. Also, would have appreciated a statement on how other disciplines would be covered.

Evaluator 2: 45

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Submitted, extensive experience for Sub. (HCE)

Evaluator 3: 40

identity and qualifications to relevant subcontractors documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

Provided detailed qualifications. Appears to have both distribution and collection experience from a construction management standpoint. Sub comes with grant experience and a key people for funding assistance.

Evaluator 5: 40

Material submitted

**1E. Qualification and Experience - Organizational Chart | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 45

Appreciate the inclusion of funding assistance personnel. Chart has clear line of authority and includes personnel that could address items not specifically addressed later in the proposal.

Evaluator 2: 45

Org chart shows all key personnel well qualified.

Evaluator 3: 40

extensive organizational chart documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

Very thorough. Easy to see key personal, notations for those with sub (Holtz) and as needed support listed. Specific people noted for document control, operation, etc.

Evaluator 5: 40

Very detailed and informative

**2A. Owner's Representative Experience - Start and End Date | Points Based | 25 Points (2.8%)**

Evaluator 1: 25

Exceeded the maximum. At least 3 projects directly related to Owner's Rep in Water Treatment Plants.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 2: 20

plenty of projects, all noted on time and budget with some still in process. Lots of relevant experience.

Evaluator 3: 24

extensive owners representative experience documented.

Evaluator 4: 25

Provided

Evaluator 5: 20

Well experienced

**2B. Owner's Representative Experience - Project Description | Points Based | 180 Points (20%)**

Evaluator 1: 180

Each project provided included a section on how the projects were relevant to the City's water treatment plant project.

Evaluator 2: 160

I felt that Hazen has had an extensive history, as well as current ongoing projects that are Membrane plants, and Brackish water RO plants. Many of which are in Florida, and had to deal with FDEP.

Evaluator 3: 175

extensive owners representative experience project descriptions documented.

Evaluator 4: 130

The chart on page 49 listing the projects, the firms role, delivery method, and if it is a membrane WTP project, is very helpful. In conjunction with the maps on pages 50-51 it's easy to understand. Would like to have seen more completed projects, not ongoing, to see final outcome. Would also like to have seen other collaborative projects between prime and sub.

Evaluator 5: 175

Provided in detailed

**2C. Owner's Representative Experience - Timeliness and Budget | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 1: 50

Each project mentioned the health of time and budget. Would have appreciated a little more detail on this. Many projects are not on time and budget, and if these are then clarification on how would have been informative.

Evaluator 2: 40

Timeliness and on budget seem to be consistent, with exception of ongoing projects, which were noted on time and budget to date.

Evaluator 3: 40

documented.

Evaluator 4: 30

Provided, however, many projects are ongoing.

Evaluator 5: 40

Provided

**2D. Owner's Representative Experience - Subcontractor Usage | Points Based | 25 Points (2.8%)**

Evaluator 1: 25

Although the projects mentioned subcontractors, the proposal did not mention how they were used in those particular examples.

Evaluator 2: 20

Hazen is Sub consulting HCE, Relevant experience was noted. Multiple other projects noted not using Subs.

Evaluator 3: 20

documented.

Evaluator 4: 10

Firm only noted that subs used were not the one proposed on this project. However, the intent is to see how firms fill in the gaps, if any.

Evaluator 5: 20

Detailed

**2E. Owner's Representative Experience - References | Points Based | 30 Points (3.3%)**

---

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal (RFP) - Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 1: 30

All projects provided a reference.

Evaluator 2: 30

References attached, and contact information

Evaluator 3: 25

documented.

Evaluator 4: 30

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 25

Provided

**3A. Methodology/Approach - Planning | Points Based | 145 Points (16.1%)**

Evaluator 1: 145

The proposal discusses the work needed to setup the water treatment plant construction project: delivery method, procurement, communication with council, departments and the public.

Evaluator 2: 130

Clear Project Objectives, Budget and Cost Management, Communication and Collaboration, Risk Management, Time Management, Quality Control.

Evaluator 3: 135

methodology approach and planning well documented.

Evaluator 4: 75

Fairly generic copy/paste. Not project specific. It's a decent format, but would appreciate more project details.

Evaluator 5: 145

Detailed

**3B. Methodology/Approach - Schedule | Points Based | 60 Points (6.7%)**

Evaluator 1: 60

Sample CPM schedule provided based on their thoughts of this project, and bringing in information from an in-house database of other projects.

Evaluator 2: 50

These things are discussed in the proposal, and a collaborative approach is mentioned. "Effective communication isn't about overwhelming people with information— it's about delivering the right updates at the right time. We'll have structured checkins and clear action plans, so the City always knows where things stand without getting bogged down in the details." Schedule is a high oversight view with little details.

Evaluator 3: 50

documented.

Evaluator 4: 50

Also fairly generic and not very detailed. \*Very detailed chart provided.

Evaluator 5: 55

Provided

**3C. Methodology/Approach -Coordination with City | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 50

Communication with the council, other City departments, the public is mentioned in several parts of the proposal.

Evaluator 2: 45

"Effective communication isn't about overwhelming people with information— it's about delivering the right updates at the right time. We'll have structured checkins and clear action plans, so the City always knows where things stand without getting bogged down in the details." These things are discussed in the proposal, and a collaborative approach is mentioned.

Evaluator 3: 45

well documented.

Evaluator 4: 35

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Generic. \*Brought up presentation/workshops for buy in.

Evaluator 5: 45

Provided

**3D. Methodology/Approach - Project Challenges | Points Based | 60 Points (6.7%)**

Evaluator 1: 60

All major sources of headaches were identified and addressed.

Evaluator 2: 54

“With design-build, the key challenges are managing risk, maintaining control over costs, and ensuring quality while keeping up with an aggressive schedule. Our role is to be the City’s advocate—guiding them through the process, negotiating favorable terms, and making sure they stay in the driver’s seat. Surprises in permitting, unexpected site conditions, or supply chain issues. Being Proactive, not reactive. Good, Basic High-level overview. Well thought out, and explained well during presentation.

Evaluator 3: 45

documented.

Evaluator 4: 50

Generic. \*Gave real world examples of issues on other projects and how these issues were resolved. Has database of typical issues and resolutions on membrane plants.

Evaluator 5: 55

Provided

**3E. Methodology/Approach - Document Control | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 50

Presented several options for document control including a relatively new system that would integrate with design software. Able to train staff to use this new tool.

Evaluator 2: 40

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Regular meetings and facilitating communication between all parties. Revit-ACC program. 3D Autocad workflow and file mangmt. software.

Evaluator 3: 45

documented.

Evaluator 4: 40

While other areas of the document notate specific persons assigned as Document Control Managers, there is nothing in this tab showing how that would be accomplished. Only one line on Page 75 mentions milestones. \*Much more fleshed out during presentation. Gave real world examples and gave options not previously seen. All excellent options for project of this scale.

Evaluator 5: 45

Provided

**PMA Consultants LLC**

**1A. Qualification & Experience - History | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 40

Did not see the 5-year breakdown as requested by the solicitation.

Evaluator 2: 42

Experience noted, Broad experience, some RO Treatment experience as well.

Evaluator 3: 40

documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

Interesting sidebar regarding the software patents. Interested in learning more.

Evaluator 5: 40

54 years experience, 100 billion in construction projects

**1B. Qualification and Experience - Key Personnel | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal (RFP) - Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 1: 45

Firm seems to be experts in management. Many of the key individuals have a long history with the company.

Evaluator 2: 42

Broad experience, DB experience and construction management. Water treatment experience noted, some of which was RO.

Evaluator 3: 40

documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

A great deal of plant experience between the team, as well as DB, and other areas. The key sheet for the prime firm was helpful.

Evaluator 5: 40

Highly experienced

**1C. Qualification & Experience - Licenses and Certifications | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 45

Completed as requested.

Evaluator 2: 45

Licenses and Certifications provided.

Evaluator 3: 40

documented, one certification was expired.

Evaluator 4: 45

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 40

High level of education, Licenses, & certifications

**1D. Qualification and Experience - Subcontractors | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 45

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Subs are highly qualified and cover most of the technical needs for reviewing plans, documents, etc. on behalf of the City. Disciplines mentioned are typical of what would be needed in a water treatment plant construction project.

Evaluator 2: 40

3 subs listed: CHA AXIOM GCI Relevant experience/qualifications are present

Evaluator 3: 40

documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

Identified and role/qualifications provided.

Evaluator 5: 35

Subcontractors well identified

**1E. Qualification and Experience - Organizational Chart | Points Based | 45 Points (5%)**

Evaluator 1: 45

Lines of authority are clear. It looks as if the prime set themselves up to wrangle the technical specialists.

Evaluator 2: 40

Org chart shows all parties involved through different phases, and which company they represent.

Evaluator 3: 40

documented and laid out well.

Evaluator 4: 45

Color coding helps with knowing which team member is with which firm.

Evaluator 5: 35

Organized

**2A. Owner's Representative Experience - Start and End Date | Points Based | 25 Points (2.8%)**

Evaluator 1: 15

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

As to the OA projects, unclear as to whether the dates meet the spirit of the question. The projects with PMA are not local. Projects from CHA are not OA, but certainly provide a good representation in this section.

Evaluator 2: 20

Projects were submitted within the last 10 years, and some older. Projects for Water Treatment plants where RO is the treatment process Included City of Vero Beach, City of Clearwater, and the Tesla UV plant was of particular interest to name a few. Lots of design build as well as some CMAR.

Evaluator 3: 23

relevant projects were documented.

Evaluator 4: 25

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 20

Good projects shown

**2B. Owner's Representative Experience - Project Description | Points Based | 180 Points (20%)**

Evaluator 1: 150

Only 2 of the projects included similarities explicitly stated. The others were self-evident to the technical side of water but not necessarily the OA. A definitive statement would have been helpful.

Evaluator 2: 140

The proposer has a vast experience in construction management and design build. Some projects were not directly related to new construction of a Water Treatment Plant, while others were and contained Reverse Osmosis treatment, like what will be utilized at the COPSL.

Evaluator 3: 165

relevant projects with supporting documentation provided.

Evaluator 4: 130

Some of the projects were outside of the 10 year time frame. Would like to have seen more Florida projects from Prime, though the projects highlighted are applicable save for some of the dates. Sub CHA has extensive plant experience in Florida. There are some

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

inconsistencies in formatting between the projects noted depending on firm. Prime followed the criteria to the letter, which made it easy to digest.

Evaluator 5: 160

Well documented

**2C. Owner's Representative Experience - Timeliness and Budget | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 30

Similar to previous. Only 3 projects included this type of statement. Would have appreciated the others include the same.

Evaluator 2: 30

Some projects note they were completed on time; one project had over 1 million left in contract. Others noted completed on time, with no mention of whether or not it was within budget or if change orders were issued.

Evaluator 3: 30

specific details were not provided.

Evaluator 4: 25

Not always provided. Sub was missing some information such as who were there change orders (if applicable).

Evaluator 5: 40

Seemed to be on time

**2D. Owner's Representative Experience - Subcontractor Usage | Points Based | 25 Points (2.8%)**

Evaluator 1: 20

The subcontractors are highly experienced, including some directly in water treatment plants. Firm mentioned their long history with one particular sub, but would have appreciated a similar statement to each of the other subs.

Evaluator 2: 22

3 subs listed that will be used on this project. CHA AXIOM GCI

Evaluator 3: 22

documented.

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Evaluator 4: 13

Sub was missing some information such as who were there subs (if applicable).

Evaluator 5: 20

Documented

**2E. Owner's Representative Experience - References | Points Based | 30 Points (3.3%)**

Evaluator 1: 20

References were provided in many of the projects, but not in all.

Evaluator 2: 25

References included from previous projects, with contact information.

Evaluator 3: 27

documented.

Evaluator 4: 30

Provided.

Evaluator 5: 20

Documented

**3A. Methodology/Approach - Planning | Points Based | 145 Points (16.1%)**

Evaluator 1: 145

Provided a list of the major hold ups in a typical project and how they would address them. They recognized how water treatment plant construction has changed over time, technological improvements, etc.

Evaluator 2: 130

the proposer mentions meeting the needs of rapidly growing populations, responding to new regulatory mandates, and overhauling aging infrastructures. Project Delivery & Procurement Strategy Site Analysis & Feasibility Studies Regulatory & Permitting Requirements Capacity & Demand Analysis Technology selection, Infrastructure and utility coordination, Budget and costs estimates,

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Stakeholders and community engagement Identify potential design, permitting, construction, and operational risks, such as design coordination, submittals and long lead items, and supply chain issues.

Evaluator 3: 135

well documented.

Evaluator 4: 100

Would like to have seen more under this planning section. Some generic information, though the highlighted project is impressive and shows the prime firms capabilities. \*Additional information provided regarding flow of information, approvals, etc.

Evaluator 5: 125

Documented

**3B. Methodology/Approach - Schedule | Points Based | 60 Points (6.7%)**

Evaluator 1: 60

Detailed explanation of their experience in scheduling. Included a Gantt chart that addresses the general outline of a water treatment plant construction project with tentative dates, duration, milestones, and critical path.

Evaluator 2: 52

Schedule was provided, just over 4 years finishing in the 3rd quarter of 2029.

Evaluator 3: 55

well documented.

Evaluator 4: 60

This is very well fleshed out in the gantt chart. Would be interested in seeing more on their technology as it's very much highlighted in this proposal.

Evaluator 5: 50

Documented

**3C. Methodology/Approach -Coordination with City | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 50

---

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal (RFP) - Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 20250065

Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

---

Mentioned that their job would be to represent the interests of the City in all communications with the Design-Builder, regulatory agencies, etc.

Evaluator 2: 45

There is acknowledgement of other departments involvement such as FDEP and SFWMD, and public outreach.

Evaluator 3: 49

very well documented.

Evaluator 4: 30

Fairly generic copy/paste. However, the real life projects where the prime firm applies this is a nice touch.

Evaluator 5: 40

Key ways to assist with coordination with the city

**3D. Methodology/Approach - Project Challenges | Points Based | 60 Points (6.7%)**

Evaluator 1: 60

Submission covered most possible risks associated with this type of project. They addressed each challenge systematically, in general, but then personalized it to the City's specific worries.

Evaluator 2: 50

Defining Clear Project Requirements  
Selecting Qualified Design Build Teams / Inadequate evaluation during procurement can result in selecting teams lacking necessary experience, leading to project inefficiencies.  
Navigating Complex Regulatory Requirements  
Managing risks, Maintain quality control, coordinating activities, controlling costs and keeping on schedule.

Evaluator 3: 55

very well documented.

Evaluator 4: 45

This started as fairly generic, though the prime obviously has a system in place for addressed common issues. There were some local challenges noted, including the long lead items and potential weather related setbacks. Would like to have seen more on the way to address all the challenges noted.

Evaluator 5: 50

---

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal (RFP) - Owner's Representative for Design-Build Project for New Water Treatment Plant and Related Improvements

Permitting delays, Equipment lead times, Existing infrastructure

**3E. Methodology/Approach - Document Control | Points Based | 50 Points (5.6%)**

Evaluator 1: 50

Answered both questions thoroughly. Provided an outline of how documents would created, accessed, and distributed.

Evaluator 2: 40

PMA would utilize Procore, Aconex, e-Builder, Kahua, or a similar project management platform to manage project documents in a single, cloud-based location. • The DMS would allow real-time access to design documents, specifications, RFIs, submittals, and reports. "Document management" Communication and training for stakeholders

Evaluator 3: 45

well documented.

Evaluator 4: 50

This seems to be where the prime excels. Would like to see more on this in presentation.

Evaluator 5: 40

By implementing a structured Document Management System (DMS)