County of DeKalb, GA
Purchasing & Contracting
Michelle Butler, Chief Procurement Officer
1300 Commerce Drive, Decatur, GA 30030

# EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 2025-117-RFP

Design Build Services (DBS) for Scott Candler Water Treatment Plant Demolition and New Clearwells and High Service Pump Station

RESPONSE DEADLINE: March 5, 2026 at 3:00 pm

## VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

| Vendor | Milestone Schedule Points Based 15 Points (15%) | Project Experience and Capabilities: Points Based 25 Points (25%) | Management Plan Points Based 5 Points (5%) | Cost Points Based 15 Points (15%) | Local Small Business Enterprise Participation (LSBE) Points Based 10 Points (10%) | Overall Project Approach & Technical Approach Points Based 30 Points (30%) | Total Score (Max Score 100) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ruby-Collins, Inc. | 14.8 | 23.2 | 4.6 | 15 | 7.4 | 29 | **94** |
| Reeves Young, LLC | 13.4 | 22.4 | 4.3 | 11.4 | 10 | 27.2 | **88.73** |

## COMMENTS

### Reeves Young, LLC

#### Milestone Schedule | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

1. Detailed schedule. Meets time from of completion within 1460 days.
2. The report adequately addresses time frame and constraints in document.
3. DB team provided the required schedule meeting milestones, but they do not show any schedule reduction
4. The schedule presented would have benefited from a summary that explained the major phases, key milestones, and critical path. Also, the proposed timeline does not appear to be as aggressive for this project.
5. They're detailed time frames of the Pre-Construction, as well as the Construction phases are great. As long as there's no Acts of God to alter the plans in order to create change orders.

## Project Experience and Capabilities: | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

1. DB team - Arcadis and Contractor have ample experience. Very familiar with project site. Has worked on multiple projects together. Key personnel - All personnel has been identified with experience. Team has only completed 2 projects together. Experience provided from past projects does not seem equal to the complexity of this project.
2. (a) Recounts and relies on 6 previous projects with DeKalb. Describes what they are known for, very basic. Also puts subcontractors with descriptions. (b) lists key personnel with time commitment, includes role and responsibilities and licenses.
3. The proposed team structure includes three primary companies rather than two, which may introduce additional administrative complexity and potential cost inefficiencies. The delineation of roles and responsibilities is not entirely clear and may lead to overlap or duplication of effort. For example, the presence of both a Project Executive and Project Manager, as well as a Lead Design Manager and Design Manager, creates ambiguity regarding leadership hierarchy and accountability. It is not clearly defined who will serve as the primary point of contact responsible for overall scope, schedule, and budget management. The number of management roles appears excessive and may impact efficiency. All key staff meet the required experience qualifications. However, the design-build team's prior project experience appears to be on a smaller scale compared to this project. Notably, RY's experience with design-build projects ranges from approximately $8 million to $43 million, which is significantly smaller than the scale of the current project. The scoring I gave was Design build team 7, Key Personnel 11
4. (a) Provide a detailed and complete description of the Company and the team for the DB. (b) Identifies the firm's key team personnel. Some concern about firm being able to maintain critical staff levels through out entirety of the project.
5. Their project experience and capabilities are very good. They have a lot of experience working with DeKalb County.

## Management Plan | Points Based | 5 Points (5%)

1. Addresses all the issues but does not spell out how they will have clear communication, rapid resolution, informed decision making.
2. describes build management approach, understandign of the project, and design build management plan

3. The design-build team proposes to utilize project management tools to enhance project visibility and coordination. Their approach emphasizes the integration of design and construction activities to improve efficiency and collaboration. They also plan to incorporate BIM modeling, LiDAR scanning, and constructability reviews to support design accuracy and optimize project execution.
4. The firm demonstrates that it has given considerable thought to how it will interact with DWM staff, project manager, the project team and other stakeholders. I have full confidence that the firm will manage this effort effectively.
5. Did not see how issues will be resolved if/when they arise.

## Overall Project Approach & Technical Approach | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

1. Project understanding seems good. Proposing a phased approach to help control issues. Details risk and explains how they will mitigate said risk. Proposing an alternative hydraulic design for consideration. This will be one approach to achieving end result. Team has experience in structural demolition and identifies how to protect existing structures/electrical not to be demolished. Provides example of value engineering several times, 1) by using open line shaft pumps instead of specified vertical turbine pumps. In depth proposal, can tell they took time to investigate issues and solutions
2. goes over critical components and firm resources/tools to conduct full diagnosis; provides basic blueprint (with labels on what would change) of alternative hydraulic profile; breaks down demolition process and reconfiguration of site
3. The team identifies critical work components and outlines an approach to support execution, including completion of a dam survey and implementation of protective measures to minimize operational disruptions. Subsurface exploration is planned in two phases, which supports a more informed design and construction approach. A basic excavation and dewatering plan is described, and the team proposes early procurement of long-lead items to optimize the schedule. These items will be identified prior to the 60% design milestone and procured with DWM approval. The contractor will develop a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) as part of the project delivery. The proposal identifies three key risk factors and presents corresponding mitigation strategies. The use of a project-specific risk register is proposed, with an example provided. The team also references a safety plan and a project quality plan, indicating a structured approach to risk, safety, and quality management. The design-build approach is organized into two primary phases: design and preconstruction. A notable engineering recommendation is to raise the hydraulic profile by approximately 7 feet. According to the team, this adjustment could reduce construction costs by minimizing dewatering requirements, lowering uplift pressures on structures, potentially reducing slab thickness and concrete volume, and eliminating the need for anchors. It may also contribute to schedule savings. However, the

proposal does not provide quantified estimates to substantiate the anticipated cost or schedule benefits. The demolition approach is generally described; however, details regarding protection of existing infrastructure are limited and could be further developed. The team outlines their approach to temporary bypass systems, including electrical equipment and controls. Several design optimizations are proposed, including the use of open line shaft pumps at the transfer pump station as a potential cost-saving measure, as well as the addition of an extra wet well. Updated pump curves are provided to reflect the revised hydraulic profile. The team also recommends the use of a smaller transformer as part of the electrical design. The Clearwell design approach includes the use of hydraulic modeling. An external overflow system is mentioned; however, the discharge location is not clearly defined. The proposal also includes descriptions of HSPS3, its control strategy, and associated pump performance data. Surge risk management is addressed, along with the design of a new electrical room and power supply system. Additional elements of the proposal include stormwater management (SWM), yard piping, structural design, power distribution, system modifications, and instrumentation and control. The team emphasizes coordination with plant operations staff to support a smooth transition from construction to commissioning. The proposal concludes by highlighting the advantages of elevating the Clearwells above grade. Required permits and regulatory considerations are also identified. In summary, the team proposes one primary design modification—raising the hydraulic profile. While this change may offer potential benefits, the proposal does not provide detailed analysis or quantified estimates regarding anticipated schedule or cost savings. Additionally, the description of methodologies and techniques remains relatively general, with limited detail on how specific project challenges and obstacles will be addressed.

4. The firm demonstrates that it has given considerable thought to its proposed approach. The narrative reflects a clear understanding of the project's risks, as well as the requirements necessary to complete the work successfully. The firm provided ample due diligence and provides confidence in their ability to manage the effort effectively. However, there are some concerns over the ability of this firm to tackle identified obstacles and unknown challenges. Even though this firm is more familiar with plant processes and operations.
5. Looks like their previous experience with DeKalb County has provided knowledge of previous issues that can be avoided.

## Cost | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

$306,743,974.07

## Local Small Business Enterprise Participation (LSBE) | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

10

# Ruby-Collins, Inc.

## Milestone Schedule | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

1. Detailed schedule identifying a completion date 1 yr. earlier than required by using concurrent design and construction vs. phased.
2. Anticipates to finish project 380 days faster that date limited identified in the addendum. Provides construction sequencing.
3. The proposed project schedule indicates final completion within 1,095 days, which is approximately 38 days ahead of the RFP milestone. The team plans to implement concurrent design and construction activities and anticipates initiating early work upon achieving 60% design approval and securing the necessary permits. Mobilization is scheduled to begin in November 2026, with final project activities extending through May 2029.
4. Milestones and scheduling details are addressed in Addendum #1 and Appendix F1. The project timeline is from 2026 through 2029. A summary that explains the major phases, key milestones, and critical path is provided on slide 47. This provides clarity regarding sequencing, dependencies, and overall project controls. This supplemental information strengthens the understanding of how the firm intends to manage and track progress of a more aggressive time frame.
5. Project schedule and timeline created by Primavera P6 (newest timeline software).

## Project Experience and Capabilities: | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

1. Ample experiences with Team (Tetra Tech). Team members identified. Prior experience provided identifies equal complexity as this project. Has worked at site and familiar with needs team has only worked on one project together.
2. Good description of design-builder team, lists design engineer and subconsultants, with roles and reasoning, lists org. chart with specifics on management team
3. The proposal clearly defines the organizational chart, including roles and responsibilities. It provides detailed descriptions of the relevant experience of each key team member. The majority of key personnel are from Ruby-Collins (RC) and Tetra Tech,

with RC proposing to self-perform approximately 70% of the work using a local team. The Project Manager is expected to dedicate 75% of their time throughout the project duration. The Design Manager will dedicate 70%, while the Construction Manager (CM) will allocate 100% of their time during construction and 60% during the design and permitting phase. This level of commitment indicates that project leadership will remain highly engaged throughout the duration of the project. All key personel meet the required experience The team structure consists primarily of two main entities: the General Contractor (RC) and the Design Consultant (Tetra Tech), reflecting a traditional and efficient design-build approach. RC has demonstrated experience in water infrastructure projects, including three comparable large-scale projects. Tetra Tech also demonstrates strong experience in the design of water tanks and high-service pump stations. Collectively, the team has delivered more than 13 design-build projects with scopes that include clearwell design and construction, multiple pumping stations, pipeline installation, demolition, electrical systems, and commissioning/startup.RC hasreferenced projects range from $18M to &145M. The design-build team structure, key personnel experience, and lines of authority are well defined. The firms have prior experience working together on similar water infrastructure projects and demonstrate capability in delivering complex projects of comparable size and scope. The RC Project Manager will serve as the primary point of contact, and the Construction Manager will lead constructability reviews during Phase 1 and manage construction activities during Phase 2.

4. Provide well-developed project descriptions. The clearwell pump work, demolition projects, and other relevant scope elements are clearly identified and explained. Supports this firm and its Design Builders strength and ability to complete this complex task. (b) This section also effectively demonstrates the firm’s key team personnel that will support its ability to start and complete this project.
5. Key Personnel appears to be qualified by years of experience and education. Project Manager previous roles isn't listed on any projects under his bio. Hartsfield-Jackson project has someone named "Allen" listed. Some of the other staff has their previous roles listed on the projects under their names, but not all.

## Management Plan | Points Based | 5 Points (5%)

1. Conducting daily safety inspections, Quality assurance plan, list individuals who will be responsible for daily activities.
2. lists critical work components and specifically what they will be demolishing.
3. The design-build management plan identifies critical work components to establish execution priorities, including protection of existing pipelines and utilities, Maintenance of Plant Operations (MOPO), demolition, and deep excavation with shoring. The

approach reflects a well-structured strategy for managing project execution and controlling costs. The proposal demonstrates strong risk management practices, including the development of a project-specific draft risk register. A comprehensive safety plan is also provided, including orientation materials in Spanish, which reflects a clear commitment to workplace safety and workforce inclusivity. In addition, the team presents a robust quality management approach for design deliverables. A sample QA/QC plan from a previous project with the City of Atlanta is included, demonstrating their experience and established procedures for ensuring quality.

4. The firm demonstrates that it has given considerable thought to how it will interact with DWM staff, project manager, the project team and other stakeholders. I have full confidence that the firm will manage the effort effectively.
5. I like how they address how they will execute their critical work components. I did not see anything regarding resolving conflict issues.

## Overall Project Approach & Technical Approach | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

1. Proposes a sequenced approach to expedite the completion. Describes in detail critical elements of the project and how each will be mitigated. A decision log will be established to help manage cost. Using the DB approach will allow cost to be understood for different elements. Alterations can be chosen if cost becomes a factor. provides detailed project scope layout.
2. Continuity of service, extremely detailed project approach and single point of failure analysis with value engineering alternatives
3. The proposal includes an accelerated project schedule, indicating completion approximately 380 days ahead of the RFP requirement. Additional fixtures are proposed to further reduce SPF. A new wet well is included at Transfer Pump Station 2 (TPS2) to maintain operational capacity during maintenance activities. RC proposes to self-perform approximately 70% of the work using a local team. This is excellent to increase quality of work and accountability and reduce costs. Within the design-build plan, the team demonstrates a solid understanding of the project scope and DWM requirements, with strong emphasis on maintaining plant operations throughout construction. The proposal addresses demolition sequencing, groundwater management, and risks associated with excavation near Reservoir N2. Proper handling of hazardous materials is also discussed, including the use of qualified personnel. The team outlines their approach to modeling the Clearwell design and identifies the responsible parties. Recommendations are provided for new pumping stations, including identification of subcontractors supporting the work. Pump cut sheets are included, along with performance curves for both turbine pumps and horizontal

split-case pumps. A surge analysis is proposed to manage hydraulic transients, to be incorporated into the control narrative. The stormwater management plan appears compliant with state requirements. Special construction considerations for HSPS3 are described, including the use of auger-cast piles and thick slabs and walls. Construction methodologies are also detailed for TPS2 and the Clearwells. Electrical, instrumentation, and control (EI&C) work is clearly assigned to subcontractors, with defined responsibilities. A key strength of the operational analysis is the identification of three single points of failure that could result in service interruptions. These are associated with the junction box design, the suction systems of both pumping stations, and the discharge from HSPS3. Significant attention is given to Maintenance of Plant Operations (MOPO), including coordination with plant management across seven well-defined areas. The proposal also addresses electrical system considerations and outlines how a required 90 MGD bypass will be implemented and managed. The startup process will be led by the RC Manager in conjunction with subcontractors. The team proposes several notable improvements to the conceptual design to meet redundancy requirements. These include adding a third wet well to maintain required flow capacity during maintenance and incorporating additional valves to enhance flow redundancy. They also propose eliminating identified single points of failure through strategic additions of piping and valving to allow operational flexibility during emergencies. Overflow management is addressed with the proposal of two 30-inch overflow pipes connected to the stormwater system. Additionally, five value engineering alternatives are presented for County review, including: • Potential savings in electrical equipment • Reuse of demolition materials as fill where feasible • Advanced modeling for Clearwell baffle design • Consideration of micropiles in lieu of auger-cast piles to reduce construction costs A list of required permits is also provided.

4. The firm demonstrates that it has given considerable thought to its proposed approach. Slide 27-30. The narrative reflects a clear understanding of the project's risks, as well as the requirements necessary to complete the work successfully. The proposal demonstrates due diligence and provides confidence in the firm's ability to manage the effort effectively. Less concern over the firm's ability to handle identified obstacles and unknown challenges.
5. Looks like the firm has a very good understanding on certain issues that they are faced with this project.

## Cost | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

$233,810,423.00

## Local Small Business Enterprise Participation (LSBE) | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

7.4