REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
IRL COUNCIL FY 2022
2022-07

Special Category: Feasibility Study for Cape Canaveral Space Force Station (CCSFS) Regional Wastewater Treatment: Identifying and Evaluating Options for 21st Century Wastewater Treatment to serve CCSFS and Kennedy Space Center (KSC) with consideration of facility options for adjoining communities.

PROJECT INTENT: Develop a feasibility study that identifies and evaluates options to address current and future needs for wastewater treatment to meet or exceed regulatory requirements, accommodate needs at the CCSFS and KSC, projected Kennedy Space Center and local community growth, increase infrastructure resilience, and provide long-term water quality benefits to the Indian River Lagoon.

RFP SECTIONS:
1. Background and RFP Priorities
2. Proposal Submission Requirements
3. Proposal Review and Award Information
4. Proposal Application (Required Format)

RFP ATTACHMENTS:
1. Copy of proposal submitted by the EDC and funded by Florida Defense Support Task Force
2. Sample Proposal Scoresheet
3. Scrutinized Companies Certification Form

PROPOSAL SUPPORT: Please address any questions regarding this RFP in writing to info@irlcouncil.org. All submitted questions and responses will be posted on the IRLNEP website at http://www.onelagoon.org/

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE: Proposal packages are due on July 1, 2022, by 5:00 p.m. Proposals received after this deadline will be considered non-responsive and returned to the applicant. Proposal partner letters of support must accompany the proposal package at the time of submission.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
Feasibility study for expanded and improved WWTP to serve
Kennedy Space Center and adjoining communities

1. BACKGROUND

SOURCE OF FUNDS
The Economic Development Commission of Florida’s Space Coast ("EDC") received a $200,000 grant from the Florida Defense Support Task Force to secure a qualified and experienced contract firm ("Contractor") through a competitive Request for Proposal process (RFP).

FOCUS OF THE PROJECT
The focus of the project is to conduct an alternative analysis feasibility study of wastewater treatment options as a first planning step in a phased strategy to initiate regional wastewater planning to address aging infrastructure and the rapid growth of Cape Canaveral Space Force Station (CCSFS), NASA’s Kennedy Space Center (KSC), and adjacent communities.

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
The IRL Council, an independent special district of Florida and host agency of the Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program ("IRLNEP"), will support the RFP review and ranking process. This includes development and release of this RFP, assembling an independent technical committee to review and rank proposals submitted by Contractors in response to this RFP, and provide an award recommendation. The EDC will contract with the selected Contractor and serve as the project administrator for the duration of the project.

BACKGROUND AND INTENDED OUTCOME
The Space Force and NASA/KSC have a joint wastewater collection and treatment system, which is located at CCSFS on a barrier island. The system dates to the 1950’s when the installations were first constructed. These facilities are connected by a collection system of nearly 100 miles of sewer mains, about 50 miles of which are located at KSC. The growth at the Cape over the past decade, as well as that projected for the next decade, has strained CCSFS’s antiquated system. In addition, the current system fails to meet new state water quality standards that require a minimum of advanced wastewater treatment (AWT) by 2025. See EDC proposal, Attachment 1, for details.

This study represents a first step to enable the adoption, development, and execution of a fundable advanced wastewater treatment (AWT) project at the municipal or county level to address the demands outlined by the study. Such a project would protect and enhance three high-value assets – CCSFS, KSC and the IRL – notable for their importance to local, state, and national interests.

The feasibility study will identify and evaluate a variety of alternatives and associated costs in a manner that will allow for informed decisions as to how the project shall proceed to design and build phases. The feasibility study phase is the foundation for identifying the project vision.

Without the proper due diligence in this first phase, the project could take a path, which may not deliver all of the multiple benefits that could be associated with the project. This study will be used as the Basis of Design (BOD) to start collaborating with a design-build contractor to complete the project using the Progressive Design Build (PDB) alternative project delivery method. The contractor for the design-build phase will be chosen through a separate competitive process.
**PRIORITIES**

Applicants to this proposal are encouraged to include innovative options and approaches in their proposals that optimize infrastructure and environmental benefits. The following provides a list of priorities that the feasibility study should address.

1. Evaluate wastewater treatment plant options that include, but are not limited to, upgrades and expansion of existing facilities, building a new stand-alone facility, or building a larger regional facility on the mainland that consolidates multiple utilities.

2. Review and evaluate the current and future wastewater treatment needs of CCSFS and KSC with consideration for the utility demands of commercial space expansions. Evaluation of utility capacity should include most recent projections of workforce and infrastructure growth from relevant parties, to include Space Force, NASA/KSC and local municipalities as well as estimate of the amount of inflow and infiltration that contributes to the flows.

3. Review and evaluate alternate strategies and infrastructure requirements to deliver 21st century wastewater solutions to CCFS and KSC to attain a **minimum of AWT standards as defined in FS 403.086** for nutrients with sustainable management of biosolids, no direct discharge of reclaimed water to surface waters of the IRL or its tributaries, and nutrient management strategies that protect groundwater from nutrient loads.

4. Review and evaluate the current and future wastewater treatment status and needs to include the regional sewerage treatment flow and load capacity needed for CCSFS, KSC and adjacent communities of the barrier island and north Brevard County over the long term (20 to 25 years), including any collection and transmission systems that might be needed and compare to the total maximum daily load allocations for the IRL Basin. At a minimum, the feasibility study should include current and future wastewater facilities and needs of North Brevard, Titusville, Port St. John, Merritt Island/Sykes Creek, and Cape Canaveral.

5. Incorporate DEP planning practices, accounting for priorities including regional approach, coastal resiliency, and innovation, all which align with three DEP grant funding sources that may support future implementation phases.

6. Provide a business case for the holistic, regional approach for sustainable wastewater management by comparing costs with the associated economic, social, and environmental benefits.

7. Provide preliminary cost estimates for facility capital construction and associated operations and management (O&M) costs options. Identify an implementation strategy for moving forward to next phases of design-build and funding.

**PROJECT DELIVERABLES**

Final project deliverables include:

- A preliminary and comprehensive feasibility study report that identifies current and future wastewater needs, identifies WWTP options and positions the recommended option to secure design, engineering and construction funding from the State of Florida, the federal government and other sources.
• A Power Point presentation that serves as an Executive Summary of the feasibility study report findings.

• Four presentations of the report findings: 1. EDC of Florida’s Space Coast Board of Directors; 2. Florida Defense Support Task Force; 3. Space Florida; and 4. IRL Council Board of Directors.

• Any additional deliverables offered by the Applicant will be considered in the proposal evaluation and ranking.

• Time is of the essence. Proposals that commit to delivering a comprehensive, innovative, and high-quality feasibility study earlier than the January 31, 2023, will receive extra points in project evaluation. See proposal scoresheet as Attachment 2.

CONDITIONS FOR FUNDING:
The IRL Council will consider recommending projects on behalf of the EDC for funding submitted to this request under the requirements set forth in this RFP. **Failure to meet all the requirements listed below at the time of proposal package submission will result in a proposal being deemed non-responsive.**

• **COVER LETTER:** The proposal must be accompanied by a cover letter in PDF format from the president, chief executive officer, or another person authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the organization, company or individual. This letter is not counted toward the 6-page limit.

• **1-PAGE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** in PDF format provided in RFP Section 4. Proposal Application.

• **6-PAGE PROPOSAL NARRATIVE** in PDF format as described in RFP Section 4. Proposal Application.

• **3 EXAMPLES OF FINAL REPORTS FROM SIMILAR WORK.** Three individual PDFs of final reports that correspond to the three examples of similar work and size identified in the proposal narrative. There is no page limit to these final reports or documents, however supplemental additional materials (media, public relations or other documents) should not be included in the package.

• **SCRUTINIZED COMPANIES CERTIFICATION FORM.** Signed if applicable

• There is **NO** matching fund requirement for this RFP.

• To promote access and equity to these funds, projects submitted by minority owned and/or service-disabled veteran businesses will receive extra points in project evaluation. See proposal scoresheet as Attachment 2.

• The contract will be for a fixed fee of $200,000. No-cost contract extensions will **NOT** be granted. Cost over-runs will not be considered for Applicant compensation.
2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Proposal Deadline: Applications for project funding are due no later than 5:00 p.m., July 1, 2022. Applications received after the deadline will be considered non-responsive and returned to the applicant without review.

Proposal Format: Proposals are required to be submitted via electronic mail in Portable Document Format (PDF) only to Daniel Kolodny, Chief Operating Officer (kolodny@irlcouncil.org) with a copy to Duane De Freese, Executive Director (ddefreese@irlcouncil.org). Applications will not be accepted via U.S. Postal Service or other mail carrier. Please contact Daniel Kolodny if the file size is prohibitive to sending via email.

Proposals must include all information requested in the Project Proposal Application (see section 4 below). Proposals will not be considered if the application is incomplete. During the review and evaluation process, applicants may be asked to provide additional details of the work and associated financial information.

Award Timeframe: A technical committee of a minimum of 5 volunteer members will participate in the review of proposals. Applicants should have no contact proposal review committee members for purposes of influencing ranking or funding decisions during the review and award period.

The IRL Council will prepare and post a Notice of Proposal Ranking on the IRL Council website (one lagoon). Applicants are responsible to monitor the website for Addenda and notices regarding the Request for Proposals.

Once the Rankings are prepared, the IRL Council will turn over the project to the EDC for award issuance, contracting, and project management. The EDC goal is to have Contract, Statements of Work and Budget completed and the agreement executed as soon as possible, but no later than August 1, 2022. Funds administered through this award will be available based on a payment schedule negotiated with the top ranked Applicant.

Legal Requirements: The Contractor must comply with all federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, policies, rules, and regulations that are applicable to this RFP and the work to be performed under the awarded contract. The Contractor’s lack of knowledge about the applicable laws shall not be grounds for relief from such laws or constitute a defense against the enforcement of such laws.

Public Records: Any material submitted in response to this RFP will become a public record and shall be subject to public disclosure consistent with the Florida Public Records Law (Part 119, Florida Statutes), except as may be provided by the Public Records Law or other applicable state or federal law. If an applicant contends that part of its application is not subject to disclosure, the applicant shall identify specifically any information contained in the qualifications that the applicant considers confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Law, and the applicant shall cite the specific section of the law creating the exemption for such information. The IRL Council reserves its right to make all determinations concerning the applicability of the Florida Public Records Law to any documents submitted in response to this RFP.

Litigation Concerning the RFP and Agreement:
By submitting an application, the applicant agrees that: (a) any and all legal actions necessary to interpret or enforce this RFP or the resulting Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of Florida; and (b) the exclusive venue for any litigation concerning this RFP or the Agreement shall be the state and federal courts in and for Indian River County, Florida.

Public Entity Crimes:
As provided in the IRL Council Operating Procedures Manual, a person or affiliate who has been placed on the Convicted Proposers list following a conviction for a public entity crime may not submit a proposal on a contract to provide any goods or services to a public entity; may not submit a proposal on a contract with a public entity for the construction or repair of a public building or public work; may not submit proposals on leases of real property to a public entity; may not be successful or perform work as a contractor, supplier, subcontractor, or consultant under a contract with any public entity in excess of the threshold amount in section 287.017, Florida Statutes, for CATEGORY TWO for a period of 36 months following the date of being placed on the convicted Contractor list (see section 287.133, Florida Statutes).

Prohibition on Scrutinized Companies:
As provided in F.S. 287.135(2)(a), by submitting an application, or entering into any agreement with the IRL Council, or performing any work in furtherance hereof, the applicant (if a company as defined in section 215.473, Florida Statutes) certifies that it is not on the Scrutinized Companies that Boycott Israel List, created pursuant to section 215.4725, Florida Statutes, or is engaged in a boycott of Israel. The applicant shall complete the attached Scrutinized Companies Certification Form which is attached here as Attachment 3.

Non-Lobbying:
Pursuant to section 216.347, Fla. Stat., as amended, funds received under this Agreement shall not be used for the purpose of lobbying the Legislature or any other state agency.

IRL Council Discretion:
In its sole discretion, the IRL Council may withdraw this RFP either before or after receiving applications, may accept or reject any or all applications, may accept applications which deviate from the non-material provisions of this RFP, and may postpone the application due date and time. The IRL Council may waive any minor irregularity which is defined as a variation from the terms and conditions of this solicitation that does not (1) affect the price of the proposal, (2) give the applicant an unfair competitive advantage over other applicants, or (3) adversely impact the interests of the IRL Council.

Funding Contingencies and Restrictions: Funding of proposals selected under this Request for Proposals (RFP) is contingent upon availability of funds from the Economic Development Commission of Florida's Space Coast.

Cost Sharing:
No matching funds are required under this RFP.

3. PROPOSAL REVIEW AND AWARD INFORMATION

A Proposal Review Committee will review and rank proposals. The proposal review committee will be comprised of a minimum of 5 volunteer members chosen based on their knowledge, experience or technical expertise.

No oral presentations will be conducted. Written proposals will be reviewed and ranked based on their substance, adherence to guidelines and ranking criteria as presented herein.
Proposals will be pre-reviewed by the IRL Council staff to determine if the proposal is complete (responsive) pursuant to RFP instructions herein. Proposals that are determined to be non-responsive will not be reviewed nor scored by the proposal review committee. All responsive proposals will be reviewed and scored independently and individually by members of the proposal review committee. The only exception is when a committee member declares a conflict or potential conflict of interest associated with a proposal.

After all ranking sheets are received from the proposal review committee, IRL Council staff will review score sheets and assign addendum points as appropriate (see sample score sheet attached herein as Attachment 2). IRL Council staff will compile all review sheets for each proposal and place them in numeric ranked order. IRL Council staff will provide the following information on our website www.onelagoon.org to allow for public access to all submitted proposals as well as project scores and rankings in EXCEL spread sheets. The IRL Council staff will present the individual score sheets and compiled EXCEL spreadsheet of proposal scores and overall rankings to the EDC.

The EDC will finalize the scope of work, detailed budget and contract terms with the selected applicant and serve as the contract administrator until the project is completed. The IRL Council staff will be available as technical support to the EDC during the project term as needed.

A sample Proposal Score Sheet is provided (Attachment 2) for informational purposes only and is not part of the proposal application. Applicants should pay close attention to the attached score sheet when developing their proposals. Proposals with a numeric rank score below 80% will not be considered for funding. Only one award is anticipated.

4. PROPOSAL APPLICATION

Proposals must be received no later than 5:00 p.m., July 1, 2022.

Use this format to submit your application. All items and questions must be addressed to receive funding consideration.

SUBMIT APPLICATION VIA EMAIL AS A PDF TO:
Daniel Kolodny (kolodny@irlcouncil.org) with a copy to Duane De Freese (ddfreese@irlcouncil.org).

PROPOSAL FORMAT

The project proposal must adhere to the following format (no less than 12-point Times or Calibri fonts):

• One-Page Executive Summary (Please follow format provided in RFP herein).
• Proposal Narrative (limited to 6 pages maximum).
• 3 PDF copies of final reports that correspond to similar work examples provided in the proposal narrative.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FORMAT (1-PAGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: WWTP feasibility study for CCSFS and Kennedy Space Center with options to provide consolidated services to local communities</th>
<th>Name lead organization and provide full contact information for primary Contractor and all partners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor and list of partner organizations as applicable</td>
<td>Identify lead organization and all partners that are minority and/or woman owned companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority and/or woman-owned company declaration</td>
<td>List by name, title, and affiliation all members of the applicant’s team. Quantify percentage of time that each member will contribute to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team with Roles, Responsibilities, and timeline for deliverables</td>
<td>Brief summary narrative of organization expertise and experience doing similar work. Include knowledge and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of Expertise and Experience</td>
<td>Brief narrative of methodology and approach to identifying and evaluating options and potential costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology and Approach</td>
<td>List 3 examples of similar work provided to other clients (one sentence description of work, client and date(s) work was provided including the names of the members on the proposal team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Similar Work Examples</td>
<td>Provide 3 references from former clients of the similar work who can attest to the quality and timeliness of your work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 References</td>
<td>The target date for project completion is January 31, 2023. Provide a timeline of milestones to complete the project. Extra points will be given to proposals that complete work earlier than the target date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Date for Project Completion</td>
<td>Can be no greater than $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSAL FORMAT: (PROPOSAL LIMITED TO 6 PAGES)

1. Title of Project.

   A. Narrative that demonstrated the expertise of Applicant and all participating partners. Identify all that are minority or women-owned businesses.

   B. List of individual team members, titles and affiliations assigned to the project with identification of individual expertise and experience that each member brings to the project and relative amount (percent) of time that each member will deliver to the project.

   C. Description of the team’s local experience and knowledge working with local municipalities and wastewater utilities on the design, construction and operation of AWT-level WWTP systems.

   D. Description of the team’s experience and knowledge working with CCSFS and/or NASA at KSC on wastewater issues or other relevant infrastructure issues. Include experience and understanding of federal government chain of command and protocols to access technical
information.

E. Narrative that succinctly describes options that will be considered, methodologies to evaluate options and approaches to consider technology innovations, waste stream management, Indian River Lagoon water quality and infrastructure resilience to storms, storm surges and sea level rise.

F. List three examples of similar work performed for clients and the names of the proposal team members. Provide a PDF copy of the final report for each of the 3 projects listed.

G. Provide a name and full contact information for 3 references from former clients. At least two references should be from the work listed in G. above. All should be references for work accomplished in past 3-5 years.

H. Provide a detailed budget with milestones, deliverables, and invoicing dates. The project and all project deliverables must be completed on or before January 31, 2023.

The remainder of this page is blank intentionally
RFP ATTACHMENTS

Information on the following pages is provided for information only.

Attachments are NOT part of the proposal application.
ATTACHMENT 1: Proposal submitted by the Economic Development Commission of Florida’s Space Coast to the Enterprise Florida, Florida Defense Support Task Force

Florida Defense Support Task Force
Out of Cycle Grant Funding Application

Applicant
Economic Development Commission of Florida’s Space Coast

Project Title
Feasibility Study for Cape Canaveral Space Force Station Regional Wastewater Treatment

Start and End Dates
Upon approval

Amount Requested
$200,000

Project Summary
The Economic Development Commission of Florida’s Space Coast (EDC) proposes an alternative analysis feasibility study as step one in a strategy to initiate regional wastewater planning to address the rapid growth of Cape Canaveral Space Force Station (CCSFS), NASA’s Kennedy Space Center (KSC) and the adjacent community.

CCSFS and KSC have a joint wastewater collection and treatment system, which is located at CCSFS on a barrier island. The system dates to the 1950’s when the installations were first constructed. These facilities are connected by a collection system of nearly 100 miles of sewer mains, about 50 miles of which are located at KSC.

In 2020, Space Launch Delta 45 (SLD45) planned for 230 space launches, went into 59 countdowns, and launched 39 missions. Launch rates from CCSFS/KSC are expected to increase to almost 100 by 2030. Together, KSC and the local Space Force installations boast a total local workforce of more than 21,000, including military, civil servants, contractors, construction crews, and a growing number of commercial tenants, who are dedicated to supporting the nation’s defense, national security, civil and commercial space initiatives.

The growth at the Cape over the past decade, as well as that projected for the next, has strained CCSFS’ antiquated system. Moreover, new advanced wastewater treatment standards (AWT) mandated by SB 712 “Clean Waterways Act” define the maximum concentrations of nutrients and other constituents that treated wastewater may contain by July 1, 2025 if disposed into the Indian River Lagoon (IRL). For example, upgrades were recently completed at the CCSFS wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) to comply with existing permits to reduce total nitrogen effluent levels to ~12 mg/L. However, the AWT standard is four times more stringent, requiring maximum allowable total nitrogen effluent concentrations of no more than 3 mg/L on an average annual basis. Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) recently sent notice that the basin management action plan (BMAP) will enforce the AWT standard.
In proximity to CCSFS, there are five other WWTPs (three owned and operated by Brevard County and two by City of Titusville) that do not currently meet the AWT standards. Significant investment by federal, county and city governments will be required to bring all six facilities into compliance with the AWT standard. As providing wastewater collection and management service is not part of the core mission of CCSFS, this scenario is primed for a regional planning approach, which aligns with DEP and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) funding priorities. Therefore, such an approach makes good policy sense from both fiscal and environmental perspectives for local, state, and federal stakeholders, including taxpayers.

The project will provide additional benefits in terms of alternative water supply. A regional wastewater facility can be designed to produce a high quality reclaimed water that can be reused beneficially to provide a non-potable or potentially potable water supply that will reduce the impacts on local drinking water supplies due to population growth.

**Study Objectives**

1) Below is a summary of this feasibility study objectives: To determine the regional sewerage treatment flow and load capacity needed for CCSFS, KSC and adjacent community needs over the long term (20 to 25 years), including any collection and transmission systems that might be needed and compare to the total maximum daily load allocation for the IRL Basin.

2) To identify infrastructure requirements to meet the capacity needs and IRL Basin objectives, including wastewater collection, transmission, treatment and reuse of effluent, and solids management; focusing on sustainable and resilient approaches. This will include determining potential physical locations for a regional AWT plant with reduced vulnerability to coastal storms, storm surge, and sea level rise.

3) To incorporate DEP planning practices, accounting for priorities including regional approach, coastal resiliency, and innovation, all which align with three DEP grant funding sources that may support future implementation phases.

4) To initiate a collaborative approach with local, City and County stakeholders with the objectives to support the growth at CCSFS and KSC, while also protecting the IRL and support our local communities’ future needs.

5) To provide a business case for the holistic, regional approach for sustainable wastewater management by comparing costs with the associated economic, social, and environmental (triple bottom line) benefits.

6) To identify an implementation strategy for the infrastructure requirements identified in step two that will be fundable by:

   a. Florida Department of Environmental Protection wastewater grants that prioritize regional planning, resilience, and innovation.
   b. Defense Community Infrastructure Program (DCIP) grant U.S. Department of Defense from the U.S. Department of Defense Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation, which is designed to address deficiencies in community infrastructure, supportive of a military installation, in order to enhance military value, installation resilience, and military family quality of life.
c. St. Johns River Water Management District grant funding including alternative water supply funding that could apply to beneficial reuse of treated wastewater.
d. Other sources of state and federal funding as identified.

Project Deliverables
The feasibility study, which will identify the wastewater needs and future project scope for the proposed area, is the key to unlocking significant funding sources from the State of Florida and the federal government designed to address these specific challenges. The study will be the first step to enable the adoption, development, and execution of a fundable AWT project at the municipal or county level to address the demands outlined by the study. Such a project would protect and enhance three high-value assets – CCSFS, KSC and the IRL – notable for their importance to local, state, and national interests.

How Does This Project Support the Mission of the FDSTF?
Based on ongoing discussions with federal, state, and local partners, including elected officials, as well as DEP, EPA, SLD45 and NASA, the regional approach to wastewater treatment has a high probability of success and will relieve USSF from the non-core mission of owning, operating, and maintaining a WWTP. The initial obstacle is funding the feasibility study, which will lead to the planning and design of a project that is fundable by DEP and DOD, with local match. SLD45 could then focus MilCon projects on mission critical infrastructure particularly as it addresses the challenges presented by significantly increased launch cadence over the next decade.

Performance Measures: Completed study and action items.

Task 1 – Preparation for RFQ/RFP
Include a copy of the RFQ/RFP with quarterly reporting paperwork.

Task 2 – Select Contractor and execute contract
Include a copy of the contract with quarterly reporting paperwork.

Task 3 – Complete study
Include a copy of the final study with final grant report paperwork as a deliverable.

Path Forward
The feasibility study will present a variety of alternatives and present associated costs in a manner that will allow for informed decisions as to how the project shall proceed. The feasibility study phase is the foundation of the project. Without the proper due-diligence in that phase, the project could take a different trajectory, which may not achieve all the objectives of the project. This study will be used as the Basis of Design (BOD) to start collaborating with the design-build contractor to complete the project using the Progressive Design Build (PDB) alternative project delivery method. Per the DBIA.org, “Progressive design-build delivery is a stepped, or progressive process (commonly referred to as Progressive Design-Build or PDB). PDB uses a qualifications-based or best value selection, followed by a process whereby the owner then “progresses” towards a design and contract price with the team (thus the term “Progressive”).” The feasibility study is foundational to the project moving forward since it provides a BOD for the selection of the design-build firm based on their qualifications. Without a well-defined BOD, misunderstanding could arise that could affect the cost and schedule of the project. Therefore, preparing the BOD is essential for the PDB delivery of a project.
Each proposal reviewer will fill out a scoresheet for each proposal and submit it to the IRL Council staff for review. The IRL Council staff will collate the quantitative scores, calculate an average score for the proposal and rank proposals based on the average of scores.

**PROPOSAL SCORE SHEET**

Proposals that do not achieve a minimum score of 80% of total points available will not be considered for funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING</th>
<th>POINTS AVAILABLE</th>
<th>POINTS EARNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Summary (Limited to 1 page)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Executive Summary is provided with required documentation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in proper format as described in RFP and contains adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information to succinctly explain the applicant’s expertise,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience and approach to the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewers: Score 0 – 10 points using rubric below as a guide:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate: 1-4 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good: 5-7 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 8-10 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Proposal – Proposal title with Primary Applicant and Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Demonstrated Expertise of Applicant and Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal provides a succinct but descriptive overview of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise and experience of the Applicant and partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewers: Score 0 – 15 points using rubric below as a guide:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate: 1-4 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good: 5-9 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 10-15 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Expertise and Experience of Team Members Assigned to Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal identifies individuals assigned to the project with a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description of individual expertise, experience and estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time (%) dedicated to the project. A team leader must be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identified.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewers: Score 0 – 20 points using rubric below as a guide:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate: 1-8 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good: 9-15 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: 16-20 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Local Experience and Knowledge
Proposal describes the team’s local experience and knowledge working with municipalities and wastewater treatment utilities.

**Reviewers: Score 0 – 15 points using rubric below as a guide:**
- Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points
- Adequate: 1-4 points
- Good: 5-9 points
- Excellent: 10-15 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### D. Experience Working with Canaveral Space Force Station, NASA and/or KSC or other Relevant Federal Partners
Proposal describes the experience and knowledge of the team previous work with CCSFS, NASA and/or KSC or other relevant work federal partners on similar or related projects.

**Reviewers: Score 0 – 10 points using rubric below as a guide:**
- Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points
- Adequate: 1-4 points
- Good: 5-7 points
- Excellent: 8-10 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### E. Approach to Project, Options and Innovation
Proposal provides a narrative that demonstrates that the Applicant and partners understand the scope of the project. Narrative provides details of potential wastewater treatment options that the feasibility study will consider with clear understanding of current and future waste stream management needs, compliance issues and consideration for Indian River Lagoon water quality and infrastructure resilience to storms, storm surges and sea level rise.

**Reviewers: Score 0 – 25 points using rubric below as a guide:**
- Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points
- Adequate: 1-10 points
- Good: 11-20 points
- Excellent: 21-25 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### F. Examples of Similar Work
Proposal provides a succinct description of 3 relevant and similar projects delivered for other clients in the proposal narrative. Proposal package includes a PDF of the final report or work product for each project.

**Reviewers: Score 0 – 15 points using rubric below as a guide:**
- Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points
- Adequate examples of similar work: 1-4 points
- Good examples of similar work: 5-9 points
- Excellent examples of similar work: 10-15 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**G. References (Three references are required)**

Proposal provides three (3) references with the name of a primary contact and full contact information. Two must represent references from the examples of similar work listed in F.

**Reviewers: Score 0 – 15 points using rubric below as a guide:**
- Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points
- Adequate references: 1-4 points for each adequate reference
- Good references: 5-9 points for each good reference
- Excellent: 10-15 points for each excellent reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers: Score 0 – 15 points using rubric below as a guide:</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**H. Project Budget Table**

Proposal contains a detailed budget table that lists milestones, deliverables as tasks, and invoicing dates.

**Reviewers: Score 0 – 15 points using rubric below as a guide:**
- Poorly presented/unresponsive: 0 points
- Adequate: 1-4 points
- Good: 5-9 points
- Excellent: 1-15 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers: Score 0 – 15 points using rubric below as a guide:</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**I. Minority-Owned or Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business (Bonus Points)**

Is the Applicant or any organization that is part of the team a Minority-Owned or Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business? If yes, provide appropriate documentation.

**Reviewers: Score**
- If Yes, add 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers: Score</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**J. Proposal Urgency (Bonus Points)**

The milestones and timeline for project completion commit to a project completion date before January 31, 2023.

**Reviewers: Score**
- If Yes, add 5 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers: Score</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Reviewer Score from above (Max 150 points):</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Score:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3: 
SCRUTINIZED COMPANIES CERTIFICATION FORM

For a company as defined in section 215.473, Florida Statutes only

SCRUTINIZED COMPANIES CERTIFICATION FORM
By execution below, I, ________________, on behalf of ______________________________ (hereinafter, the “Applicant”), hereby swear or affirm to the following certifications:

The following certifications apply to all procurements:
1. The Applicant has reviewed section 215.4725, Florida Statutes, section 215.473, Florida Statutes and section 287.135, Florida Statutes, and understands the same.
2. The Applicant is not on the Scrutinized Companies that Boycott Israel List nor is the Applicant engaged in a boycott of Israel.
3. If awarded a contract, the Applicant agrees to require these certifications for applicable subcontracts entered into for the performance of work/services under this procurement.
4. If awarded a contract, the Applicant agrees that the certifications in this section shall be effective and relied upon by the IRL Council and the EDC for the entire term of the contract, including any and all renewals.

APPLICANT:
By: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF _________________

The foregoing instrument was sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before this ______ day of _________________________, 20_____, by _____________________, who is the ______________________ of ________________________________, who is personally known to me or who has produced____________________ as identification.

NOTARY PUBLIC
Printed Name of Notary_____________________
My Commission expires: __________________