

City of Pflugerville, Texas Water Treatment Plant Expansion
Membrane Filtration System Procurement

Evaluation Category	Definition	Weight	Rating Determination (1-5)	Offeror 1		Offeror 2		Notes
				SUEZ Water Technologies	DuPont Water Solutions (Memcor)	DuPont Water Solutions (Memcor)	DuPont Water Solutions (Memcor)	
Capital cost	Cost of equipment and services specified to be provided by the Membrane System Supplier	25%		5	1.25	4	1	SUEZ - \$7,390,000; DuPont/Memcor - \$8,910,000, Memcor is 20.6% higher than SUEZ. Whereas SUEZ was less expensive, Memcor's design offered a robust system that allows operational flexibility and expandability within the proposed system.
Operating Cost	Present Worth of the annual costs for operating the membrane system, including power, chemicals, and membrane replacement.	25%		3	0.75	5	1.25	SUEZ - \$2,887,952; DuPont/Memcor - \$2,656,992, SUEZ is 8.7% higher than DuPont/Memcor. The DuPont/Memcor membranes appeared to have a slightly longer lifespan than the SUEZ membranes based on the review of their installations, and their pinning procedures are less labor-intensive as compared to the SUEZ membranes.
Quality and Details of Proposal	Quality and completeness of the Proposal based on the information requested in the Instructions to Bidders and quality of interview presentation	10%	Rating (1-5) based on overall review of the proposal, including the completeness of the drawings, equipment specifications, calculations, and functional description of the system.	3	0.3	4	0.4	Both proposals provided key information requested, including scope description, pilot unit, references, design calculations, PIDs, electrical load list, equipment cut sheet, and layout drawings. The overall quality and presentation of the DuPont/Memcor's proposal was better. In addition, DuPont/Memcor's interview presentation was well delivered to address all interview questions.
Availability of Pilot and Ability to Meet the Project Schedule	Ability to meet the specified delivery schedule, review of pilot cost, and proposed pilot team and technical service during pilot	5%	Rating (1 to 5) based on overall review of the pilot cost, schedule, and technical support during piloting	3	0.15	4	0.2	DuPont/Memcor's pilot cost is less than SUEZ's; DuPont/Memcor explicitly stated during interview that their membrane pilot unit was reserved for the project. Coordination has been made with pretreatment pilot supplier and a unit was reserved for the project. In addition, DuPont/Memcor has assigned a local technical service team who be responsible for pilot daily check-in and operation to support the project team.
Demonstrated Experience with Plant of Similar Capacity Treating Water of Similar Water Quality (raw water quality, finished water quality, operation history such as flux rate, etc.)	Number of surface water plants treating water of similar nature	10%	Rating (1 to 5) based on overall review of installation list and project references	4.5	0.45	4	0.4	Both provided a well-established installation list and project references.
Ability to Integrate New Membrane System into the Plant	Ability of membrane system facilities to work within the design, minimizing impacts to plant operation	2%	5 = No impacts 4 = Some impacts to plant (s) 3 = Moderate impacts to plant 2 = Significant impacts to plant 1 = Major impacts to plant	3	0.06	3	0.06	Both systems will require a careful staging and sequencing plan during retrofit and both discussed their proposed plan in the proposal and during the interview.
Qualifications as Defined in Bidders Qualification Statement	Membrane supplier qualifications related to staff, subcontractors; location of staff to cover O&M issues	4%	Rating (1 to 5) based on overall review of support staff location, quality of personnel resumes and subcontractors to be used.	4	0.16	5	0.2	Both meet qualifications required. DuPont/Memcor included a list of specific people/resumes in the proposal, as well as each individual's role and responsibility.
Acceptance of Terms & Conditions	Quantity and acceptability of exceptions taken to Contract Terms	8%	5 = No exceptions 4 = Minor exceptions 3 = Moderate exceptions 2 = Several exceptions 1 = Excessive exceptions	3	0.24	3	0.24	Both requested exceptions to City purchasing agreement (under review by City Legal), and both indicated that they are open to negotiation for a mutual agreement.
Complies with Equipment Specifications	Quantity and acceptability of exceptions taken to Technical Specs	6%	5 = Exceeds specs 4 = Meets all specs 3 = Some deviations to specs 2 = Significant deviations to specs 1 = Major deviations from specs	3	0.18	3	0.18	Both requested exceptions to technical specifications (currently being reviewed by the project team).
Acceptance of Membrane Module Warranty Conditions	Quantity and acceptability of exceptions taken to Warranty Conditions	5%	5 = Provisions for extended year warranty 4 = No exceptions to warranty provisions 3 = Minor exceptions to warranty provisions 2 = Major exceptions to warranty provisions 1 = Excessive exceptions to warranty provisions	3	0.15	3	0.15	Both requested exceptions; however, they are willing to discuss with the city to reach a mutually agreeable warranty.
Total Points		100%			3.69		4.08	
TOTAL POINTS BASED ON A 100-POINT SCALE					73.8		81.6	