

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study

OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

Firm	Average Evaluation Score
Wildan Financial Service	96.0
NewGen Strategies and Solutions, LLC.	93.0
Carollo Engineers, Inc.	92.0
Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc. (DBA Raftelis)	83.0
Schneider Engineering, LLC. Db Senenergy	56.0

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

Evaluator		Evaluator #1		Evaluator #2		Evaluator #3	
Proposer		Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Rating	Points
Wildan Financial Service		Acceptable		Acceptable		Acceptable	
5500 Democracy Dr., Ste. 130							
Plano, TX 75024							
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)		Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)		Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	14
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)		Acceptable	18	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	18
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)		Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	7
Sec. 5. Technical Approach (20 Maximum Points)		Acceptable	18	Acceptable	19	Acceptable	18
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)		Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	8
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)		Acceptable	19	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	18
Final Determination of Review		Acceptable	95	Acceptable	99	Acceptable	88

Notes:

Strengths: (EV1) *The dedicated key personnel have relevant experience.*; Firm has clearly shown its experier Relevant and verifiable references.; Clear breakout of fee structure by the type of service. Cost is at a reduced p consultants.; *Mr. Goral has experience on similar projects.*; - *Rate Study for Harlingen, Brownsville, Edinburg; Pr understanding of the complexities involved.*; The plan consists of 6 phases that will be executed over 6 months ; **(EV5)** Over 25 years of experience as consultants working close with municipalities. The project's scope is well

Weaknesses:

Comments: (EV1) (EV2) Based off price & experience this is the best option. **(EV3)** It seems that the Com Willdan currently has 93 employees. Willdan will have a sub-contractor, MSW Consultants, a Refuse Consulting Mission's Utility Rate Study.; *It seems that the Team selected has education, knowledge, and experience with M samples of prior Rate Study Projects completed, including a past experience Client List was provided by their Pl Comprehensive Utility Rate Study Projects and Company mentions the three (3) local cities, Harlingen, Brownsvi Brownsville are continued Projects as needed.*; The Company provided a customized Work Plan with 7 Phases sewer, drainage, garbage and brush rate structures and revenues, including IMPACT FEES (emphasis added)." intended to recalculate impact fees under Chapter 395 of Texas Local Government Code." And state that recalcul Company will perform an impact fee study with an additional scope and fee.; The Company outlined a detailed 8 specific tasks" to be developed for the Rate Study Project (pgs 15 – 20). And offered a Timeline on page 21 for e Services Client List from the office of Plano, Texas was provided of their National experience starting with a total from with in the USA with 10 Pacific Region These studies include water, wastewater, gas, electric, sanitation an Harlingen and Brownsville active, as needed.; It seems the Company's proposal offers knowledge and experien cost of \$227,441.

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

Evaluator	Evaluator #1		Evaluator #2		Evaluator #3	
	Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Rating	Points
Proposer						
NewGen Strategies and Solutions, LLC. 275 W. Campbell Rd., Ste. 440 Richardson, TX 75080	Acceptable		Acceptable		Acceptable	
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	14
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	19	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	17
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	9	Acceptable	8
Sec. 5. Technical Approach (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	9	Acceptable	10
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	16	Acceptable	20
Final Determination of Review	Acceptable	95	Acceptable	90	Acceptable	92

Notes:

Strengths: (EV1) *The entire team displays excellent qualifications.; Local and verifiable references provided.; over 36 years of experience.; They have done similar studies for other cities.; they have the ability to meet their commitments.; They have completed 10 projects for cities focusing on developing and implementing improvements.; Overall the team is experienced and capable.*

Weaknesses: (EV1) (EV2) (EV4) *Project manager & consultant have been with company less than 5 years.*

Comments: (EV1) (EV2) (EV3) *The Company seems to be clear in general quality and had an adequacy of staff having at total of 150 years of experience.; It seems that the selected Team of nine (9) Studies ranging from 36 years to 1 year experience (new).; Overall the Company states that they have complete currently one (1) local city project pending for completion on Water and Wastewater Rate Study and have completed shows the majority Water and Wastewater and Sanitation Rate Studies were completed in the state of Texas.; Project. And they also attached seven (7) Projects they have completed for the Water, Sewer and Solid Waste Rate Study requesting from the City for their Utility Rate Study Analysis.; The Company is clear in formulating a detailed rate Study Sample for Water and Sewer and Solid Waste and have a total of ten (10) references.; The Company is a local valley city, Weslaco. The Company mentions they have ten (10) references on working with the Rate Study of costs for the Study on pages 27 to 28 with a timeline. \$171,449. (EV5) I would have preferred if this presented*

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

Evaluator						
	Evaluator #1		Evaluator #2		Evaluator #3	
Proposer	Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Rating	Points

Carollo Engineers, Inc. 3700 N. 10th Street, Ste. 307 McAllen, TX 78501		Acceptable		Acceptable		Acceptable	
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5	
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	14	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	14	
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	19	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18	
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	9	Acceptable	8	
Sec. 5. Technical Approach (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18	
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	9	Acceptable	9	
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	17	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	18	
Final Determination of Review	Acceptable	93	Acceptable	89	Acceptable	90	

Notes:

Strengths: (EV1) Local firm available and team displays much relevant experience.; Relevant experience with services to be provided. (EV2) (EV3) (EV4) Fully understands the scope of this project.; They are industry le conducted and completed over 300 rate studies since 2015.; Describes teh study detailed pages 16-20 and work supports their conclusion.; (EV4) The price is higher than other similar studies. (EV5) Carollo fully understar

Weaknesses: (EV1) (EV2) (EV4) doesn't indicate how long project will last. (EV5) It doesn't indicate how lo

Comments: (EV2) (EV3) It seems that the Company prepared a crystal clear proposal for the Comprehensive sub-Contractors.; It seems that the selected Team of seven (7) has education, knowledge, and experience with completed over 300 Comprehensive Utility Rate Study Projects and although the Sanitation Fund was not mentik with a 10-year financial forecast as well.; The Company did not provide a Timeline Table or Graph of the duratior Tasks to be completed for the Comprehensive Utility Rate Study deliverable process for a 4-10 year financial fore proposal; but was submitted, as requested, the signed form in a separate loose sheet as an attachment.; The Cc will impact our City's current customers as part of the forecasting and planning of any financial implementation.; confidence to deliver a worthwhile financial Comprehensive Utility Rate Study (\$350,000).;

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

Evaluator						
	Evaluator #1		Evaluator #2		Evaluator #3	
Proposer	Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Rating	Points

Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc. (DBA Raftelis) 3755 S. Capital of Texas Highway, Bldg 1, Ste. Austin, TX 78704		Acceptable		Acceptable		Acceptable	
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5	
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	13	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10	
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	17	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	17	
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	9	Acceptable	8	Acceptable	8	
Sec. 5. Technical Apporoach (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	16	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15	
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	8	Acceptable	8	Acceptable	5	
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	12	
Final Determination of Review	Acceptable	83	Acceptable	76	Acceptable	72	

Notes:

Strengths: (EV1) The firm and its subs include excellent qualifications. Local office available for subs.; The fin outlined.; **(EV2) (EV3) (EV4)** Show a solid understanding of the projects scope and indicates availability to tra References for similar projects; *The project will last for six months.; Raftelis has listed more than 2k local govern project's scope and indicates availability to travel for any questions from the City or its representatives. They hav manager bring a wealth of experience to the table, with the project director having over 30 years of experience w*

Weaknesses: (EV1) (EV2) (EV4) Two subcontractors will be used depending on their availability.; Their cos depending on their availability.; Despite their extensive experience, their cost is higher than those of competitor f

Comments: (EV1) (EV2) (EV3) It seems that the Company prepared a clear proposal for the Comprehensive Company's Pool Staff Consultant Team consist of staff with a short time experience working on the Water, Wast for the Team Project is comprised of six (6) and do have Rate Study experience; also some clients are not of loc Management Capacity of the Scope of Work and Study Tasks to be completed. The Company appears to offer n clear for the Grand Total pricing on page 24 (asterisk) red asterisk is probably on the wrong row, might be a cleri Company's proposal offers knowledge and experience for a Comprehensive Utility Rate Study_ (\$363,163).

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

Evaluator						
	Evaluator #1		Evaluator #2		Evaluator #3	
Proposer	Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Rating	Points

Schneider Engineering, LLC. Db a Senergy							
191 Menger Springs Pkwy							
Boerne, TX 78006		Acceptable		Unacceptable		Acceptable	
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	5	
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	13	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	14	
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	17	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	17	
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	8	
Sec. 5. Technical Apporoach (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	16	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	15	
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	8	
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	17	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	20	
Final Determination of Review	Acceptable	83	Not Acceptable	0	Acceptable	87	

Notes:

Strengths: (EV1) Clear identification of successful past projects.; Clearly identified price proposal by project to implement.; **(EV5)** They have a clear understanding of the project that the municipality intends to implement.;

Weaknesses: (EV1) No local references to better understand past performance compared to City's needs.; O may be needed. **(EV2) (EV4)** They have conducted 3 studies on water and wastewater, but non on sewer drain

Comments: (EV2) Looking for more experience.; **(EV3)** Company seems to be clear in their Comprehensive seven (7) with education, knowledge, and experience qualifications working with Municipal Utility Rate Studies. 1 staff member.; The LLC Company seem to have (2) Water and Sewer Rate Study client experience and have h staff that will be working on the Rate Study are provided._ Company has provided three (3) Texas Water and Wa Wastewater Rate Study Projects and are attached to the proposal along with seven (7) Electric and Gas Utility R 22 of the Utility Rate Study Timeline and forecasting analysis, including a 10-Year Study Financial Assessment a Proposal.; It seems the Company meets the required three (3) List of similar project Rate Study references.; It se Utility Rate Study._ Although it appears that Electric is the Utility the company is mostly experienced working on project have experience in electrical field.; Other companies take more or less 6 months, they are aiming for 4 m assigned to the project have experience in electrical field.; While other companies typically take and average of s months. Comparing this timeline to those of other studies, I believe SeEnergy is underestimating the time require developed, and completed in 4 phases.;

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

	Evaluator						
	Evaluator #4		Evaluator #5				
Proposer	Rating	Points	Rating	Points			Average
Wildan Financial Service							96
5500 Democracy Dr., Ste. 130							
Plano, TX 75024	Acceptable		Acceptable				
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5			
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15			
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	20			
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10			
Sec. 5. Technical Apporoach (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18			
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10			
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	20			
Final Determination of Review	Acceptable	98	Acceptable	98			

Notes:

Strengths: (Eice with similar performance projects.; Clearly structured plan of action.; Relevant and verice for full service. (EV2) (EV3) (EV4) Over 25 years of experience as consultants.; Meviouse projects conducted with other municipalities have shown an understanding period.; They have completed over 198 projects.; They offer reasonable cost. (EV5) Over 25 defined and includes specific start and end dates.; Mr. Goral, project

Weaknesses:

Comments: (pany prepared a clear proposal for the Comprehensive Utility Rate Study. Willdan currentl Firm and it has 15 staff and associates and 4 staff will be assigned to work Mission's Utilitylunicipal Utility Rate Studies. The resumes provided are clear and have samples of prioano Office.; It seems the Company states that they have completed over 400 Comprehensiveville, and Edinburg are included as references and noted that Harlingen and Brownsville are on page 14 and added a note stating that they "will evaluate current water, sewer, drainage they highlighted "impact fees" specifically stating that "this Project IS NOT intended to reculation of impact fees, is a different process than a Utility Rate Study._The Company will pt Task Step Plan or "system-specific project management plan with system-specific tasks" tan expected 6 month duration to complete the Study.; The Willdan Financial Services Client' of 121 Cities from Texas, 47 Cities from Arkansas, 7 Cities from Oklahoma, 4 from with in the d/or solid waste utility systems. Currently the company states they have Harlingen and Ece to deliver a financial Comprehensive Utility Rate Study with a proposed cost of \$227,44

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

	Evaluator						
	Evaluator #4		Evaluator #5				
Proposer		Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Average	
NewGen Strategies and Solutions, LLC.						93	
275 W. Campbell Rd., Ste. 440							
Richardson, TX 75080		Acceptable		Acceptable			
	Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	4	Acceptable	4		
	Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	14	Acceptable	14		
	Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18		
	Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10		
	Sec. 5. Technical Approach (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	20		
	Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	9	Acceptable	9		
	Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	20		
	Final Determination of Review	Acceptable	95	Acceptable	95		

Notes:

Strengths: (E) Price Proposal clearly outlined. (EV2) (EV3) (EV4) Project manager has over 36 years of experience.; They provided a 6 month study and its detailed cost breakdown.; They have completed cost for this project is very reasonable.; (EV5) Based on the 4 points

Weaknesses: (EV5) The water project manager and the construction assigned to this

Comments: () responses for Utility Rate Study. The LLC company was established in August 2012, yet has education, knowledge, and experience with Municipal Utility Rate Studies ranging over 1200 Comprehensive Utility Rate Study Projects and that it has currently one (1) to six (6) Texas Projects recently. The U.S. map provided on page 17 shows the majorThe Company provided a Timeline Table or Graph of the duration of the Project. And the Study The Company has a clear concise detail of the data they will be requesting from design on page 20 and also the exhibit 1 on page 22 offers a 5-year Rate Study Sample currently working with delivering their Comprehensive Utility Rate Study to a local valley city.; It seems the Company's proposal offers a concise clear fee structure detail of costs for the portion began with NewGen Introduction and past projects.;

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

		Evaluator						
		Evaluator #4		Evaluator #5				
Proposer		Rating	Points	Rating	Points			Average
								Average
Carollo Engineers, Inc.		Acceptable		Acceptable				92
3700 N. 10th Street, Ste. 307								
McAllen, TX 78501								
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5				
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15				
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	20				
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	9	Acceptable	9				
Sec. 5. Technical Apporoch (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	20				
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10				
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15				
Final Determination of Review	Acceptable	94	Acceptable	94				

Notes:

Strengths: (E) larger municipalities.; *Successful projects provided.*; Pricing clearly outlines services to be paders on thsi project and have over 10 years of experience.; They have conducted and c plan covered on pages 21-23.; *The work done in four major cities supports their nds the scope of this project.; They are industry leaders on this project. Some*

Weaknesses:ng this project will last.;

Comments: (e Utility Rate Study and with 16 years in existence, the company will have no sub-ContractorsMunicipal Utility Rate Studies.; Overall the Company states that they have completed overoned they were clear to state that they will contact 10 local cities to provide us with a 10-year fin of the Project. Yet, they did provide details of the Scope of Work and Study Tasks to be corecast.; The Company did not include the pricing form in the bounded proposal; but wampany offers three (3) Challenges for this Study as recommendations that will impact our (The Company's proposal offers knowledge, experience and mentioned confidence to d

PROPOSAL NAME/NUMBER: 26-469-06-15 / Comprehensive Utility Rate Study



OPEN DATE: June 22, 2026 2:00 PM CST

	Evaluator						
			Evaluator #4		Evaluator #5		
Proposer		Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Average	
							Average
Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc. (DBA Raftelis)						83	
3755 S. Capital of Texas Highway, Bldg 1, Ste. Austin, TX 78704		Acceptable		Acceptable			
Sec. 1. General Quality and Adequacy of Response (05 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	5	Acceptable	5			
Sec. 2. Project Team Qualifications (15 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	15	Acceptable	15			
Sec. 3. Firm Experience (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	20	Acceptable	20			
Sec. 4. Capacity to Perform (10 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10			
Sec. 5. Technical Apporoach (20 Maximum Points)	Acceptable	18	Acceptable	18			
Sec. 6. References & Past Performance (10 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	10	Acceptable	10			
Sec. 7. Pricing & Fees (20 Total Maximum Points)	Acceptable	14	Acceptable	14			
Final Determination of Review		Acceptable	92	Acceptable	92		

Notes:

Strengths: (E)n displays much experience with similar project types.; Optinal services cleary outlined.; (EV)2vel.; project manager & manager bring alot of experience to the table.; References for iment agencies.; (EV5) The cover letter shows a solid understanding of the project's scope e several years of experience in this field.; The project director and the manager bring zorking with various clients on rate studies. The team chosen for this project

Weaknesses: it is higher for the same study (EV5) Two subcontractors will be utilized depending on thor the same study.;

Comments: /e Utility Rate Study, the company will have sub-contractors.; It seems that the Company's Poæwater, Storm Water, Solid Waste Rate Study Experience.; The chosen staff for the Team Pral municipalities.; The Company provided a Timeline for an overall Project Management Cecomendations for each Utility Study.; The Pricing Schedule Table is not clear for the Græcal mistake.; The Company offers no local Utility Rate Studies; It seems the Company's proj

