

Port of Houston Authority Evaluation Form

Project: RFP-464 Container Capacity Assessment and Operational Options Study

Date: 10/03/2017 @ 2:00 P.M.

Estimate: \$250,000

			SELECTION CRITERIA						
			1	2	3	4	5		
Vendor	Proposal Amount	Small Business Information SB Goal SB Prime % SB Subs	Price	Respondent	Benefit to PHA	Compliance w/PHA Policies	Small Business Participation and Local Business	Total Score	Comments
Project Relative Weight (%)			15%	45%	30%	7%	3%	100%	
Moffatt & Nichol 1800 Hughes Landing Boulevard, Suite 450 The Woodlands, TX 77380	\$425,200.00	0% Goal 0% SB Sub	3.27	39	25	7	0	74.27	1. Highest price; it is an all-inclusive proposal however, including full model, updates, and one year support. No additional work required upon completion of contract scope. 2. "Most creditable proposer," displaying best understanding of underlying issues, with excellent references and extensive experience providing services of this type, including Bayport and BCT master planning services. 3. Excellent model, most useful and designed specifically for PHA (Flexterm software with license), including simulation and planning. 4. Vendor complied with all PHA guidelines. 5. Vendor did not meet Local Business requirement; however, vendor has a local presence.

Vendor	Proposal Amount	Small Business Information SB Goal SB Prime % SB Subs	Price	Respondent	Benefit to PHA	Compliance w/PHA Policies	Small Business Participation and Local Business	Total Score	Comments
Project Relative Weight (%)			15%	45%	30%	7%	3%	100%	
Mott MacDonald 10415 Marado Circle, Bldg. 1, Suite 300 Austin, TX 75759	\$126,128.00	0% Goal % SB Sub	10.21	26	21	7	0	64.21	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Second lowest price; price does not include model updates or license, however. 2. Good experience and expertise on less-relevant past projects (i.e. not container terminals); required to work from a distance; no particular planning expertise. 3. Static, less advanced model. Additional work would be required to change it; not part of proposal. Requires manual data entry. 4. Vendor complied with all PHA guidelines. 5. Vendor did not meet Local Business requirement; vendor working remotely.
TBA B.V. Karredpad 2a 2623AP Delft The Netherlands	\$92,700.00	0 % Goal 0% SB Sub	15	29	18	7	0	69	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lowest price; however, price did not include additional model updates and support. 2. Good international experience on relevant past projects; no PHA experience. 3. Microsoft Excel-based, static model; proprietary model, i.e. future changes to model inputs and simulation not included in scope; proposed services akin to a "data dump," and close to not being responsive. 4. Vendor complied with all PHA guidelines. 5. Vendor did not meet Local Business requirement; no local presence.

Vendor	Proposal Amount	Small Business Information SB Goal SB Prime % SB Subs	Price	Respondent	Benefit to PHA	Compliance w/PHA Policies	Small Business Participation and Local Business	Total Score	Comments
Project Relative Weight (%)			15%	45%	30%	7%	3%	100%	
HPC Hamburg Port Consulting GMBH Container Terminal Altenwerder Am Ballinkai 1 21129 Hamburg Germany	\$398,768.98	0% Goal 0% SB Sub	3.49	36	20	7	0	66.49	1. Third lowest price; price is exclusive of additional model updates and support. 2. Good international experience; past PHA experience not persuasive; value of subconsultants not clear. 3. Model is static, spreadsheet type, with no simulation capability. Because it was a proprietary model, future changes to model inputs and simulation not included. 4. Vendor complied with all PHA guidelines. 5. Vendor did not meet Local Business requirement; limited local presence.
WSP USA, Inc. 16200 Park Row, Suite 200 Houston, TX 77084	\$414,740.00	0 % Goal 0% SB Sub	3.35	32	17	7	0	59.35	1. Fourth lowest price; however, price is exclusive of additional model updates and support. 2. Good references and certain good experience; team did not appear to have planning experience with projects of this type. 3. Model approach appears to be "over engineered," and includes hard-coded aspects; because it is proprietary, additional updates must be performed by vendor. No simulation provided. 4. Vendor complied with all PHA guidelines. 5. Vendor did not meet Local Business requirement; however, the vendor does have a local presence.