

Budget: \$300,000

October 6, 2020 11:00 a.m. via Webex

Project Relative Weight	Dannenbaum Engineering			Average Team Score
	E1	E2	E3	92.33
Background of Respondent - 10 pts				
Background of Respondent - 10 pts	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.7
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 5 pts				
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 5 pts	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
References, including PHA project examples - 10 pts				
References, including PHA project examples - 10 pts	7.0	10.0	10.0	9.0
Quality of Respondent's services - 5 pts				
Quality of Respondent's services - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects - 5 pts				
Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7
Respondent's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts				
Respondent's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.3
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	34.0	36.0	40.0	36.7
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 45 pts				
Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned personnel related to this project - 15 pts				
Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned personnel related to this project - 15 pts	10.0	14.0	14.0	12.7
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 10 pts				
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 10 pts	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.7
Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 5 pts				
Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Personnel's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts				
Personnel's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7
Personel capabilities and resilience - 5 pts				
Personel capabilities and resilience - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7
Personnel's past professional reputation - 5 pts				
Personnel's past professional reputation - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	38.0	40.0	44.0	40.7
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 10 pts				
Methodology Proposed to perform the Port Authority projects and services - 3 pts				
Methodology Proposed to perform the Port Authority projects and services - 3 pts	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Plan for Communicating with the Port Authority - 1 pts				
Plan for Communicating with the Port Authority - 1 pts	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Any unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods related to this project- 2 pts				
Any unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods related to this project- 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Presentation of the important issues to consider in this project (see FICAP reports in Exhibit No. 3) - 4 pts				
Presentation of the important issues to consider in this project (see FICAP reports in Exhibit No. 3) - 4 pts	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts				
Understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts				
Understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Clarity and Brevity of Response - 2 pts				
Clarity and Brevity of Response - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Thoroughness of Response, including submission of all items required by the RFQ - 1 pt				
Thoroughness of Response, including submission of all items required by the RFQ - 1 pt	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES				92.3

FOR ED AND PORT COMMISSION ONLY

RFQ-1615 Repair Terminal

Budget: \$300,000

Project Relative Weight	Jacob Engineering Group, Inc			Average Team Score	Lanier & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc			Average Team Score
	E1	E2	E3		E1	E2	E3	
				86.67				71.33
Background of Respondent - 10 pts								
Background of Respondent - 10 pts	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.7	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.7
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 5 pts								
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 5 pts	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
References, including PHA project examples - 10 pts								
References, including PHA project examples - 10 pts	9.0	9.0	6.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	4.0	6.3
Quality of Respondent's services - 5 pts								
Quality of Respondent's services - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.3
Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects - 5 pts								
Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects - 5 pts	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.7
Respondent's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts								
Respondent's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	3.0
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	35.0	33.0	32.0	33.3	27.0	33.0	27.0	29.0
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 45 pts								
Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned personnel related to this project - 15 pts								
Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned personnel related to this project - 15 pts	10.0	14.0	15.0	13.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 10 pts								
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 10 pts	6.0	7.0	9.0	7.3	6.0	7.0	10.0	7.7
Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 5 pts								
Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Personnel's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts								
Personnel's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.3	5.0	3.0	1.0	3.0
Personel capabilities and resilience - 5 pts								
Personel capabilities and resilience - 5 pts	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.7
Personnel's past professional reputation - 5 pts								
Personnel's past professional reputation - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	34.0	38.0	44.0	38.7	34.0	33.0	36.0	34.3
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 10 pts								
Methodology Proposed to perform the Port Authority projects and services - 3 pts								
Methodology Proposed to perform the Port Authority projects and services - 3 pts	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.7
Plan for Communicating with the Port Authority - 1 pts								
Plan for Communicating with the Port Authority - 1 pts	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.3
Any unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods related to this project- 2 pts								
Any unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods related to this project- 2 pts	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Presentation of the important issues to consider in this project (see FICAP reports in Exhibit No. 3) - 4 pts								
Presentation of the important issues to consider in this project (see FICAP reports in Exhibit No. 3) - 4 pts	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.7	6.0	3.0	4.0	4.3
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts								
Understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts								
Understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.3
Clarity and Brevity of Response - 2 pts								
Clarity and Brevity of Response - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.7
Thoroughness of Response, including submission of all items required by the RFQ - 1 pt								
Thoroughness of Response, including submission of all items required by the RFQ - 1 pt	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.7
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.0	3.7
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES				86.7				71.3

FOR ED AND PORT COMMISSION ONLY

RFQ-1615 Repair

Budget: \$300,000

Project Relative Weight	Laurence & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc			Average Team Score	Moffatt & Nichol			Average Team Score
	E1	E2	E3	75.00	E1	E2	E3	90.33
Background of Respondent - 10 pts	10.0	8.0	5.0	7.7	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.7
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 5 pts	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.3	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
References, including PHA project examples - 10 pts	7.0	10.0	2.0	6.3	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.7
Quality of Respondent's services - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.3
Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects - 5 pts	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Respondent's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	1.0	3.3	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	34.0	35.0	23.0	30.7	35.0	38.0	38.0	37.0
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 45 pts								
Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned personnel related to this project - 15 pts	10.0	12.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	12.7
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 10 pts	6.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.3
Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Personnel's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	1.0	3.3	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7
Personel capabilities and resilience - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Personnel's past professional reputation - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	36.0	37.0	29.0	34.0	38.0	41.0	43.0	40.7
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 10 pts								
Methodology Proposed to perform the Port Authority projects and services - 3 pts	3.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.3
Plan for Communicating with the Port Authority - 1 pts	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Any unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods related to this project- 2 pts	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.3
Presentation of the important issues to consider in this project (see FICAP reports in Exhibit No. 3) - 4 pts	2.0	2.0	1.0		4.0	2.0	3.0	
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	7.0	6.0	4.0	5.7	10.0	6.0	7.0	7.7
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts								
Understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Clarity and Brevity of Response - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Thoroughness of Response, including submission of all items required by the RFQ - 1 pt	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES				75.0				90.3

FOR ED AND PORT COMMISSION ONLY

RFQ-1615 Repair

Budget: \$300,000

Project Relative Weight	WJE Associates, Inc			Average Team Score	WSP USA, Inc			Average Team Score
	E1	E2	E3	86.00	E1	E2	E3	90.67
Background of Respondent - 10 pts	10.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.7
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
References, including PHA project examples - 10 pts	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.7	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Quality of Respondent's services - 5 pts	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.3
Respondent's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.7	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.3
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	36.0	38.0	30.0	34.7	38.0	38.0	39.0	38.3
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 45 pts								
Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned personnel related to this project - 15 pts	10.0	14.0	12.0	12.0	11.0	14.0	12.0	12.3
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 10 pts	9.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	8.0
Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Personnel's Past Relation with the Port Authority - 5 pts	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Personel capabilities and resilience - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.7
Personnel's past professional reputation - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.0
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	37.0	41.0	36.0	38.0	37.0	40.0	37.0	38.0
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 10 pts								
Methodology Proposed to perform the Port Authority projects and services - 3 pts	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Plan for Communicating with the Port Authority - 1 pts	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Any unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods related to this project- 2 pts	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Presentation of the important issues to consider in this project (see FICAP reports in Exhibit No. 3) - 4 pts	4.0	2.0	3.0		4.0	3.0	3.0	
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	10.0	6.0	9.0	8.3	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.3
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts								
Understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Clarity and Brevity of Response - 2 pts	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Thoroughness of Response, including submission of all items required by the RFQ - 1 pt	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES				86.0				90.7

FOR ED AND PORT COMMISSION ONLY