Budget: \$ 250,000 02/24/2022 at 10:30 AM via Teams

| | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Evaluators: 1-Craig, 2-Ross, 3-Daniel, 4-Nathan | | RPS (| Group | | Average Team Score | Lockwood, Andrews & Newnam, Inc. | | | | Average Team Score |
| Project Relative Weight | | | | | | | | | | |
| SMWBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspirational Goal | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculation of SMWBE Participation | 0.00% | | | | 92.50 | | 0.00 | % | | 90.75 |
| · | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | |
| Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 25 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Background of Respondent - 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 |
| Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 3 pts | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.00 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.00 |
| References, including government project examples - 5 pts | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.50 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.50 |
| Quality of Respondent's services -2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects, including, if required, | | | | | | | | | | |
| the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 5 pts | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4.25 |
| Respondent's Past Performance - 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.25 |
| Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service | 23.00 | 25.00 | 23.00 | 25.00 | 24.00 | 22.00 | 24.00 | 21.00 | 25.00 | 23.00 |
| Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| • • | | I | | | | | T . | | | |
| Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned personnel- 15 pts | 15.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 14.00 | 15.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 14.25 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 14.00 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 13.0 | 14.23 |
| Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, | | | | | | | | | | |
| including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - | 9.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 9.25 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 8.75 |
| 10 pts | 9.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 9.23 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.73 |
| Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 |
| 5 pts | 10.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 9.25 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 8.75 |
| Personnel's Past Performance -10 pts | 39.00 | 37.00 | 33.00 | 40.00 | 37.25 | 38.00 | 36.00 | 33.00 | | 36.75 |
| Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience | 39.00 | 37.00 | 33.00 | 40.00 | 31.23 | 38.00 | 30.00 | 33.00 | 40.00 | 30.73 |
| Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 30 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Methodology Proposed - 10 pts | 10.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 9.50 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.50 |
| Plan for Communication with Port Houston - 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or | | | | | | | | | | |
| environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods- 5 pts | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.75 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.75 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed schedule for planning and design activities, including deliverables at | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30%, 60%, 100%, and issue for construction documents - 10 pts | 9.0 | 10.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 8.75 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 9.00 |
| Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits | 28.00 | 28.00 | 22.00 | 29.00 | 26.75 | 26.00 | 28.00 | 25.00 | 25.00 | 26.00 |
| O HC P MADE: 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| Clarity, Robustness and Brevity of Response, including submission of all items | | | | | | | | | | |
| required by RFQ - 1 pts | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| Willingness to employ small business and MWBEs to the extent they are | | | | | | | | | | |
| qualified, available, and cost competitive- 2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.50 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| · | | | • | | | | | | | |
| TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES | | | | | 92.50 | | | | | 90.75 |

| Budget. \$ 250,000 02/24/2022 at 10.50 Alvi via Teams | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|--------------------|-------|
| Evaluators: 1-Craig, 2-Ross, 3-Daniel, 4-Nathan | KIT Professionals Inc. Average Team Score | | | | | | DE (| C orp. | Average Team Score | |
| Project Relative Weight | i i | | | | | | | | | |
| SMWBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspirational Goal | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculation of SMWBE Participation | 0.00% 89.75 | | | | | 0.0 | 0% | 88.25 | | |
| Calculation of Sivivible Participation | 0.0076 | | | | 89.75 | | 0.0 | 0 70 | 00.25 | |
| | E1 E2 E3 E4 | | | | | E1 | E2 | E3 | | |
| Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 25 pts | E1 E2 E3 E4 | | | | EI | E.Z | E3 | | | |
| Background of Respondent - 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 |
| Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 3 pts | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.75 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.50 |
| References, including government project examples - 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.25 |
| Quality of Respondent's services -2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects, including, if required, | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 5 pts | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4.00 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4.25 |
| Respondent's Past Performance - 5 pts | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.25 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service | 23.00 | 22.00 | 21.00 | 25.00 | 22.75 | 19.00 | 25.00 | 19.00 | 21.00 | 21.00 |
| Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service | 23.00 | 22.00 | 21.00 | 23.00 | 22.13 | 17.00 | 23.00 | 17.00 | 21.00 | 21.00 |
| Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned | | | | | | | | | | |
| personnel- 15 pts | 14.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 13.50 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 13.25 |
| 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 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 9.00 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 8.25 |
| Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 |
| Personnel's Past Performance -10 pts | 9.0 | 8.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 8.25 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 8.50 |
| Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience | 38.00 | 34.00 | 32.00 | 39.00 | 35.75 | 34.00 | 37.00 | 30.00 | 39.00 | 35.00 |
| Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 30 pts | | | | | | | • | | • | |
| Methodology Proposed - 10 pts | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 8.50 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 9.00 |
| Plan for Communication with Port Houston - 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 |
| rian for Communication with role flouston - 5 pts | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or | - 0 | 2.0 | | - 0 | 405 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | - 0 | |
| environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods- 5 pts | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.25 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.25 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed schedule for planning and design activities, including deliverables at | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30%, 60%, 100%, and issue for construction documents - 10 pts | 10.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 7.0 | 8.75 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 9.00 |
| Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits | 28.00 | 26.00 | 24.00 | 27.00 | 26.25 | 28.00 | 29.00 | 25.00 | 27.00 | 27.25 |
| Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| Clarity, Robustness and Brevity of Response, including submission of all items | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 | 1.0 | 1.0 | | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| required by RFQ - 1 pts | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| Willingness to employ small business and MWBEs to the extent they are | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| qualified, available, and cost competitive- 2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES | | | | | 00.75 | | | | | 00.35 |
| TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES | | | | | 89.75 | | | | | 88.25 |

RFQ-2079 Planning and design of Water Supply and Fire Protection Systems at Barbours Cut Terminal

| Budget: \$ 250,000 02/24/2022 at 10:30 AM via Teams | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------------|----------------------|-------|--------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Evaluators: 1-Craig, 2-Ross, 3-Daniel, 4-Nathan | | | ng, LLC ring, LLC | | Average Team Score | Schaumburg & Polk Inc. | | | | Average Team Score |
| Project Relative Weight | · | | | | | | | | | |
| SMWBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspirational Goal | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculation of SMWBE Participation | | 0.00% 75.75 | | | | | 0.0 | 0% | 75.50 | |
| Calculation of SWIWBE Participation | 0.00% | | | 75.75 | | 0.0 | U%o | | /5.50 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | |
| Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 25 pts | | | | | | 4.0 | | | | |
| Background of Respondent - 5 pts | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.00 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 3 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.50 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.75 |
| References, including government project examples - 5 pts | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.00 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Quality of Respondent's services -2 pts | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.50 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 |
| Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects, including, if required, | | | | | | | | | | |
| the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 5 pts | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.25 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.25 |
| Respondent's Past Performance - 5 pts | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.75 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service | 19.00 | 16.00 | 19.00 | 18.00 | 18.00 | 20.00 | 21.00 | 19.00 | 20.00 | 20.00 |
| D | | | | | | | | | | |
| Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts | | | | ı | | | | ı | 1 | |
| Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned | 10.0 | | 100 | 10.0 | 10.25 | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.50 |
| personnel- 15 pts | 12.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 10.25 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.50 |
| 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 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 9.0 | 7.25 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.00 |
| Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.50 |
| Personnel's Past Performance -10 pts | 8.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.75 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 8.00 |
| Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience | 33.00 | 24.00 | 27.00 | 33.00 | 29.25 | 33.00 | 33.00 | 30.00 | 32.00 | 32.00 |
| Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 30 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Methodology Proposed - 10 pts | 7.0 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.50 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 6.75 |
| Plan for Communication with Port Houston - 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.75 |
| That is communication with orthodoxon of pro | | 5.0 | | 2.0 | | 5.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 2.25 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.77 |
| environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods- 5 pts | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.25 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.75 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed schedule for planning and design activities, including deliverables at | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30%, 60%, 100%, and issue for construction documents - 10 pts | 9.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 8.25 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.25 |
| Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits | 24.00 | 21.00 | 22.00 | 28.00 | 23.75 | 22.00 | 21.00 | 20.00 | 19.00 | 20.50 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.75 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.25 |
| Clarity, Robustness and Brevity of Response, including submission of all items | | | | | | | | | | |
| required by RFQ - 1 pts | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| Willingness to employ small business and MWBEs to the extent they are | | | | | | | | | | |
| qualified, available, and cost competitive- 2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.75 |
| Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies | 5.00 | 4.00 | 2.0 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies | 5.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 4.73 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES | | | | | 75.75 | | | | | 75.50 |

RFQ-2079 Planning and design of Water Supply and Fire Protection Systems at Barbours Cut Terminal

| Evaluators: 1-Craig, 2-Ross, 3-Daniel, 4-Nathan | Neera Associates, Inc. Average Team Score | | | | | Jensen Hughes | | | | Average Team Score |
|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Project Relative Weight | | | | | | | | | | |
| SMWBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspirational Goal | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculation of SMWBE Participation | 0.00% 71.50 | | | | | 0.0 | 00% | 66.00 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E1 E2 E3 E4 | | | | E1 | E2 | E3 | | | |
| Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 25 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Background of Respondent - 5 pts | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.25 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.75 |
| Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 3 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.25 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.50 |
| References, including government project examples - 5 pts | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.25 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.25 |
| Quality of Respondent's services -2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.75 |
| Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects, including, if required, | | | | | | | | | | |
| the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 5 pts | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.50 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.75 |
| Respondent's Past Performance - 5 pts | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.25 |
| Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service | 17.00 | 19.00 | 20.00 | 17.00 | 18.25 | 18.00 | 17.00 | 19.00 | 19.00 | 18.25 |
| Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned | | ı | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| personnel- 15 pts | 12.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 11.00 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 9.75 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 12.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 11.00 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 7.13 |
| Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Houston projects, | | | | | | | | | | |
| including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - | 7.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 7.25 | (0 | 7.0 | (0 | 5.0 | (00 |
| 10 pts | 7.0 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 7.0 | 7.25 | 6.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.00 |
| Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - | | | | 4.0 | 4.50 | | - 0 | - 0 | 2.0 | 4.50 |
| 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.50 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.50 |
| Personnel's Past Performance -10 pts | 8.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 8.0 | 7.25 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.50 |
| Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience | 32.00 | 29.00 | 30.00 | 29.00 | 30.00 | 28.00 | 27.00 | 30.00 | 22.00 | 26.75 |
| Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 30 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Methodology Proposed - 10 pts | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.00 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.00 |
| Plan for Communication with Port Houston - 5 pts | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.00 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or | | | | | | | | | | |
| environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods- 5 pts | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.75 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.75 |
| errinomiental considerations, sest practices, or quarty control methods is par | 5.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 21.0 |
| Proposed schedule for planning and design activities, including deliverables at | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30%, 60%, 100%, and issue for construction documents - 10 pts | 8.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 6.00 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.75 |
| Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits | 23.00 | 18.00 | 21.00 | 17.00 | 19.75 | 19.00 | 19.00 | 19.00 | 17.00 | 18.50 |
| Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits | 23.00 | 18.00 | 21.00 | 17.00 | 17.73 | 19.00 | 19.00 | 19.00 | 17.00 | 10.50 |
| Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.25 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.25 |
| Clarity, Robustness and Brevity of Response, including submission of all items | | | | | | | | | | |
| required by RFQ - 1 pts | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.75 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.73 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| Willingness to employ small business and MWBEs to the extent they are | | | | | | | | | | |
| qualified, available, and cost competitive- 2 pts | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.25 |
| Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies | 4.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 1.00 | 3.50 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 |
| TEAM AVEDACE TOTAL SCORES | | | | | 71 50 | | | | | 66.00 |
| TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES | | | | | 71.50 | | | | | 66.00 |

RFQ-2079 Planning and design of Water Supply and Fire Protection Systems at Barbours Cut Terminal

| Evaluators: 1-Craig, 2-Ross, 3-Daniel, 4-Nathan | Arcen | eaux Wils | on & Col | Average Team Score | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|--|
| Project Relative Weight | | | | | | |
| SMWBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% | | | | | | |
| Aspirational Goal | | | | | | |
| Calculation of SMWBE Participation | | 0.0 | 0% | | 55.50 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | | |
| Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 25 pts | | | | | | |
| Background of Respondent - 5 pts | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.50 | |
| Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 3 pts | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.75 | |
| References, including government project examples - 5 pts | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.25 | |
| Quality of Respondent's services -2 pts | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.75 | |
| Availability and Dedication of Resources to PHA projects, including, if required, | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.00 | |
| the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 5 pts | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.00 3.50 | |
| Respondent's Past Performance - 5 pts | 4.0 19.00 | 3.0 18.00 | 3.0 17.00 | 4.0 17.00 | 3.50 17.75 | |
| Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service | 19.00 | 18.00 | 17.00 | 17.00 | 17.75 | |
| Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts | | | | | | |
| Background, Reputation, Qualification and Relevant experience of assigned | | | | | | |
| personnel- 15 pts | 10.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 10.00 | |
| 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 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.00 | |
| Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - | | | | | | |
| 5 pts | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.75 | |
| Personnel's Past Performance -10 pts | 7.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 7.0 | 6.25 | |
| Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience | 27.00 | 27.00 | 26.00 | 24.00 | 26.00 | |
| Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 30 pts | | | | | | |
| Methodology Proposed - 10 pts | 5.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 3.75 | |
| Plan for Communication with Port Houston - 5 pts | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.50 | |
| Tidil for communication with Forthousion 5 pts | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 1.50 | |
| History Contribution of the Contribution of th | | | | | | |
| Unique or Specialized Processes, organization, capabilities, safety or | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.75 | |
| environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods- 5 pts | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1./5 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Proposed schedule for planning and design activities, including deliverables at | | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.55 | |
| 30%, 60%, 100%, and issue for construction documents - 10 pts | 5.0 | 0.0 | 9.00 | 4.0 | 2.75 9.75 | |
| Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits | 14.00 | 0.00 | 9.00 | 16.00 | 9.75 | |
| Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts | | | | | | |
| Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives - 2 pts | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.25 | |
| Clarity, Robustness and Brevity of Response, including submission of all items | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | | | |
| required by RFQ - 1 pts | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.50 | |
| | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.50 | |
| Willingness to employ small business and MWBEs to the extent they are | | | | | | |
| qualified, available, and cost competitive- 2 pts | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.25 | |
| Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies | 2.00 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | |
| TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES | | | | | 55.50 | |