Budget: \$2,500,000 7/25/2024 at 11:00 AM via Teams														
	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.							AECOM Technical Services, Inc.						
Project Relative Weight						Average Team Score						Average Team Score		
	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	94.5	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	93.0		
SBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% Aspirational Goal														
S/MWBE Participation - Excluded														
Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 20 pts														
Background of Respondent - 7 pts	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	6.8	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0		
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 8 pts	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.6	6.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.6		
References, including government project examples & Respondent's past performance - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	19.0	20.0	20.0	19.0	19.0	19.4	18.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	19.6		
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts														
Background, Reputation, Qualifications and Relevant experience of assigned personnel including Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 10 pts	10.0	10.0	9.5	10.0	9.0	9.7	9.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	9.4		
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Authority projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 15	10.0	10.0	7.3	10.0	7.0	<i>y</i>	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	<i></i>		
pts	14.0	14.0	14.5	13.0	14.0	13.9	13.0	14.0	14.0	13.0	12.0	13.2		
Personnel's Past Performance - 15 pts	13.0	14.0	15.0	14.0	15.0	14.2	13.0	14.0	14.0	15.0	12.0	13.6		
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	37.0	38.0	39.0	37.0	38.0	37.8	35.0	38.0	37.0	38.0	33.0	36.2		
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 35 pts														
The methodology proposed to perform Port Houston projects and services and plan for communicating with Port Houston - 10 pts	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	9.4	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.4		
Any unique or specialized processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods - 10 pts	10.0	9.0	9.5	9.0	8.0	9.1	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0		
Design schedule timeline (30%, 60%, 100% package) or the design duration for the final package for Phase 1 15 pts	13.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	13.8	15.0	14.0	14.0	13.0	13.0	13.8		
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	33.0	33.0	33.5	32.0	30.0	32.3	34.0	33.0	32.0	31.0	31.0	32.2		
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts														
Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives including, clarity, robustness, and brevity of Response, including submission of all items required by														
RFQ - 5 pts Total Average Overall Compliance with BHA Belisies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0 5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES						94.5						93.0		

D., J.,	62 500 000	7/25/2024 at 11:00 AM via Teams
Riluget.	\$7.500.000	///5//U/4 at 11:00 A VI VIA Leams

Budget: \$2,500,000 7/25/2024 at 11:00 AM VIa Teams														
	Hatch Associates Consultants, Inc.							Lockwood, Andrews & Newnam, Inc.						
Project Relative Weight						Average Team Score						Average Team Score		
	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	91.2	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	90.8		
SBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% Aspirational Goal														
S/MWBE Participation - Excluded														
Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 20 pts														
Background of Respondent - 7 pts	6.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	6.4	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.6		
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 8 pts	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.4	7.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.4		
Beferences, including government project examples & Respondent's past performance - 5 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	18.0	19.0	20.0	19.0	18.0	18.8	18.0	19.0	20.0	19.0	19.0	19.0		
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts														
Background, Reputation, Qualifications and Relevant experience of assigned personnel including Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 10 pts	9.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	8.8	9.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.8		
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Authority projects,	9.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	0.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	0.0	0.0		
including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 15														
pts	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	13.0	13.0	14.0	12.0	13.0	13.0		
Personnel's Past Performance - 15 pts	14.0	14.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.4	14.0	13.0	13.0	14.0	14.0	13.6		
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	37.0	37.0	34.0	37.0	36.0	36.2	36.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	35.0	35.4		
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 35 pts														
The methodology proposed to perform Port Houston projects and services and plan														
for communicating with Port Houston - 10 pts	9.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	9.2		
Any unique or specialized processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods - 10 pts	9.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.4	9.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	8.8		
Design schedule timeline (30%, 60%, 100% package) or the design														
duration for the final package for Phase 1 15 pts	14.0 32.0	14.0 33.0	14.0	13.0	14.0 31.0	13.8 31.2	13.0	12.0	15.0	13.0 32.0	14.0 32.0	13.4 31.4		
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	32.0	33.0	31.0	29.0	31.0	31.2	31.0	30.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	31.4		
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts														
Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives including, clarity, robustness, and brevity of Response, including submission of all items required by	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	<i>5</i> ^	5.0		
RFQ - 5 pts Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		
Total Average - Overall compliance with FITA Fullities	5.0	5.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	2.0		
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES						91.2						90.8		

Budget: \$2,500,000 7/25/2024 at 11:00 AM via Teams															
	Moffatt & Nichol							Lanier & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc.							
Project Relative Weight				_		Average Team Score		_	_			Average Team Score			
	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	83.2	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	79.2			
SBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% Aspirational Goal															
S/MWBE Participation - Excluded															
Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 20 pts															
Background of Respondent - 7 pts	7.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	6.2	6.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	5.8			
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 8 pts	6.0	7.0	8.0	5.0	7.0	6.6	6.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.8			
References, including government project examples & Respondent's past performance - 5 pts	5.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.4	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.6			
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	18.0	17.0	20.0	13.0	18.0	17.2	17.0	17.0	16.0	17.0	14.0	16.2			
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts															
Background, Reputation, Qualifications and Relevant experience of assigned personnel including Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 10 pts	9.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.8			
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Authority projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 15															
pts	13.0	12.0	13.0	11.0	13.0	12.4	12.0	12.0	13.0	11.0	13.0	12.2			
Personnel's Past Performance - 15 pts	13.0	12.0	13.0	11.0	13.0	12.4 32.8	13.0	13.0	12.0	12.0	13.0	12.6 32.6			
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	35.0	32.0	34.0	29.0	34.0	32.8	33.0	34.0	32.0	31.0	33.0	32.0			
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 35 pts															
The methodology proposed to perform Port Houston projects and services and plan for communicating with Port Houston - 10 pts	9.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.6	8.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	8.2			
Any unique or specialized processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods - 10 pts	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	8.2	7.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.2			
Design schedule timeline (30%, 60%, 100% package) or the design duration for the final package for Phase 1 15 pts	13.0	8.0	13.0	11.0	13.0	11.6	8.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	13.0	9.4			
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	30.0	24.0	29.0	30.0	29.0	28.4	23.0	21.0	24.0	32.0	29.0	25.8			
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts															
Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives including, clarity, robustness, and brevity of Response, including submission of all items required by						4.0									
RFQ - 5 pts Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6			
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0			
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES						83.2						79.2			

Budget: \$2,500,000 7/25/2024 at 11:00 AM via Teams														
	Patrick Engineering Inc.							TLC Engineering, Inc.						
Project Relative Weight						Average Team Score						Average Team Score		
	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	76.2	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	73.2		
SBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% Aspirational Goal														
S/MWBE Participation - Excluded														
Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 20 pts														
Background of Respondent - 7 pts	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	5.8	4.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.2		
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 8 pts	5.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.6	5.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.6		
Beferences, including government project examples & Respondent's past performance - 5 pts	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.6		
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	14.0	17.0	16.0	16.0	14.0	15.4	11.0	14.0	13.0	17.0	12.0	13.4		
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts														
Background, Reputation, Qualifications and Relevant experience of assigned personnel including Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and dedicated personnel - 10 pts	7.0	8.0	7.0	9.0	6.0	7.4	6.0	8.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	6.8		
Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Authority projects, including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 15	7.0	8.0	7.0	9.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0		
pts	10.0	12.0	12.0	13.0	12.0	11.8	10.0	11.0	11.0	12.0	13.0	11.4		
Personnel's Past Performance - 15 pts	10.0	12.0	11.0	13.0	12.0	11.6	10.0	11.0	11.0	12.0	12.0	11.2		
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	27.0	32.0	30.0	35.0	30.0	30.8	26.0	30.0	28.0	32.0	31.0	29.4		
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 35 pts														
The methodology proposed to perform Port Houston projects and services and plan for communicating with Port Houston - 10 pts	6.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	8.0	7.6	6.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	8.0	7.6		
Any unique or specialized processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods - 10 pts	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.8	6.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	7.8		
Design schedule timeline (30%, 60%, 100% package) or the design duration for the final package for Phase 1 15 pts	10.0	7.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	10.0	11.0	7.0	7.0	14.0	13.0	10.4		
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	23.0	23.0	22.0	30.0	29.0	25.4	23.0	23.0	20.0	34.0	29.0	25.8		
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts														
Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives including, clarity, robustness, and brevity of Response, including submission of all items required by														
RFQ - 5 pts	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6		
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0		
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES						76.2						73.2		

Budget: \$2,500,000 7/25/2024 at 11:00 AWI via Teams							
	Cobalt Engineering & Inspections, LLC						
Project Relative Weight						Average Team Score	
	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	65.8	
SBE Participation - 35% Organizational Goal/MWBE - 30% Aspirational Goal							
S/MWBE Participation - Excluded							
Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service - 20 pts							
Background of Respondent - 7 pts	4.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	4.8	
Reputation of Respondent and Respondent services - 8 pts	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.2	
References, including government project examples & Respondent's past							
performance - 5 pts	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Total Average - Respondents Reputation and Quality of Service	12.0	12.0	13.0	14.0	14.0	13.0	
Personnel, Qualification and Experience - 40 pts							
Background, Reputation, Qualifications and Relevant experience of assigned personnel including Certifications, Registrations, and Licenses of available and	5.0	60	6.0	8.0	7.0	6.4	
dedicated personnel - 10 pts Availability and Dedication of Qualified Personnel to Port Authority projects,	3.0	6.0	0.0	8.0	7.0	0.4	
including, if required, the ability to perform multiple projects at the same time - 15							
pts	9.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	9.6	
■ersonnel's Past Performance - 15 pts	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	13.0	10.4	
Total Average - Personnel, Qualification and Experience	24.0	25.0	25.0	26.0	32.0	26.4	
D							
Performance Plan and Other Benefits - 35 pts			1	1			
The methodology proposed to perform Port Houston projects and services and plan for communicating with Port Houston - 10 pts	5.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	6.4	
Any unique or specialized processes, organization, capabilities, safety or environmental considerations, best practices, or quality control methods - 10 pts	6.0	6.0	6.0	10.0	8.0	7.2	
Design schedule timeline (30%, 60%, 100% package) or the design							
duration for the final package for Phase 1 15 pts	8.0 19.0	5.0 17.0	6.0 17.0	13.0 31.0	13.0	9.0 22.6	
Total Average - Performance Plan and Other Benefits	19.0	17.0	17.0	31.0	29.0	22.0	
Overall Compliance with PHA Policies - 5 pts							
Demonstrated understanding of the RFQ and its objectives including, clarity,							
robustness, and brevity of Response, including submission of all items required by RFQ - 5 pts	2.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.8	
Total Average - Overall Compliance with PHA Policies	2.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.8	
		•					
TEAM AVERAGE TOTAL SCORES						65.8	