

**CITY OF HOUSTON**  
**INTER OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE**

To: Mario C. Diaz  
Director of Aviation

From: Justina J. Mann, CPPO  
Procurement Officer  
Supply Chain Management  
Houston Airport System

Date: November 25, 2015

Subject: **ITRP and MLIT Executive Summation of Solicitation Projects**

**Solicitation Summary**

For at least two years, the Houston Airport System has been planning for the necessary rebuild of the Mickey Leland International Terminal (MLIT) and the broader International Terminal Redevelopment Program (ITRP) at Bush Intercontinental Airport. After this extensive planning, six solicitations to advance the projects were published earlier this year. Two solicitations were associated with MLIT projects, three were associated with ITRP projects and one was for an Owner Controlled Insurance Program (OCIP) encompassing both MLIT and ITRP. The Houston Airport System employed a number of delivery methods for the various projects with the goals of obtaining the best value and procuring the most qualified professionals that had demonstrated experience and could demonstrate a history of working together in a cohesive team. The teamwork approach was especially important given the very complex nature of the MLIT project, the associated high risks, and the potential for significant impact on airline operations and passenger service over the extensive project duration, which is estimated to exceed five years. The table below shows the procurement strategy/delivery method associated with each project.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Procurement / Delivery Method</b>
Architectural Engineering Design Services for IAH MLIT	RFQ
Construction Manager at Risk Services for IAH MLIT	RFQ CMAR (Texas Government Code 2269.251)
East Aircraft Parking Hardstand	RFQ Design Build (Texas Government Code 2269.301)
Owner Controlled Insurance Program	RFP
Project Management Office (PMO) Building	RFQ Design Build (Texas Government Code 2269.301)
Enabling Utilities	RFQ Design Build (Texas Government Code 2269.301)

The Houston Airport System received considerable feedback from Architectural and Engineering (A&E) firms, construction companies, and the business community in general regarding the solicitations prior to advertisement. Four Industry Days were held from March 2014 to March 2015, where the Airport System coordinated with the City of Houston's Office of

Business Opportunity to introduce upcoming opportunities for the ITRP. Industry Day events encouraged networking between prime and sub-contractors.

The Airport System's Office of Supply Chain Management worked closely with the City's Acting Chief Procurement Officer and the Executive Program Management team in the development of the budget, scope, and schedule. Each solicitation was advertised for two consecutive weekends in the Houston Chronicle and posted on the Airport's fly2houston website. Evaluation committee members for the projects attended evaluator and consensus scoring training and were issued a training manual. After evaluators were trained and executed non-disclosure agreements, they were provided hard copies of the proposals / statements of qualifications they were assigned to evaluate.

## **Evaluation Process**

The evaluation criteria for each project can be found at the end of this memorandum as Attachment II. Proposal scoring rested solely with members of the evaluation committee for each project. As a level of oversight to the evaluation committees, stakeholder representatives from United Airlines and the foreign-flag carriers participated in monitoring the evaluation process. To assure we had expert assistance in the field of architecture, the Airport System solicited the participation of several prominent architecture experts in the City listed in Attachment I: Evaluation Summary. As a part of the A&E procurement process, non-voting observers and stakeholders helped to provide an overall assessment of the respondents and advised the evaluation committee wherever further clarification was required.

A consensus scoring approach was employed in rating all proposals. A consensus score from 1-5 was reached by all members of the evaluation committee, then weighting factors were applied in a manner consistent with the relative importance for each criterion. By way of example, if a respondent received the highest score (5) allowed for each criterion, after consideration of the weighting factors, that respondent would have received a score of 100.

For the proposals solicited as design-build, several short-listed firms were invited to advance to the second step of the evaluation process and were requested to submit their technical and price proposals. The technical proposals were evaluated using the same consensus scoring methodology. If the technical proposal scored sufficient points above all others, the proponent was selected to move forward with the recommendation to award following an oral presentation, when necessary, to assure clarity on all points made in the proposal.

The top three respondents to the procurements for Architectural Engineering Design (A&E), Construction Manager at Risk Services (CMAR) and Enabling Utilities were invited to deliver oral presentations to the evaluation committees. The oral interview process was essential in helping the evaluation committees clarify critical points made in the statement of qualifications / proposals and identify a decisive frontrunner for each solicitation. The evaluation committees drafted questions that were sent to respondents invited to oral interviews. The questions were sent in advance of the scheduled interviews to promote a productive discourse. In view of the critical need for collaboration between the A&E and the CMAR, and with the Airport System, the representatives of the three top-ranked CMAR firms were invited to observe the oral interviews

for the A&E firms. During the oral interviews for the CMAR, each respondent was asked to force rank the A&E firms with respect to their previous work experience with each, and the level of cooperation they were able to establish. The final two top-ranked A&E firms were similarly required to force rank the CMAR firms, again with respect to previous work experience with each CMAR team and the level of cooperation they were able to establish.

At the conclusion of oral interviews, the evaluation committees scored each responding firm, taking into account the new information gathered during the oral interviews. The scores from the written proposal phase were set aside, and new scores were established in compliance with the process. The oral interviews were scored using consensus scoring, consistent with the scoring method of the first level of review, and became the basis for determining the winning proposal.

In the case of the A&E solicitation, there was required a further tie-breaking step that brought into play a best-and-final offer as the basis for deciding the winning proposal. Interviews were held with the top two firms and questions posed to both, which were then submitted in writing. The responses were used to formulate the decision as to the recommended firm.

Please see Attachment I through VIII for further details:

Attachment I: Evaluation Summary

Attachment II: Evaluation Criteria by Project (ITRP/MLIT)

Attachment III: East Aircraft Parking Hardstand

Attachment IV: Architectural Engineering (AE) Design Services for IAH MLIT

Attachment V: Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for IAH MLIT

Attachment VI: Design Build Services for the ITRP Enabling Utilities – Landside Project at IAH

Attachment VII: Project Management Office Building and Owner Controlled Insurance Program

Attachment VIII: Respondent Log—All Projects

**Attachment I: Evaluation Summary**

**EAST AIRCRAFT PARKING HARDSTAND**

Evaluation Committee (Voting Members<sup>1</sup>):

Airfield Operations Manager  
Operations Manager  
Sr. Airport Planner  
Acting Assistant Director of Construction, Infrastructure  
Sr. Project Manager

Non-Voting Observers:

Supply Chain Management

Justina J. Mann	Procurement Officer
Alfredo Oracion	Sr. Procurement Specialist

Executive Program Management

Steve Andersen	ITRP Executive Program Manager
----------------	--------------------------------

Office of Business Opportunity – Houston Airport System

Jason McLemore	Deputy Assistant Director, OBO-HAS
----------------	------------------------------------

**ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING (AE) DESIGN SERVICES FOR IAH MLIT**

Evaluation Committee (Voting Members):

General Manager, IAH  
Chief Infrastructure Officer  
Chief Technology Officer  
Chief Commercial Officer  
Assistant Director – Planning

Non-Voting Observers:

Supply Chain Management

Justina J. Mann	Procurement Officer
Andre' Morrow	Sr. Procurement Specialist

Executive Program Management

Steve Andersen	ITRP Executive Program Manager
----------------	--------------------------------

Office of Business Opportunity – Houston Airport System

Jason McLemore	Deputy Assistant Director, OBO-HAS
----------------	------------------------------------

---

<sup>1</sup> All evaluation committee members were selected based on qualifications from among the Airport System middle to upper management unless indicated otherwise.

United and Foreign Flag Airlines Representative

David Brandenburg, United Airlines  
Bruce Rieser, Foreign Flag Airlines Representative

Academic and Professional Organizational Architectural Design Oversight Committee

Sarah Whiting; Dean of School of Architecture at Rice University  
Patricia B. Oliver; Dean of Gerald D. Hines College of Architecture at University of Houston  
Ikhlas Sabouni; Dean and Professor of Architecture at Prairie View A&M University  
Linda Sylvan; Executive Director of Rice Design Alliance at Rice University  
Rusty Bienvenue; Executive Director - American Institute of Architects-Houston

CMAR Evaluation Committee (*Observed A/E Oral Presentations Only*)

Project Definition Manager  
Assistant Director - Design  
Assistant General Manager  
Deputy Director - Planning Design Services, Public Works & Engineering  
ITRP Executive Representative - Program Management

Two representatives from each of the three top-ranked CMAR Short-listed Firms (*Observed A/E Oral Presentations Only*)

**CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR IAH MLIT**

Evaluation Committee (Voting Members):

Project Definition Manager  
Assistant Director - Design  
Assistant General Manager  
Deputy Director - Planning Design Services, Public Works & Engineering  
ITRP Executive Representative - Program Management

Non-Voting Observers:

Supply Chain Management

Justina J. Mann	Procurement Officer
Andre' Morrow	Sr. Procurement Specialist

Executive Program Management

Steve Andersen	ITRP Executive Program Manager
----------------	--------------------------------

Office of Business Opportunity – Houston Airport System

Jason McLemore	Deputy Assistant Director, OBO-HAS
----------------	------------------------------------

United Airlines and Foreign Flag Airlines Representatives

David Brandenburg	United Airlines Representative
Bruce Rieser	Foreign Flag Airlines Representative



**OWNER CONTROLLED INSURANCE PROGRAM (OCIP)**

Evaluation Committee (Voting Members):

Assistant Director - Finance & Administration  
Division Manager - Safety & Emergency Management  
Airline Affairs Management

Non-Voting Observers:

Supply Chain Management

Justina J. Mann	Procurement Officer
Benard Hubbard	Sr. Procurement Specialist

Tina Paquet	Assistant Director, Administration and Regulatory Affairs
-------------	---

Office of Business Opportunity – Houston Airport System

Jason McLemore	Assistant Deputy Director, HAS OBO
----------------	------------------------------------

## **Attachment II: EVALUATION CRITERIA by ITRP/MLIT PROJECT**

### **EAST AIRCRAFT PARKING HARDSTAND**

#### **SOQ Evaluation Criteria (Step-1)**

1. Project Approach
2. Firm(s) Qualifications
3. Project Team Qualifications
4. Pre-Construction and Construction Phase Services
5. Management and Staffing Plan
6. Project Controls
7. Financial Capabilities

#### **Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria (Step-2)**

1. Project Approach
2. Anticipated Problems
3. Proposed Solutions to Anticipated Problems
4. Ability to Meet Schedules
5. Conceptual Engineering Design/Comments on Design Criteria Package
6. MWBE Compliance

### **PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE (PMO) BUILDING**

#### **SOQ Evaluation Criteria (Step-1)**

1. Project Approach
2. Firm(s) Qualifications
3. Project Team Qualifications
4. Pre-Construction and Construction Phase Services
5. Management and Staffing Plan
6. Project Controls
7. Financial Capabilities

#### **Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria (Step-2)**

1. Project Approach
2. Anticipated Problems
3. Proposed Solutions to Anticipated Problems
4. Ability to Meet Schedules
5. Conceptual Engineering Design/Comments on Design Criteria Package
6. MWBE Compliance

## **ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING (AE) DESIGN SERVICES FOR IAH MLIT**

### **SOQ Evaluation Criteria**

1. People/ Resources/ Capabilities
2. Representative Project Experience
3. Design Approach
4. Cost Estimating Capability
5. Quality Management Approach
6. Construction Support Capability
7. Project Controls Capability
8. Financial Capabilities
9. MWBE Compliance

## **CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR IAH MLIT**

### **SOQ Evaluation Criteria**

1. Project Approach and CMAR Team Commitment
2. Firm(s) Qualifications
3. Project Team Qualifications
4. Pre-Construction and Construction Phase Services
5. Management and Staffing Plan
6. Project Controls
7. Financial Capabilities
8. MWBE Compliance

## **DESIGN BUILD SERVICES FOR THE ITRP ENABLING UTILITIES – LANDSIDE PROJECT AT IAH**

### **SOQ Evaluation Criteria (Step-1)**

1. Project Approach
2. Qualifications for Design Services
3. Qualifications for Pre-Construction and Construction Services
4. Design, Pre-Construction and Construction Phase Services
5. Management and Staffing Plan
6. Project Controls
7. Financial Capabilities

### **Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria (Step-2)**

1. Project Approach
2. Anticipated Problems
3. Proposed Solutions To Anticipated Problems
4. Ability To Meet Schedules
5. Conceptual Engineering Design/ Comments on Design Criteria Package
6. MWBE Compliance

### **OWNER CONTROLLED INSURANCE PROGRAM**

#### **Evaluation Criteria**

1. Qualifications, Knowledge, and Experience of Key Personnel
2. Management Approach and Proposed Administration Services
3. Brokerage Service Agreement and Remuneration
4. Team Track Record and Experience Working Together
5. Resources and Capacity
6. Timeline and Approach to Provision of Service
7. MWBE Compliance
8. Financial Capabilities

### **Attachment III: East Aircraft Parking Hardstand**

The East Aircraft Parking Hardstand was solicited under the Design Build delivery method; therefore, HAS was required to follow a two-step process. Five respondents submitted a Statement of Qualification (SOQ) in response to the Request for Qualification (RFQ) advertised July 24<sup>th</sup> and July 31<sup>st</sup> 2015. The evaluation committee convened for two days (September 24<sup>th</sup> and September 25<sup>th</sup>) to score and rank each SOQ using the evaluation criteria published in the RFQ (See Attachment II), which concluded the first step. The three firms chosen to participate in the second step and their initial scores were; James Construction Group. LLC (87), Texas Sterling – Banicki, JV LLC (78), and J.D. Abrams L.P. (77), respectively.

As a requirement of the second step, the three short-listed firms submitted their technical and price proposals. Proposals were received October 6, 2015 and were evaluated by the evaluation committee on October 12, 2015 utilizing the same consensus scoring methodology, but with a different set of evaluation criteria that was provided in the RFQ. Texas Sterling – Banicki, JV LLC received the highest score (80), followed by J.D. Abrams L.P. (68), and James Construction Group, LLC (58). The evaluation committee did not require additional information; therefore, no oral presentations were required. The evaluation committee recommended Texas Sterling – Banicki, JV LLC to move forward to the negotiation process.

The M/WBE goal for this contract is 33.51%

#### **Texas Sterling – Banicki, JV LLC — MWBE Participation Plan 33.51%**

Ferguson Consulting	Electrical, Telecommunications, Security Design	0.84%
Quadrant Consulting	Environmental and Storm Water Design	8.67%
English & Associates	Architectural Design	5.22%
Henderson & Rogers	Structural Engineering	4.14%
Gorronzona & Associates	Structural Engineering	1.65%
4b Technology	Communications	3.3%
HVJ Associates, Inc.	Geotechnical Testing	2.39%
Fronza & Francis	Construction Management	3.97%
Infrastructure Associates	MEP Design	3.33%

**Attachment IV: Architectural Engineering (AE) Design Services for IAH MLIT**

Nine (9) respondents submitted a Statement of Qualification on September 2, 2015 in response to the Request for Qualification advertised July 17, 2015 and July 24, 2015. The evaluation committee convened for three days (September 21<sup>st</sup> to September 23<sup>rd</sup>) to conduct the first step of the evaluation process and scored each SOQ using the evaluation criteria published in the RFQ. At the conclusion of the first step, three short-listed firms were invited to step two of the evaluation process; Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP (SOM) (86) received the highest score followed by Fentress Architects, Ltd. (80) and Hellmuth, Obata, & Kassabaum, LP (HOK) (72), respectively.

On October 1, 2015, HAS Stakeholders met with the Academic and Professional Organizational Architectural Design Oversight Committee to discuss ITRP Scope.

On October 14, 2015, the three short-listed firms appeared before the evaluation committee, industry stakeholders, and the CMAR selection committee—accompanied by two representatives of each of the three top ranked proponents—to participate in oral presentations and respond to questions provided to them in advance of step two of the evaluation process.

A Best and Final Offer (BAFO) was then requested of the top two finalists, Fentress and SOM, in order to be able to make a definite selection. In the essence of time, both firms were invited to separate meetings where the questions were discussed. Each firm received a written Request for BAFO and responses were received in the allowed time frame.

The evaluation committee reconvened immediately following the receipt of the BAFOs and, through consensus scoring, determined that Fentress Architects, Ltd. (88) was the firm it would recommend for award. The second and third-ranked respondents were Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP (SOM) (80) and Hellmuth, Obata, & Kassabaum, LP (HOK) (70), respectively. The Evaluation Committee recommended Fentress Architects, Ltd., to be awarded the contract and move to contract negotiation.

The M/WBE goal for this contract is 30%.

**Fentress Architects, Ltd. — MWBE Participation Plan: 32.65%**

STOA International Architects	Architecture, BIM/GIS Design	9%
RdIR Architects	Programming, Interior Architecture	2.5%
Smith & Company	Interiors	1.25%
Huerta & Associates Architects	Architectural Support	1.25%
Archi*Technics/3	Design Development, Construction Documents	1.25%
Bradlink	WMSBE Coordinator	0.5%
Henderson & Rogers	Structural Engineer	3%

*(Continued)*

Jones Engineers	Mechanical Engineer	2.7%
Hunt & Hunt Engineering	Electrical Engineer	2.7%
4b Technology	Technology Communications	4.5%
PGA Engineers	Security Systems	0.5%
Isani Consultants	Civil Engineering	1%
United Engineers	Civil Engineering	1%
OMEGA Engineers	Civil Engineering	1%
Clark Condon	Landscape Architect	0.5%

## **Attachment V: Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for IAH MLIT**

Five (5) respondents submitted a Statement of Qualification on September 4, 2015 in response to the Request for Qualification for CMAR services. This solicitation was advertised July 17, 2015 and July 24, 2015. The evaluation committee convened for three days (between September 28<sup>th</sup> and October 5<sup>th</sup>) to initiate the first step of the evaluation process and scored each SOQ using the evaluation criteria published in the RFQ. At the conclusion of the first step, Skanska USA Building Inc. (77) received the highest score; the second and third-highest ranked SOQs were to Austin-Gilbane, Joint Venture (74) and Turner+Preston Banks+Koasati Joint Venture (68), respectively.

The short-listed CMAR firms were required to appear and observe the A/E interview/oral presentations. All three short-listed CMAR firms participated as observers on October 14, 2015.

On October 22, 2015, the three short-listed firms appeared before the evaluation committee to participate in an oral presentation and respond to questions provided to them in advance as it was provided for in Step Two of the evaluation process. On October 16, 2015, the three short-listed firms were requested to submit their Price Proposal to HAS by October 23, 2015.

The evaluation committee reconvened following the oral interviews and, through consensus scoring determined Austin-Gilbane, Joint Venture (78) to be the highest scoring firm. The second and third-ranked respondents were Skanska USA Building Inc. (71) and Turner+Preston Banks+Koasati Joint Venture (56), respectively. The Evaluation Committee recommended Austin-Gilbane, Joint Venture, to be awarded the contract and move to contract negotiation. The price proposal received from Austin-Gilbane was used for final negotiations.

The MWBE participation goal for Component 1 (Pre-Construction), Phase 1 of the Agreement is 10%. During the pre-construction services phase the design of the terminal will be sufficiently detailed to understand the construction components that may be undertaken by MWBE firms. Once sufficient design is completed, and before returning to Council for approval of the guaranteed maximum price, a final MWBE participation plan will be developed and submitted that we anticipate, together with the preconstruction services contribution, should approach 30%.

### **Austin-Gilbane, Joint Venture — MWBE Participation Plan 15%**

ChaseSource	Pre-Construction Services, Estimating, Scheduling Project Management, Building Information Modeling (BIM) Coordination	10%
Con-Real	Staffing and Construction Services in Support of the Pre-Construction and Construction Scopes of Work	5%

**Attachment VI: Design Build Services for the ITRP Enabling Utilities – Landside Project at IAH**

Four (4) respondents submitted a Statement of Qualification on September 15, 2015 in response to the Request for Qualification advertised August 1, 2015 and August 7, 2015. The evaluation committee convened on October 6, 2015 to conduct the first step of the evaluation process and scored each SOQ using the consensus scoring method. At the conclusion of the first step, Hensel Phelps (80) scored the highest; the second and third-ranked SOQs were Burns & McDonnell/Azteca Enterprises/W.A. Robbins team (76) and Clark/Horizon ITRP, A Joint Venture team (76), respectively.

On October 6, 2015, the three short-listed firms appeared before the evaluation committee to participate in an oral presentation and respond to questions provided to them in advance.

On October 9, 2015, the three short-listed firms were requested to submit their technical and price proposals as stated in Section 8.0 of the solicitation document. Proposals were received October 22, 2015, and were distributed to the evaluation committee the following day.

On October 23, 2015, the evaluation committee evaluated the technical proposal under the same consensus scoring method and with the evaluation criteria stipulated for step two (Section 8.0). After careful review of the Respondent's written and oral submittals, a discussion was held and scores were tabulated with the following results: Hensel Phelps (96), Clark/Horizon ITRP, A Joint Venture team (86) and Burns & McDonnell/Azteca Enterprises/W.A. Robbins team (44), respectively. The Evaluation Committee recommended that the Hensel Phelps/Atkins team be awarded the contract and move to contract negotiation.

The M/WBE goal for the preconstruction services portion of this contact is 19%.

**Hensel Phelps— MWBE Participation Plan 19.5%**

4b Technology	Information Technology and Telecommunication	6.3%
Aviles Engineering	Geotechnical Services	3%
HT&J	Drainage Design	1%
Isani Consultants	Water Line Services	3%
Shah Smith & Associates	Lighting, Ventilation	5%
Vesta Rae & Associates	Public Outreach	1.2%

**Attachment VII: Project Management Office Building and Owner Controlled Insurance Program**

**Project Management Office Building**

Nine respondents submitted a Statement of Qualification in response to the Request for Qualification advertised July 24, 2015 and July 31, 2015. The evaluation committee convened for two days (September 30<sup>th</sup> and October 1<sup>st</sup>) to conduct the first step of the evaluation process and scored each SOQ using the evaluation criteria published in the RFQ. At the conclusion of the first step in its evaluation process, the committee reached a shortlist of respondents. Technical proposals were requested of the short listed firms, which were evaluated by the committee as well. This solicitation was CANCELLED due to the failure of the three top-ranked respondents to supply the required MWBE participation plan specified in the technical phase of the RFQ. The solicitation will be re-issued in January 2016.

**Owner Controlled Insurance Program (OCIP)**

Six respondents submitted proposals to the OCIP Request For Proposal. The evaluation committee convened for one day (October 7, 2015) to conduct its initial evaluation of the proposals and scored each proposal. At the conclusion of its initial evaluation, Alliant Insurance Services, Inc. received the highest score (84); the second and third-highest ranked proposals were Willis of Texas, Inc. (82) and Marsh USA Inc. (75) respectively.

In an effort to establish a clear distinction between the three highest-ranked proposals, each proposer was given identical questions and invited to oral interviews on October 26, 2015. The evaluation committee reconvened immediately following the oral interviews and through consensus scoring, determined that Marsh USA Inc. (88) was the proposer it would recommend for award. Willis of Texas, Inc. scored (76) and Alliant Insurance Services scored (62).

The M/WBE goal for this contract is 24%.

**Marsh USA Inc. — MWBE Participation Plan 31.23%**

Boris Miles Insurance Agency            OCIP Administration

## Attachment VIII: Respondent Log--All Projects

**Supply Chain  
Management  
("SCM")**



### **MISSION**

We exist to connect the people, the business, the cultures and the economies of the world to Houston

## **STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIPT LOG**

**Request for Qualification (RFQ) Solicitation No. H37-MLITAE-2016-002**

**MICKEY LELAND INTERNATIONAL TERMINAL (MLIT) ARCHITECT ENGINEER (A/E) DESIGN CONSULTANT SERVICES**

**DUE DATE:** Wednesday, September 2, 2015

**DUE BY:** 2:00 P.M. CST

**FACILITATOR:** Andre' Morrow, Sr. Procurement Specialist

**LOCATION:** SCM – 18600 Lee Rd., Humble TX 77338

### **STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIVED**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>VENDOR</b>
1	Foster + Partners Group Ltd
2	Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP
3	Fentress Architects, Ltd.
4	LVA Luis Vidal USA, Inc.
5	Corgan Associates, Inc.
6	Hellmuth, Obata, & Kassabaum, LP (HOK)
7	Atkins and eStudio Joint Venture (A&E JV)
8	FR-EE HKS/ Page Group LLC
9	M. Arthur Gensler, Jr. & Associates, Inc. (dba Gensler)

**Supply Chain  
Management  
("SCM")**



**MISSION**

We exist to connect the people, the  
business, the cultures and the  
economies of the world to Houston

**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIPT LOG**

**Request for Qualification (RFQ) Solicitation No. H27-PMODB-2016-006**

**PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE BUILDING (PMO)**

**DUE DATE:** Thursday, September 3, 2015    **DUE BY:** 2:00 P.M. CST  
**FACILITATOR:** Al Oracion    **LOCATION:** SCM

**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIVED**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>VENDOR</b>
1	The Ross Group Construction Corp.
2	SpawGlass Construction Corp.
3	E.E. Reed Construction, L.P.
4	CYMI Industrial, Inc.
5	Teal Construction Co.
6	Rogers-O'Brien Construction Company, Ltd.
7	Anslow Bryant Construction Ltd.
8	Horizon/Aztec/Robbins JV
9	DPR Construction, A General Partnership

**Supply Chain  
Management  
("SCM")**



**MISSION**

We exist to connect the people, the  
business, the cultures and the  
economies of the world to Houston

**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIPT LOG**

**Request for Qualification (RFQ) Solicitation No. H27-EAPDB-2016-005**

**EAST AIRCRAFT PARKING HARDSTAND**

DUE DATE: Thursday, September 3, 2015 DUE BY: 2:00 P.M. CST  
FACILITATOR: Al Oracion LOCATION: SCM

**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIVED**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>VENDOR</b>
1	J.D. Abrams, L.P.
2	OHL USA, Inc.
3	J. Banicki Construction, Inc.
4	Burns & McDonnell / Azteca / W.A. Robbins Team
5	James Construction Group, LLC

**Supply Chain  
Management  
("SCM")**



**MISSION**  
We exist to connect the people, the  
business, the cultures and the  
economies of the world to Houston

## **STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIPT LOG**

**Request for Qualification (RFQ) Solicitation No. H37- MLITCMAR-2016-003**

**MICKEY LELAND INTERNATIONAL TERMINAL (MLIT)  
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK (CMAR) SERVICES**

**DUE DATE:** Friday, September 4, 2015

**DUE BY:** 11:00 A.M. CST

**FACILITATOR:** Andre' Morrow, Sr. Procurement Specialist

**LOCATION:** SCM – 18600 Lee Rd., Humble TX 77338

### **STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIVED**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>VENDOR</b>
<b>1</b>	Houston Airport Builders
<b>2</b>	Austin-Gilbane, a Joint Venture
<b>3</b>	Gateway Constructors
<b>4</b>	Turner+Preston Banks+Koasati Joint Venture
<b>5</b>	Skanska USA Building Inc.

Supply Chain  
Management  
("SCM")



**MISSION**

We exist to connect the people, the  
business, the cultures and the  
economies of the world to Houston

**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIPT LOG**

**Request for Qualification (RFQ) Solicitation No. H37-EUTLDB-2016-004**

**ITRP ENABLING UTILITIES – LANDSIDE PROJECT**

DUE DATE: Tuesday, September 15, 2015

DUE BY: 11:00 A.M. CST

FACILITATOR: Andre' Morrow, Sr. Procurement Specialist

LOCATION: SCM – 18600 Lee Rd., Humble TX 77338

**STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS RECEIVED**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>VENDOR</b>
1	Burns & McDonnell / Azteca Enterprises / W.A. Robbins
2	OHL USA, Inc. and Lockwood Andrews & Newnam, Inc. (OHL + LAN)
3	Hensel Phelps / Atkins
4	Clark / Horizon ITRP, A Joint Venture



George Bush Intercontinental ~ William P. Hobby ~ Ellington Airport

**PROPOSAL RECEIPT SHEET**

**Request for Proposal (RFP) Solicitation No. HBH-OCIP-2015-026  
OWNER CONTROLLED INSURANCE PROGRAM**

**DUE DATE:** Thursday, September 17, 2015

**DUE BY:** 2:00 P.M. CST

**FACILITATOR:** BJ Hubbard, Sr. Procurement Specialist

**LOCATION:** SCM – 18600 Lee Rd., Humble TX 77338

**PROPOSALS RECEIVED**

NO.	VENDOR
1	USI/W.J. Alexander/Navarro Insurance Group/Resurgens Risk Management, Inc.
2	Willis of Texas, Inc.
3	McGriff, Seibels & Williams of Texas
4	Arthur J. Gallagher Risk Management Services, Inc.
5	Marsh USA Inc.
6	Alliant Insurance Services, Inc.