



CITY OF HOUSTON
FINANCE DEPARTMENT
Strategic Procurement Division

Sylvester Turner

Mayor

John J. Gillespie
Chief Procurement Officer
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

T. 832.393.9126
F. 832.393.8755
<https://purchasing.houstontx.gov>

April 15, 2016

SUBJECT: Letter of Clarification No. 1

REFERENCE: RFQ No. Q-H37-MLITAE-2016-027, Mickey Leland International Terminal (MLIT) Architect Engineer (A/E) Design Consultant Services at George Bush Intercontinental Airport (IAH)

TO: All Prospective Respondents:

This Letter of Clarification is issued for the following reasons: (Section I) to revise certain portions of this RFQ solicitation document; and (Section II) to answer questions posed by prospective respondents.

SECTION I The following are revisions to certain portions of this RFQ solicitation document:

1. PART III - EVALUATION and SELECTION PROCESS is hereby revised as follows:

6.5.1.5 After all scores have been updated, the proposals/submissions shall be ranked in order of the scores from greatest to least.

2. 6.9 New Airport Terminal Design Experience

Subsections 6.10.1 and 6.10.2 are renumbered to reflect correct sequential numbering; 6.9.1 and 6.9.2 respectively.

3. Subsection 6.10 was unintentionally omitted in the RFQ document. And shall now be added and referenced as follows:

6.10 "Intentionally Left Blank"

SECTION II The following are questions posed by prospective respondents and the SPD response:

Question No. 1: Item 6.5.2.1 (page 8) - During February 23, 2016 Industry day it was stated that the Evaluation Committee would be comprised of three voting members from HAS and two from the City's CPO. Is this still accurate?

Response No. 1: Please refer to Sections 6.2 and 6.5.2.1 in the RFQ, which addresses the composition of the evaluation committee.

Question No. 2: Item 6.5.2.1 (page 8) - During February 23, 2016 Industry day it was stated that the Evaluation Committee would be comprised of three voting members from HAS and two from the City's CPO. If this is not accurate how many voting members will be from HAS?

Response No. 2: Please refer to the response provided in Question # 1.

Question No. 3: Item 6.5.2.1 (page 8) - During February 23, 2016 Industry day it was stated that the Evaluation Committee would be comprised of three voting members from HAS and two from the City's CPO. If this is not accurate how many voting members will be from City CPO?

Response No. 3: Please refer to the response provided in Question # 1.

Question No. 4: Item 6.5.3 (page 8) - Please provide the length of time available for the oral presentations by the team.

Response No. 4: This information will be provided to the firms that are short-listed.

Question No. 5: Item 6.5.3.3 (page 8) – States that during the interview we will be ‘...permitted to present a maximum of a 20-page handout to the Evaluation Committee’. We assume this is the only thing we will be allowed to leave behind, and NOT the only material we are allowed to present. Please confirm.

Response No. 5: This information will be provided to the firms that are short-listed.

Question No. 6: Item 6.5.3.3 (page 8) - Please confirm what materials, visuals or formats will be allowed as part of the oral presentations.

Response No. 6: This information will be provided to the firms that are short-listed.

Question No. 7: Item 6.9 (page 10) - Please confirm this pass / fail requirement to be that the respondent is currently serving as, or has served in the past 5 years as the prime design consultant on a new international terminal at a world top 100 airport per ACI 2014.

Response No. 7: Yes; projects meeting the criteria for which the Respondent, serving in the role of the Prime Design Consultant, has been awarded and is currently providing services, or that has been completed within the last 5 years, on a new international terminal facility, will be acceptable.

Question No. 8: Item 6.10.2 (page 10) – Please confirm the term ‘prime design consultant’ refers to the firm leading and managing the terminal design process.

Response No. 8: Yes; the prime consultant, i.e., the firm entering into a contract with the City, is the firm leading and managing the terminal design process.

Question No. 9: Item 6.10.2 (page 10) – Does the statement ‘new international airport terminal design project’ in this sentence refer to a terminal which must be located outside of the borders of the United States?

Response No. 9: No; this statement refers to a terminal that serves international passengers.

Partnering to better serve Houston

Question No. 10: Item 6.10.2 (page 10) – Does the statement ‘new international airport terminal design project’ in this sentence refer to a terminal which accommodates international passenger traffic, regardless of its location?

Response No. 10: Yes; this statement refers to a terminal that serves international passengers regardless of its location.

Question No. 11: 6.10.2 (page 10) – During the last procurement, the definition of ‘new international airport terminal design project’ was further clarified to mean a new terminal, significant expansion, or renovation (\$400 Million +) at an existing terminal, or new terminal on greenfield site. Is this still accurate?

Response No. 11: Yes; further noting the projects must be international terminals serving international passengers - not terminals solely for domestic passengers.

Question No. 12: Item 6.20 (Page 15) – Please advise how many days in advance of oral presentation and interview that clarifying questions from the Evaluation Committee will be received.

Response No. 12: This information will be provided to the firms that are short-listed.

Question No. 13: Item 14.2 (page 24) – It was stated that at the Pre-Submittal Conference on March 24, 2016 that no breakdown is required of the MWBE 30% participation goal. Please confirm this accurate.

Response No. 13: This is a professional services contract with a 30% overall M/WBE. There is no M/WBE split.

Question No. 14: Item 14.2 (page 24) – It was stated that at the Pre-Submittal Conference on March 24, 2016 that no breakdown is required of the MWBE 30% participation goal. If this is not accurate what percentage of MBE is required?

Response No. 14: Please refer to the response provided in Question # 13.

Question No. 15: Item 14.2 (page 24) – It was stated that at the Pre-Submittal Conference on March 24, 2016 that no breakdown is required of the MWBE 30% participation goal. If this is not accurate what percentage of WBE is required?

Response No. 15: Please refer to the response provided in Question # 13.

Question No. 16: Attachment A SOS: Item 8.01.A (page 66) - The BPxP is a critical document for all parties to agree to. The delay in procurement of CMAR Services impact the BIM project structure and approach. Will development of the BPxP be made an early and urgent priority for the CMAR procurement?

Response No. 16: The intent is that the initial BPxP workshop be held no later than 30 days after the CMAR has been issued the Notice To Proceed for Phase 1 Preconstruction Services. During this workshop and subsequent BIM workshops, the BPxP will be developed. HAS maintains a BPxP template, as well as other BIM related documents which will facilitate creating the BPxP.

Question No. 17: Attachment A SOS: Item 8.01.A (page 66) - If CMAR procurement does not support the critical need for BPxP development will the CMAR procurement include the project BPxP developed prior to the CMAR’s involvement as a contract attachment?

Response No. 17: The CMAR Procurement process will support the need for BPxP development as an early deliverable.

Partnering to better serve Houston

Council Members: Helena Brown Jerry Davis Ellen Cohen Wanda Adams Mike Sullivan Al Hoang Oliver Pennington Edward Gonzalez
James G. Rodriguez Mike Laster Larry Green Stephen C. Costello Andrew Burks Melissa Noriega C.O. “Brad” Bradford
Jack Christie **Controller:** Ronald C. Green

Question No. 18: Attachment A SOS: Item 2.04.9 (page 17) - Use of BIM for production and coordination requires computers systems, workstation set up, and internet connectivity above beyond a standard office work station. Will equipment provided by HAS be procured to meet the Design Consultants technical needs for their instruments of service?

Response No. 18: If the Program Management Team (PMT) and the selected Respondent determine that the design team will be co-located with the PMT, internet connectivity will be provided at workspaces; however, BIM hardware and software will be the Respondent's responsibility. In addition, it is the Respondent's responsibility to procure their BIM related equipment including software, hardware, network and maintenance.

Question No. 19: Attachment A SOS: Item 4.05.3.E (page 41) – Will electronic model(s) be considered as equivalent to physical model(s)?

Response No. 19: No; electronic models serve a different purpose than physical models.

Question No. 20: Since this RFQ is being solicited on the City of Houston website, there is a requirement to submit proposals electronically and also to submit a copy to the Office of the City Secretary and the Office of Chief Procurement Officer. Are we required to electronically submit our submission and also to submit two additional copies to the above entities? Please clarify.

Response No. 20: Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) are not required to be submitted electronically. The SOQ's must be submitted to the Strategic Procurement Division. Please refer to Part IV of the RFQ entitled "Submission of Responses" for specific submittal requirements.

Question No. 21: On page 27 of 70, under 19.0 – Forms to be Submitted, Exhibit I is listed for the M/WBE Participation. Does this Exhibit I replace Exhibits I, J, and K?

Response No. 21: You must submit Exhibit I – Schedule of M/WBE Participation. If your M/WBE Participation Plan does not meet or exceed the M/WBE goal for this solicitation, you must complete and submit page 2 of Exhibit I.

Question No. 22: On page 27 of 70, under 20.0, Forms to be Submitted by the Successful Firm, are these forms to be submitted only when a prime firm has been selected for the Project?

Response No. 22: Yes.

Question No. 23: On page 69 of 70, Required Submittal Checklist, Exhibits I is not listed as a submittal for this response. Please clarify if we need to submit Exhibit I with this submittal.

Response No. 23: Exhibit I is listed as a submittal for this response in the Attachment A Checklist. Please refer to Item # 16 Section 13 – City Required Documents (EXHIBITS A – K).

Question No. 24: On Page 69 of 70, Required Submittal Checklist, Exhibits N, O, P, and Q are listed as being required as part of this submittal. Page 27 lists these forms as being submitted by the successful firm. Please clarify if Forms J through Q are to be submitted as part of this submittal.

Response No. 24: Exhibits N, O, P, and Q are listed as being required as part of this submittal. PART VII - City Required Documents and Attachments, Section 19.0 Forms To Be Submitted With Statement Of Qualification, has been revised to include Exhibits N, O, P, and Q.

Partnering to better serve Houston

Council Members: Helena Brown Jerry Davis Ellen Cohen Wanda Adams Mike Sullivan Al Hoang Oliver Pennington Edward Gonzalez
James G. Rodriguez Mike Laster Larry Green Stephen C. Costello Andrew Burks Melissa Noriega C.O. "Brad" Bradford
Jack Christie **Controller:** Ronald C. Green

Question No. 25: Under Evaluation Criteria and Score, the Power Point from the Pre-Proposal meeting lists “Cost Estimating Capability”, while the RFP shows “Design to Budget”. Which are you looking for?

Response No. 25: Design to Budget; however, Respondents must have cost estimating capabilities in order to deliver their design within a Design to Budget process. This process will require ongoing cost reconciliation with the PMT and CMAR, who will be responsible for producing independent cost estimates.

Question No. 26: On the City of Houston Strategic Purchasing website, there is a button to place an online bid for this submittal. Is this required along with the hard copies and USB thumb drives? Please see attached screen shot for reference.

Response No. 26: This "button" is not applicable to this solicitation as this is a Request for Qualifications, not a bid. Please refer to the response provided in Question #20.

Question No. 27: Under the Pass/Fail Criterion of Item 6.9, ‘New Airport Terminal Design Experience’, would you consider a joint submission of an Executive Architect and Design Architect, where one is the Prime and the other is the Sub-consultant, jointly as the respondent.

Response No. 27: The prime consultant, whether identified as an Executive Architect, Design Architect or joint venture, must meet the Pass/Fail Criterion.

Question No. 28: Under the Pass/Fail Criterion of Item 6.10.2, where the requirement for the Prime Consultant is to have undertaken a “new international airport terminal”, please clarify the “international” aspect; does this relate to the terminal building itself, or to the airport generally? If the requirement relates to the terminal building, must this building accommodate both international departures and arrivals?

Response No. 28: The international aspect relates to the terminal building itself. Design experience to accommodate the process and planning for arrival and departure of international passengers is a key requirement. Further, the projects must be international terminals serving international passengers - not terminals solely for domestic passengers.

Question No. 29: In the Questions & Answers during last year’s SOQ and with respect to Item 6.9 New Airport Terminal Design Experience, you clarified this to include “new terminal, significant expansion, or renovation(+ \$400m), at an existing terminal, or new terminal on a greenfield site.” Does the same expanded apply to this solicitation and additionally could this be expanded to include domestic terminal experience?

Response No. 29: Please refer to the response provided in Question #11.

Question No. 30: Are there any requirements or limitations regarding what constitutes a ‘Respondent’ for the purposes of this tender? Is there any specific legal relationship required between firms in order to be considered a ‘Respondent’?

Response No. 30: The answer to both questions is no.

END OF QUESTIONS

Partnering to better serve Houston

Council Members: Helena Brown Jerry Davis Ellen Cohen Wanda Adams Mike Sullivan Al Hoang Oliver Pennington Edward Gonzalez
James G. Rodriguez Mike Laster Larry Green Stephen C. Costello Andrew Burks Melissa Noriega C.O. “Brad” Bradford
Jack Christie **Controller:** Ronald C. Green

When issued, Letter(s) of Clarification (LOC) shall automatically become part of the solicitation documents and shall supersede any previous specification(s) and/or provision(s) in conflict with the Letter(s) of Clarification. LOC(s) will be incorporated into the Agreement as applicable. It is the responsibility of the respondent(s) to ensure that it has obtained all such letter(s). By submitting a Submittal on this project, Respondent(s) shall be deemed to have received all LOC(s) and to have incorporated them into this solicitation.

If further clarification is needed regarding this solicitation, please contact Andre' K. Morrow, Sr. Procurement Specialist, via email (preferred method) at andre.morrow@houstontx.gov or via phone at 281-233-1046.



John J. Gillespie
Chief Procurement Officer
City of Houston

Partnering to better serve Houston

Council Members: Helena Brown Jerry Davis Ellen Cohen Wanda Adams Mike Sullivan Al Hoang Oliver Pennington Edward Gonzalez
James G. Rodriguez Mike Laster Larry Green Stephen C. Costello Andrew Burks Melissa Noriega C.O. "Brad" Bradford
Jack Christie **Controller:** Ronald C. Green