



# **MEP** **GIANTS** **2026**

**EAT•N**

*Powering Business Worldwide*

CONSULTING - SPECIFYING  
**engineer**®

# Congratulations to the 2026 MEP Giants!



**Chris M. Finen, P.E.**

Manager

National Application  
Engineers

At Eaton, it is our privilege to once again recognize the outstanding accomplishments of the firms named to the **2026 MEP Giants list**. As leaders among the top Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing engineering firms in North America, your continued pursuit of engineering excellence is strengthening the critical infrastructure our communities, industries and economies depend on every day.

It is an especially exciting—and consequential—time to be an engineer. The world is undergoing rapid electrification, driven by the need for greater efficiency, resilience, sustainability and digital connectivity across the built environment. MEP engineering firms like yours play a pivotal role in making this transformation possible. From integrating distributed energy resources and electrified processes to addressing capacity constraints, power quality and system reliability, you are helping solve some of the most complex technical challenges facing our industry today.

By applying innovation across global megatrends such as electrification, digitalization and reindustrialization—in both greenfield and brownfield projects—you are unlocking smarter ways to optimize energy usage, accelerate project delivery and enable continuous improvement over the full lifecycle of facilities and infrastructure.


Leading firms represented on the 2026 MEP Giants list are embracing advanced digital tools and data-driven engineering strategies to deliver more resilient, flexible and future-ready systems. At Eaton, we are proud to partner with you to deliver more resilient, flexible and future-ready systems by providing integrated digital solutions. These tools, supported by our extensive network of Application Engineers, help streamline the entire project lifecycle—from design and specification through construction, operation and ongoing optimization to deliver lasting value for your clients. This is the future of engineering—and together, we are helping shape it.

We applaud your leadership and impact as you help build a smarter, more electrified, and more resilient world. Congratulations to all of the **2026 MEP Giants!**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Chris M. Finen". The signature is fluid and stylized, with the first and last names being more prominent.

Chris M. Finen, P.E.  
Manager, National Application Engineers  
Eaton

### PERCENTAGE OF MEP DESIGN BILLINGS



**\$97,997,769,620**

grand total gross revenue

**\$19,178,518,522**

grand total MEP design revenue

**70,896**

total engineers employed

**8,790**

LEED APs on staff

**90%**

of MEP design revenue came from projects within the U.S.

**59%**

earned design revenue in 2025 from data center projects

**31%**

of expenditures are allocated to new tools, such as software or hardware, on average

**29%**

provided engineering services to the European Union in 2025

**22%**

cite "staffing: quality of young engineers" as their biggest corporate challenge

**18%**

of engineering staff are female

# 2026 MEP GIANTS INDEX



| RANK | FIRM NAME                                |
|------|------------------------------------------|
| 5    | AECOM                                    |
| 15   | Affiliated Engineers                     |
| 20   | Alfa Tech Consulting Engineers           |
| 47   | Arora Engineers                          |
| 60   | Bala Consulting Engineers                |
| 21   | Bard, Rao + Athanas Consulting Engineers |
| 95   | Barton Associates                        |
| 79   | Bowman Consulting Group (Bowman)         |
| 84   | Bridgers & Paxton Consulting Engineers   |
| 76   | BRPH Companies                           |
| 75   | BSA                                      |
| 80   | Burdette, Koehler, Murphy & Associates   |
| 2    | Burns & McDonnell                        |
| 32   | Burns Engineering                        |
| 42   | CannonDesign                             |
| 46   | CDM Smith                                |
| 81   | CJL Engineering                          |
| 96   | Cleary Zimmermann Engineers              |
| 14   | CMTA                                     |
| 27   | Coffman Engineers                        |
| 67   | Core States Group                        |
| 73   | Cushing Terrell                          |
| 36   | Dewberry                                 |
| 99   | DFW Consulting Group                     |
| 33   | DLB Associates Consulting Engineers      |
| 39   | DLR Group                                |
| 62   | Dunham Associates                        |
| 90   | EEA Consulting Engineers                 |
| 58   | EMA Engineering and Consulting           |
| 63   | ENFRA                                    |
| 49   | EwingCole                                |
| 10   | EXP                                      |
| 28   | Fishbeck                                 |

| RANK | FIRM NAME                                       |
|------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 34   | GFT                                             |
| 52   | Ghafari Associates                              |
| 98   | GHT Limited                                     |
| 68   | GPI/Greenman-Pedersen                           |
| 66   | H.F. Lenz Co.                                   |
| 54   | H2M architects + engineers                      |
| 3    | Harris                                          |
| 9    | HDR                                             |
| 44   | HEAPY Engineering                               |
| 69   | HED                                             |
| 18   | Henderson Engineers                             |
| 50   | HGA                                             |
| 64   | Highland Associates                             |
| 72   | Hipp Design + Consulting                        |
| 12   | IMEG                                            |
| 100  | Jacob Feinberg Katz & Michaeli Consulting Group |
| 55   | Kimley-Horn                                     |
| 1    | Jacobs                                          |
| 24   | Jaros, Baum & Bolles (JB&B)                     |
| 13   | Jensen Hughes                                   |
| 43   | Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson                    |
| 61   | Jordan & Skala Engineers                        |
| 94   | Karpinski Engineering                           |
| 51   | Kimley-Horn                                     |
| 97   | Kohler Ronan                                    |
| 86   | Kohrs Lonnemann Heil Engineers                  |
| 35   | LaBella Associates                              |
| 89   | LiRo Engineers                                  |
| 88   | Matrix Technologies                             |
| 65   | Mazzetti                                        |
| 87   | McKim & Creed                                   |
| 38   | McKinstry                                       |
| 26   | ME Engineers                                    |
| 55   | MG Engineering                                  |

| RANK | FIRM NAME                                   |
|------|---------------------------------------------|
| 78   | Michaud Cooley Erickson (MCE)               |
| 6    | Mott MacDonald                              |
| 17   | NV5 Global                                  |
| 70   | Osborn Engineering                          |
| 41   | P2S LP                                      |
| 31   | PAE Consulting Engineers                    |
| 83   | PBS Engineers                               |
| 85   | Peter Basso Associates                      |
| 71   | Pond & Company                              |
| 56   | Power Design                                |
| 74   | Precis Engineering + Architecture           |
| 53   | Resolut                                     |
| 30   | RMF Engineering                             |
| 45   | Robert Derector Associates                  |
| 37   | RTM Engineering Consultants                 |
| 7    | Salas O'Brien                               |
| 82   | Sazan Group                                 |
| 91   | SETTY                                       |
| 40   | Smith Seckman Reid                          |
| 29   | SmithGroup                                  |
| 22   | Southland Industries                        |
| 16   | SSOE Group                                  |
| 57   | Stanley Consultants                         |
| 8    | Stantec                                     |
| 48   | STV                                         |
| 19   | Syska Hennessy Group                        |
| 11   | Tetra Tech High Performance Buildings Group |
| 77   | ThermalTech Engineering                     |
| 25   | TLC Engineering Solutions                   |
| 23   | Vanderweil Engineers                        |
| 59   | WB Engineers+Consultants                    |
| 93   | WD Partners                                 |
| 92   | Wiley Wilson                                |
| 4    | WSP                                         |

# 2026 MEP GIANTS INDEX



| RANK | FIRM NAME                                   | LOCATION               | TOTAL GROSS REVENUE FOR FISCAL YEAR (\$ US) | TOTAL MEP DESIGN REVENUE (\$ US) | PERCENT MEP REVENUE | MEP REVENUE, U.S. PROJECTS |
|------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 1    | Jacobs                                      | Dallas, TX, U.S.       | \$12,029,783,000                            | \$2,398,000,000                  | 20%                 | 62%                        |
| 2    | Burns & McDonnell                           | Kansas City, MO, U.S.  | \$8,600,000,000                             | \$2,137,909,556                  | 25%                 | 96%                        |
| 3    | Harris                                      | St. Paul, MN, U.S.     | \$1,760,868,589                             | \$1,760,868,589                  | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 4    | WSP                                         | New York, NY, U.S.     | \$13,340,000,000                            | \$1,503,911,733                  | 11%                 | 35%                        |
| 5    | AECOM                                       | Dallas, TX, U.S.       | \$16,139,600,000                            | \$1,452,564,000                  | 9%                  | 14%                        |
| 6    | Mott MacDonald                              | Iselin, NJ, U.S.       | \$3,344,272,000                             | \$813,285,914                    | 24%                 | 14%                        |
| 7    | Salas O'Brien                               | Irvine, CA, U.S.       | \$893,651,189                               | \$614,048,509                    | 69%                 | 90%                        |
| 8    | Stantec                                     | Edmonton, AB, Canada   | \$1,451,101,881                             | \$601,387,857                    | 41%                 | 75%                        |
| 9    | HDR                                         | Omaha, NE, U.S.        | \$4,189,528,705                             | \$537,246,534                    | 13%                 | 80%                        |
| 10   | EXP                                         | Brampton, ON, Canada   | \$1,151,172,000                             | \$481,085,000                    | 42%                 | 50%                        |
| 11   | Tetra Tech High Performance Buildings Group | Pasadena, CA, U.S.     | \$5,442,590,000                             | \$442,930,000                    | 8%                  | 40%                        |
| 12   | IMEG                                        | Rock Island, IL, U.S.  | \$599,100,000                               | \$374,150,000                    | 62%                 | 100%                       |
| 13   | Jensen Hughes                               | Columbia, MD, U.S.     | \$422,310,206                               | \$339,921,206                    | 80%                 | 65%                        |
| 14   | CMTA                                        | Prospect, KY, U.S.     | \$553,275,273                               | \$330,509,012                    | 60%                 | 100%                       |
| 15   | Affiliated Engineers                        | Madison, WI, U.S.      | \$265,304,000                               | \$239,234,000                    | 90%                 | 99%                        |
| 16   | SSOE Group                                  | Toledo, OH, U.S.       | \$320,832,643                               | \$223,880,680                    | 70%                 | 95%                        |
| 17   | NV5 Global                                  | Hollywood, FL, U.S.    | \$1,012,041,522                             | \$221,000,000                    | 22%                 | 52%                        |
| 18   | Henderson Engineers                         | Lenexa, KA, U.S.       | \$189,597,362                               | \$189,597,362                    | 100%                | 98%                        |
| 19   | Syska Hennessy Group                        | New York, NY, U.S.     | \$198,666,970                               | \$184,958,748                    | 93%                 | 93%                        |
| 20   | Alfa Tech Consulting Engineers              | San Jose, CA, U.S.     | \$173,000,000                               | \$173,000,000                    | 100%                | 75%                        |
| 21   | Bard, Rao + Athanas Consulting Engineers    | Boston, MA, U.S.       | \$156,000,000                               | \$156,000,000                    | 100%                | 99%                        |
| 22   | Southland Industries                        | Garden Grove, CA, U.S. | \$3,951,185,634                             | \$142,426,481                    | 4%                  | 100%                       |
| 23   | Vanderweil Engineers                        | Boston, MA, U.S.       | \$168,756,070                               | \$134,709,138                    | 80%                 | 99%                        |
| 24   | Jaros, Baum & Bolles (JB&B)                 | New York, NY, U.S.     | \$135,652,349                               | \$129,723,953                    | 96%                 | 99%                        |
| 25   | TLC Engineering Solutions                   | Orlando, FL, U.S.      | \$144,496,287                               | \$122,011,954                    | 84%                 | 99%                        |
| 26   | ME Engineers                                | Golden, CO, U.S.       | \$119,200,000                               | \$119,200,000                    | 100%                | 76%                        |
| 27   | Coffman Engineers                           | Seattle, WA, U.S.      | \$186,256,941                               | \$108,029,026                    | 58%                 | 98%                        |
| 28   | Fishbeck                                    | Grand Rapids, MI, U.S. | \$158,000,000                               | \$100,000,000                    | 63%                 | 100%                       |
| 29   | SmithGroup                                  | Detroit, MI, U.S.      | \$507,486,667                               | \$97,397,501                     | 19%                 | 19%                        |
| 30   | RMF Engineering                             | Baltimore, MD, U.S.    | \$95,327,387                                | \$95,327,387                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 31   | PAE Consulting Engineers                    | Portland, OR, U.S.     | \$93,100,100                                | \$91,828,653                     | 99%                 | 100%                       |
| 32   | Burns Engineering                           | Philadelphia, PA, U.S. | \$105,858,506                               | \$87,755,000                     | 83%                 | 100%                       |
| 33   | DLB Associates Consulting Engineers         | Neptune, NJ, U.S.      | \$167,212,282                               | \$86,759,193                     | 52%                 | 99%                        |

# 2026 MEP GIANTS INDEX



| RANK | FIRM NAME                      | LOCATION                 | TOTAL GROSS REVENUE FOR FISCAL YEAR (\$ US) | TOTAL MEP DESIGN REVENUE (\$ US) | PERCENT MEP REVENUE | MEP REVENUE, U.S. PROJECTS |
|------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 34   | GFT                            | Mechanicsburg, PA, U.S.  | \$1,519,220,000                             | \$85,800,000                     | 6%                  | 100%                       |
| 35   | LaBella Associates             | Rochester, NY, U.S.      | \$405,103,331                               | \$84,752,636                     | 21%                 | 100%                       |
| 36   | Dewberry                       | Fairfax, VA, U.S.        | \$763,000,000                               | \$83,803,780                     | 11%                 | 95%                        |
| 37   | RTM Engineering Consultants    | Schaumburg, IL, U.S.     | \$111,528,000                               | \$78,865,760                     | 71%                 | 100%                       |
| 38   | McKinstry                      | Seattle, WA, U.S.        | \$1,500,000,000                             | \$77,300,000                     | 5%                  | 100%                       |
| 39   | DLR Group                      | Seattle, WA, U.S.        | \$536,800,000                               | \$75,149,630                     | 14%                 | 100%                       |
| 40   | Smith Seckman Reid             | Nashville, TN, U.S.      | \$159,276,335                               | \$74,624,653                     | 47%                 | 99%                        |
| 41   | P2S LP                         | Long Beach, CA, U.S.     | \$81,760,659                                | \$71,558,295                     | 88%                 | 100%                       |
| 42   | CannonDesign                   | New York, NY, U.S.       | \$445,000,000                               | \$65,000,000                     | 15%                 | 98%                        |
| 43   | Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson   | Hunt Valley, MD, U.S.    | \$652,279,487                               | \$62,147,354                     | 10%                 | 97%                        |
| 44   | HEAPY Engineering              | Dayton, OH, U.S.         | \$103,905,000                               | \$60,941,000                     | 59%                 | 100%                       |
| 45   | Robert Derector Associates     | New York, NY, U.S.       | \$60,400,000                                | \$60,400,000                     | 100%                | 99%                        |
| 46   | CDM Smith                      | Boston, MA, U.S.         | \$1,808,431,949                             | \$59,847,372                     | 3%                  | 0%                         |
| 47   | Arora Engineers                | Chadds Ford, PA, U.S.    | \$79,744,081                                | \$58,268,182                     | 73%                 | 100%                       |
| 48   | STV                            | New York, NY, U.S.       | \$1,012,382,000                             | \$57,903,631                     | 6%                  | 100%                       |
| 49   | EwingCole                      | Philadelphia, PA, U.S.   | \$125,586,843                               | \$56,514,079                     | 45%                 | 100%                       |
| 50   | HGA                            | Minneapolis, MN, U.S.    | \$309,010,900                               | \$55,930,973                     | 18%                 | 99%                        |
| 51   | Kimley-Horn                    | Raleigh, NC, U.S.        | \$3,476,588,785                             | \$55,268,377                     | 2%                  | 100%                       |
| 52   | Ghafari Associates             | Dearborn, MI, U.S.       | \$150,100,000                               | \$53,000,000                     | 35%                 | 75%                        |
| 53   | Resolut                        | Murray, UT, U.S.         | \$46,949,988                                | \$46,949,988                     | 100%                | 97%                        |
| 54   | H2M architects + engineers     | Melville, NY, U.S.       | \$122,657,000                               | \$46,730,000                     | 38%                 | 100%                       |
| 55   | MG Engineering                 | New York, NY, U.S.       | \$45,200,000                                | \$45,200,000                     | 100%                | 99%                        |
| 56   | Power Design                   | St. Petersburg, FL, U.S. | \$1,267,470,312                             | \$43,959,593                     | 3%                  | 100%                       |
| 57   | Stanley Consultants            | Muscatine, IA, U.S.      | \$270,238,871                               | \$42,992,064                     | 16%                 | 15%                        |
| 58   | EMA Engineering and Consulting | Tyler, TX, U.S.          | \$48,100,000                                | \$42,500,000                     | 88%                 | 100%                       |
| 59   | WB Engineers+Consultants       | New York, NY, U.S.       | \$49,100,000                                | \$42,100,000                     | 86%                 | 99%                        |
| 60   | Bala Consulting Engineers      | Wayne, PA, U.S.          | \$57,300,000                                | \$41,000,000                     | 72%                 | 99%                        |
| 61   | Jordan & Skala Engineers       | Norcross, GA, U.S.       | \$45,655,572                                | \$39,978,398                     | 88%                 | 99%                        |
| 62   | Dunham Associates              | Minneapolis, MN, U.S.    | \$38,800,850                                | \$37,800,850                     | 97%                 | 98%                        |
| 63   | ENFRA                          | Little Rock, AK, U.S.    | \$1,000,000,000                             | \$37,800,000                     | 4%                  | 100%                       |
| 64   | Highland Associates            | New York, NY, U.S.       | \$66,400,000                                | \$37,185,000                     | 56%                 | 100%                       |
| 65   | Mazzetti                       | San Francisco, WA, U.S.  | \$50,000,000                                | \$35,000,000                     | 70%                 | 90%                        |
| 66   | H.F. Lenz Co.                  | Johnstown, PA, U.S.      | \$41,054,000                                | \$34,806,000                     | 85%                 | 100%                       |

# 2026 MEP GIANTS INDEX



| RANK | FIRM NAME                                       | LOCATION                    | TOTAL GROSS REVENUE FOR FISCAL YEAR (\$ US) | TOTAL MEP DESIGN REVENUE (\$ US) | PERCENT MEP REVENUE | MEP REVENUE, U.S. PROJECTS |
|------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 67   | Core States Group                               | West Chester, PA, U.S.      | \$197,851,289                               | \$32,874,435                     | 17%                 | 99%                        |
| 68   | GPI/Greenman-Pedersen                           | Melville, NY, U.S.          | \$411,372,536                               | \$32,000,000                     | 8%                  | 100%                       |
| 69   | HED                                             | Royal Oak, MI, U.S.         | \$142,700,000                               | \$31,400,000                     | 22%                 | 100%                       |
| 70   | Osborn Engineering                              | Cleveland, OH, U.S.         | \$79,730,000                                | \$31,177,593                     | 39%                 | 100%                       |
| 71   | Pond & Company                                  | Peachtree Corners, GA, U.S. | \$358,000,000                               | \$30,067,000                     | 8%                  | 92%                        |
| 72   | Hipp Design + Consulting                        | Raleigh, NC, U.S.           | \$32,504,891                                | \$29,961,159                     | 92%                 | 100%                       |
| 73   | Cushing Terrell                                 | Billings, MT, U.S.          | \$115,779,487                               | \$29,734,296                     | 26%                 | 26%                        |
| 74   | Precis Engineering + Architecture               | Ambler, PA, U.S.            | \$30,500,000                                | \$29,500,000                     | 97%                 | 100%                       |
| 75   | BSA                                             | Carmel, IN, U.S.            | \$82,202,169                                | \$29,498,704                     | 36%                 | 100%                       |
| 76   | BRPH Companies                                  | Melbourne, FL, U.S.         | \$201,400,000                               | \$29,350,000                     | 15%                 | 99%                        |
| 77   | ThermalTech Engineering                         | Richland, MI, U.S.          | \$32,800,000                                | \$28,561,000                     | 87%                 | 99%                        |
| 78   | Michaud Cooley Erickson (MCE)                   | Minneapolis, MN, U.S.       | \$27,650,000                                | \$27,650,000                     | 100%                | 99%                        |
| 79   | Bowman Consulting Group (Bowman)                | Reston, VA, U.S.            | \$490,000,000                               | \$27,000,000                     | 6%                  | 100%                       |
| 80   | Burdette, Koehler, Murphy & Associates          | Baltimore, MD, U.S.         | \$26,700,000                                | \$26,700,000                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 81   | CJL Engineering                                 | Moon Township, PA, U.S.     | \$25,979,825                                | \$25,979,825                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 82   | Sazan Group                                     | Seattle, WA, U.S.           | \$26,258,789                                | \$25,916,173                     | 99%                 | 100%                       |
| 83   | PBS Engineers                                   | San Dimas, CA, U.S.         | \$25,802,497                                | \$25,802,497                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 84   | Bridgers & Paxton Consulting Engineers          | Albuquerque, NM, U.S.       | \$24,539,793                                | \$24,539,793                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 85   | Peter Basso Associates                          | Troy, MI, U.S.              | \$24,923,000                                | \$23,322,718                     | 94%                 | 100%                       |
| 86   | Kohrs Lonnemann Heil Engineers                  | Ft. Thomas, KY, U.S.        | \$23,193,493                                | \$23,193,493                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 87   | McKim & Creed                                   | Raleigh, NC, U.S.           | \$198,600,000                               | \$23,066,000                     | 12%                 | 100%                       |
| 88   | Matrix Technologies                             | Maumee, OH, U.S.            | \$75,774,082                                | \$22,385,782                     | 30%                 | 99%                        |
| 89   | LiRo Engineers                                  | Syosset, NY, U.S.           | \$535,000,000                               | \$21,837,152                     | 4%                  | 100%                       |
| 90   | EEA Consulting Engineers                        | Austin, TX, U.S.            | \$28,488,979                                | \$21,229,499                     | 75%                 | 100%                       |
| 91   | SETTY                                           | Washington, DC, U.S.        | \$22,817,619                                | \$21,059,064                     | 92%                 | 100%                       |
| 92   | Wiley Wilson                                    | Lynchburg, VA, U.S.         | \$46,800,000                                | \$20,925,000                     | 45%                 | 100%                       |
| 93   | WD Partners                                     | Dublin, OH, U.S.            | \$62,635,000                                | \$20,618,000                     | 33%                 | 96%                        |
| 94   | Karpinski Engineering                           | Cleveland, OH, U.S.         | \$22,000,000                                | \$20,000,000                     | 91%                 | 100%                       |
| 95   | Barton Associates                               | York, PA, U.S.              | \$18,982,949                                | \$18,982,949                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 96   | Cleary Zimmermann Engineers                     | San Antonio, TX, U.S.       | \$20,900,000                                | \$18,300,000                     | 88%                 | 100%                       |
| 97   | Kohler Ronan                                    | Danbury, CT, U.S.           | \$16,857,355                                | \$16,857,355                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 98   | GHT Limited                                     | Arlington, VA, U.S.         | \$16,824,000                                | \$16,824,000                     | 100%                | 100%                       |
| 99   | DFW Consulting Group                            | Irving, TX, U.S.            | \$23,330,342                                | \$15,870,434                     | 68%                 | 100%                       |
| 100  | Jacob Feinberg Katz & Michaeli Consulting Group | New York, NY, U.S.          | \$14,600,000                                | \$14,600,000                     | 100%                | 100%                       |

# ELECTRIFIED SYSTEMS DRIVING MODERN INFRASTRUCTURE



*Powering Business Worldwide*



## **Electrified systems driving modern infrastructure**

Electrification is transforming modern infrastructure and Eaton is helping accelerate that shift. As energy demand grows and industries transition to cleaner, more connected systems, electrified technologies are becoming essential for transportation, buildings, data centers, manufacturing and communities everywhere.

# 2026 MEP GIANTS SPECIAL REPORT

Amara Rozgus and Amanda Pelliccione, *Consulting-Specifying Engineer*, Chicago

## 2026 MEP Giants numbers soar compared with last year

*Total MEP design revenue increased, making this a lucrative year for the MEP Giants.*

**T**he 2026 *Consulting-Specifying Engineer* MEP Giants, which represents data collected from the 2025 fiscal year, show a larger and more revenue-heavy market than the previous year's data. Across the mechanical, electrical, plumbing (MEP) and fire protection engineering firms highlighted, total gross revenue rose from about \$73.79 billion in 2024 to \$98 billion in 2025, while total MEP design revenue increased from \$15.02 billion to \$19.18 billion, representing an increase of 27.7%.

The average percentage of revenue attributed to MEP work also edged up, from 55.7% to 56.9%, suggesting that the listed firms remain highly concentrated in building systems work even as several multidisciplinary firms continue to dominate the top of the ranking.

At the top of the list, Jacobs retained the No. 1 position, followed again by Burns & McDonnell at No. 2. The most notable additions near the top are Harris, which entered

**Table 1: Top 10 firms by MEP design revenue**

| Rank | Firm              | MEP design revenue |
|------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1    | Jacobs            | \$2,398,000,000    |
| 2    | Burns & McDonnell | \$2,137,909,556    |
| 3    | Harris            | \$1,760,868,589    |
| 4    | WSP               | \$1,503,911,733    |
| 5    | AECOM             | \$145,256,4000     |
| 6    | Mott MacDonald    | \$813,285,914      |
| 7    | Salas O'Brien     | \$614,048,509      |
| 8    | Stantec           | \$601,387,857      |
| 9    | HDR               | \$537,246,534      |
| 10   | EXP               | \$481,085,000      |

**Table 1:** Top 10 firms are listed by MEP design revenue; these 10 firms earned \$1.23 billion out of \$19.18 billion earned by all 2026 *Consulting-Specifying Engineer* MEP Giants. Jacobs topped the list yet again — as it has since 2013 — with \$2.39 billion in MEP design revenue, a slight increase from last year. Courtesy: *Consulting-Specifying Engineer*

# 2026 MEP GIANTS SPECIAL REPORT

the list at No. 3, and AECOM, which appears at No. 5. WSP moved from No. 3 to No. 4, while Mott MacDonald slipped from No. 4 to No. 6. Salas O'Brien held steady at No. 7, and Stantec remained No. 8. HDR moved from No. 6 to No. 9, while EXP remained No. 10.

Table 1 shows the top firms based on MEP design revenue, which is how the MEP Giants are ranked.

## Shifting MEP Giants firms

There were 20 firms appearing in the current data that were not exact matches the previous year. These include Harris; AECOM; Alfa Tech Consulting Engineers; Jaros, Baum & Bolles (JB&B); Coffman Engineers; Fishbeck; GFT; HEAPY Engineering; STV; Resolut; EMA Engineering and Consulting; ENFRA; Hipp Design + Consulting; Precis Engineering + Architecture; BSA; BRPH Companies; Michaud Cooley Erickson (MCE); Bowman Consulting Group; DFW Consulting Group; and Jacob Feinberg Katz & Michaeli Consulting Group. Some of these appear to reflect naming changes or rebranding rather than purely new market entrants, such as Alfa Tech/Vela Tech - AlfaTech, GFT/Gannett Fleming Transystems, JB&B, EMA and Michaud Cooley Erickson.

Ranking movement was substantial among several firms. The largest positive jumps were LaBella Associates, up 27 spots from No. 62 to No. 35, and Arora Engineers, up 26 spots from No. 73 to No. 47. Other significant gains included Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson and DLB Associates Consulting Engineers, each up 14 spots; Power Design, up 10; and McKim & Creed, up six. The largest declines included ThermalTech Engineering, down 33 spots from No. 44 to No. 77; Pond & Co., down 18; Ghafari Associates, down 13; EwingCole, down nine; Smith Seckman Reid, down seven; and LiRo Engineers, down six.

Several year-over-year percentage shifts point to broader changes in firm revenue mix rather than simple ranking movement. The data suggests that some firms are reporting a larger share of MEP revenue from U.S.-based projects, while others show a greater concentration of work outside the U.S. or a different geographic balance than in the previous year.

Similarly, changes in the percentage of total revenue attributed to MEP work indicate that portions of the list are becoming either more specialized in MEP/FP services or more diversified across other disciplines. These shifts may reflect changes in project mix, market focus, acquisitions, organizational restructuring or reporting methodology (see "More MEP Giants join the deal-making fray in 2025" on page 21 for details about mergers and acquisitions).

Overall, the 2026 *Consulting-Specifying Engineer* MEP Giants reflect a stronger revenue base, continued dominance by large national and global firms, and meaningful volatility among midranked firms. For consulting engineers and MEP/FP industry observers, the data points to both consolidation at the top and competitive movement throughout the ranking.

It also suggests that the market is not changing only in size, but also in composition, with firms adjusting geographically, strategically and operationally as demand for MEP/FP design services continues to evolve.

## MEP Giants human resources

The 2026 MEP Giants firms employ 24,097 MEP/FP engineers, a 5.2% increase from 22,902 last year. On average, each 2026 MEP Giants firm has 116 mechanical engineers (up from 111 in 2025), 99 electrical engineers (up from 90),

# 2026 MEP GIANTS SPECIAL REPORT

14 plumbing engineers (down from 17), 12 fire protection engineers (up slightly from 11) and 60 environmental engineers (up substantially from 21).

This year's MEP Giants employ 242,989 people, including all types of administrative staff and job titles, a notable increase from last year's staffing total of 186,660 people. The firms also reported 70,896 total engineers employed, compared with 61,374 in the previous year.

The engineering staffs of this year's firms are made up of 18% females, essentially even with last year. When asked "What percentage of your firm's nonengineering staff are female?" respondents indicated 41% were female, a slight increase from 39% the year before.


On average, firms had 88 LEED Accredited Professionals at any level, up from 84 last year, and nine commissioning agents or professionals (CxAs or CxPs) on the team, essentially unchanged from last year.

## Projects, revenue for MEP Giants

In the 2025 fiscal year, as defined by each company, the MEP Giants earned 90% of their MEP design revenue from U.S.-based projects, a slight increase from 89% last year. Several opportunities remain open to MEP Giants outside the United States. Engineering services are provided in other parts of North America, including Mexico and Canada, 46% of the time, up from 44%. Other areas of international revenue include the European Union at 29%, Asia at 28%, the Middle East at 27% and the Caribbean at 22%.

Project type and billing data remained heavily centered on core building systems. HVAC represented 31% of MEP design billings, followed by electrical/power at 29%, plumbing

at 13%, fire/life safety/security at 7%, lighting at 6%, building automation/controls at 5%, commissioning at 5% and other services at 4% (see Figure 1).



**Figure 1:** The top two areas in which 2026 Consulting-Specifying Engineer MEP Giants earned revenue — HVAC and electrical/power projects — varies very little year over year. Courtesy: Consulting-Specifying Engineer

When it comes to sustainable engineering, the number of U.S. Green Building Council LEED projects increased to 1,988, up 24.6% from 1,596 projects last year. The number of projects submitted in the past fiscal year to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star Buildings Label increased to 383 projects, compared with 360 last year, with an average of nearly four projects completed by each of the 2026 MEP Giants.

# 2026 MEP GIANTS SPECIAL REPORT

## Ownership types

The overall ownership profile remained stable: private firms and employee-owned firms continued to make up most of the 2026 *Consulting-Specifying Engineer* MEP Giants list in both years. In the current year, private firms still represent the largest ownership category, while employee-owned firms remained the second-largest group.

The main changes were:

- Private firms decreased from 59% to 53% of the list.
- Employee-owned firms increased slightly from 28% to 30%.
- Limited liability companies decreased slightly from 8% to 7%.
- Public companies increased from 5% to 10%.

The biggest ownership shift was the increase in publicly held firms, which doubled from five to 10 companies. Even so, public firms still represent a relatively small share of the MEP Giants compared with private and employee-owned firms.

In broader terms, the data suggests the MEP Giants remain dominated by privately held and employee-owned companies, but the list includes a somewhat larger presence of public firms. That may reflect the addition or return of larger multidisciplinary firms, acquisition activity or changes in which firms submitted data for the ranking.

## Survey methodology

At the beginning of 2026, the *Consulting-Specifying Engineer* staff collected and analyzed data from several consulting and engineering firms. Some of the top mechanical, electrical, plumbing and fire protection engineering firms submitted their firms' profiles to *Consulting-Specifying Engineer*; however, not all consulting firms were willing or able to participate in this year's MEP Giants study. The smallest amount of MEP design revenue reported this year was more than \$14.6 million, slightly less than the last reporting period. Some firms were unable to report final data.

In 2026, more than 100 engineering firms provided their information for the MEP Giants program, with some newcomers or firms reentering the program. Data and percentages are based on the top 100 companies that responded to the request for information; the results do not fully represent the construction and engineering market as a whole. However, with nearly identical questions asked in previous years and more than 100 engineering firms participating this year, we present a qualified portrait of where the top engineering firms stand in 2026.

Margin of error: 9.8% at a 95% confidence level.



# We make what matters work.



*Powering Business Worldwide*

Power. It's all around us. Turn on the lights. Step onboard a train. Open your laptop. Drive to the store. Take an elevator to work. Share a cup of coffee with a friend. Nearly everything we do and experience is made possible by power. And the companies we depend on to keep our modern world moving depend on Eaton. To help manage power and resources more safely, reliably and efficiently each and every day. Because this is what really matters. And we're here to make sure it works.

To learn more go to: [Eaton.com/whatmatters](https://www.eaton.com/whatmatters)

**We make what matters work.**

# The power of choice

*How consulting-specifying engineers are shaping the future of energy infrastructure everywhere*

**E**lectricity is entering a new era. After nearly two decades of relatively flat consumption, demand is rising sharply again – driven by explosive growth in data centers, the electrification of transportation, reindustrialization and the rapid expansion of digital infrastructure.

The scale of this shift is significant. Global electricity demand is projected to increase by roughly 50% by 2050, with some sectors growing far faster. Data center energy use alone is expected to climb by more than 160% in the next decade, and electric mobility isn't far behind.

At the same time, the traditional one-way electric grid is evolving into a dynamic, bidirectional network where buildings can increasingly generate, store and export power. These megatrends are converging at a time when grid infrastructure is already strained, utilities face challenges expanding capacity quickly enough to meet demand, and many regions are experiencing longer interconnection timelines and higher upgrade costs.

For consulting-specifying engineers, this moment represents both a challenge and a once-in-a-generation opportunity. At Eaton, we work directly with the engineering community to navigate this complexity – supporting the development of more capable electrical systems that integrate diverse energy sources, optimize consumption and ensure resilience in the face of rising demand.

## A worldwide energy transformation



65% projected increase in electricity demand from residential and commercial buildings by 2050, driven by electrification, digitalization, and rising global energy needs.



700 million electric vehicles expected on the road by 2050, fundamentally reshaping load profiles and grid infrastructure requirements around the world.



\$4.8 trillion in estimated savings from sustainable buildings globally, underscoring the scale of the opportunity for engineers designing the infrastructure of tomorrow.

## The consultant's role in engineering the future of energy systems

Consulting-specifying engineers are at the forefront of the energy transition. They are designing the next generation of buildings, campuses, data centers and industrial facilities – each of which is becoming a more active participant in the energy ecosystem.

## THE POWER OF CHOICE

The role of the electrical consultant is expanding in several important ways, and engineering firms are now expected to serve as:

- Strategic advisors helping clients evaluate energy options and right-size investments
- System integrators designing flexible, modular architectures that can grow over time
- Technology leaders staying ahead of emerging trends like DC microgrids and AI-driven optimization
- Grid collaborators working closely with utilities to navigate interconnection complexity
- Sustainability partners guiding clients toward decarbonization and long-term resilience.

One of the clearest examples of this expanded role is grid interconnection, which has become one of the most significant challenges in modern electrical design. As more distributed energy resources (DERs) and large loads come online globally, utilities face unprecedented demand for new connections. This emerging challenge is leading to longer queues, higher upgrade costs and increased uncertainty for project timelines.

At Eaton, we've seen that consultants who can engage early with utilities, conduct capacity analysis, and incorporate energy storage and microgrid controls into system architectures can help clients move forward even when grid capacity is constrained.

And as power systems become more complex, insight and creativity are becoming essential. By designing systems that

### Why electrical capacity constraints matter now

Local grid capacity limitations are more than a scheduling inconvenience. They are a fundamental cost and competitiveness issue pushing building owners, industrial operators and campuses to seriously evaluate DERs as essential business tools.



Escalating energy costs. Peak demand charges increase as utilities struggle to meet rising demand and pass infrastructure upgrade costs on to customers.



Delayed project timelines. Interconnection queues are lengthening and upgrade negotiations are dragging on, stretching project schedules and creating budget uncertainty.



Increased investment risk. Planned facilities that cannot secure adequate power face delayed openings, reduced capacity or costly redesigns.



Reduced competitive advantage. Facilities with older, less efficient systems are losing ground to those that have modernized.

This is where consulting-specifying engineers can create distinctive value: by designing systems that unlock flexibility when the grid cannot.

# THE POWER OF CHOICE

## Accelerate the power of choice with our Buildings as a Grid approach

With advances in solar, EV charging, energy storage and digitalization, power can now flow bi-directionally, to and from the grid. Buildings are no longer just consumers of energy. They are becoming active energy hubs.

Eaton's **Buildings as a Grid** approach is built around this new reality. It empowers organizations to put their existing infrastructure to work in new ways, integrating onsite distributed energy resources (DERs) to reduce energy costs, strengthen resilience and support a low-carbon future. The approach delivers value across three dimensions:


**Resilience.** Bolster critical operations to ensure business continuity. Operate in island mode during outages. Protect people, assets and data.

**Efficiency.** Optimize energy consumption to reduce operating costs. Avoid peak demand charges. Generate revenue through grid-interactive energy storage solutions, grid services and demand response programs.

**Sustainability.** Generate more power from renewable sources. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Balance power consumption during times of peak energy generation.

Whether you are designing a corporate campus, an educational facility, a healthcare complex or an industrial plant, Eaton's integrated portfolio spanning advanced switchgear, energy storage, microgrid controllers and digital energy management provides the foundation for a flexible, future-ready energy system.



## THE POWER OF CHOICE

### The power of choice in action: Maplewood Intermediate/Middle School in Wisconsin

**Challenge:** The Menasha Joint School District set out to build Wisconsin's second net-zero school aiming to integrate and optimize onsite distributed energy resources (DERs) including solar battery storage and a backup generator while meeting rigorous utility interconnection requirements. A key driver was the district's goal to reduce long-term energy costs, conserve taxpayer dollars and achieve net-zero energy performance in a region with growing capacity constraints.


**Solution:** Eaton delivered a fully integrated turnkey microgrid solution featuring a 1.2 MWac solar array, Eaton xStorage™ battery energy storage system, advanced microgrid controls factory-integrated into an Eaton switchboard and electrically operated circuit breakers for dynamic load management. Eaton's engineering team collaborated closely with the local utility to develop load-shedding strategies, grounding configurations and protection schemes that met the utility's rigorous grid stability standards.

**Result:** The school opened ahead of the 2025 academic year and is projected to deliver \$190,000 in annual energy savings through intelligent peak shaving, load management and optimized DER performance. The microgrid also provides critical islanding capability, keeping

essential systems running during grid outages. The project has become a model for how educational institutions can lead on energy innovation.

"From electrical distribution to energy storage intelligent controls and grid interconnection, Eaton provided a solution for every piece of the puzzle. Their depth of expertise and comprehensive approach from project visualization to execution was invaluable."

— Brian Adesso, Director of Business Services, Menasha Joint School District



## THE POWER OF CHOICE

position each building as an active, intelligent participant in the broader energy ecosystem, consultants can help clients turn individual facilities into actionable energy assets. That is the principle at the heart of the power of choice, and it is the opportunity that defines the current opportunity for the profession.

### **The power of choice is transforming energy infrastructure**

The future of energy is not about choosing one source over another. It is about embracing the power of choice. A diversified energy portfolio allows facilities to meet rising loads while improving resilience, sustainability and cost control. The goal is to design systems that can adapt by integrating new energy sources, controls and storage as requirements change.

Consultants are increasingly designing systems that blend utility power for baseline reliability, onsite DERs for peak shaving and load shifting, combined heat and power for high-efficiency thermal and electrical generation, and intelligent microgrid controls that optimize onsite production and consumption.

The value of this approach goes beyond sustainability. Energy resilience has become essential to maintaining uptime, controlling costs and protecting long-term asset value. This urgency is reflected in a recent S&P Global research report in which 37% of building owners cited resilience and operational continuity as their top investment priority.

Facilities that adopt a hybrid energy approach can add redundancy, unlock additional capacity and maintain uptime even when grid upgrades are delayed. By reducing peak

grid load through onsite generation and storage, many facilities can move forward on construction and expansion plans even when utility capacity is constrained.

For consulting engineers, the opportunity is clear. Design systems that give clients more options, more flexibility and more control over their energy future. At Eaton, this approach is reflected in our Buildings as a Grid framework, which treats each building as an intelligent energy asset rather than a passive load on the grid.

### **Intelligent power management enables you to do more with what you have**

As demand grows and grid capacity tightens, smarter energy management becomes just as important as adding new sources of power. Intelligent power management systems allow facilities to optimize energy production and consumption while reducing waste and operating more efficiently – effectively enabling buildings to do more with the power they have.

The strategies making this possible span the full range of modern electrical design. Real-time monitoring and analytics identify inefficiencies and surface actionable insights before they become costly problems. AI-driven optimization balances loads and manages DERs across a facility or campus in real time. Demand response and load shifting help facilities avoid peak charges and participate in grid services programs. Intelligent switchgear and smart breakers shed non-critical loads automatically. DC power architectures reduce conversion losses and improve system efficiency. And digital twins simulate performance under a range of conditions, helping engineers validate design decisions before construction begins.

## THE POWER OF CHOICE

For consultants, intelligent power management is a powerful lever that can help clients avoid costly upgrades, improve reliability and meet sustainability goals. At Eaton, we're proud to offer one of the industry's most intelligent power management solution portfolios to help drive energy resilience, sustainability and optimization across projects of all sizes and complexity.

- **Power Xpert microgrid controller**

Built on utility-grade hardware, the Power Xpert Microgrid Controller is the intelligence at the heart of Eaton's microgrid solutions. It manages power flow, coordinates DERs, and enables seamless transitions between grid-connected and islanded operation across applications ranging from single-building deployments to large campuses.

- **xStorage battery energy storage system**

The xStorage BESS delivers 250 to 1,000 kWh of usable stored energy in a modular, liquid-cooled design engineered for commercial and industrial applications. It supports peak shaving, time-of-use optimization, demand response, backup power and islanding, and integrates directly with Eaton's microgrid controller and Brightlayer Energy software.

- **Brightlayer Energy**

Eaton energy management and optimization software (EMOS) unifies onsite renewables, battery storage and EV charging infrastructure into a single platform. It enables real-time DER monitoring and dispatch, load management, environmental reporting and virtual power plant participation to help buildings reduce energy costs and unlock new revenue streams.

- **Pow-R-Line Xpert microgrid switchboard**

Eaton's factory-assembled microgrid switchboard integrates our Power Xpert microgrid controller, Power Defense circuit breakers, metering and protection into a single, pre-tested distribution solution. This standardized built-to-order design reduces field installation time and supports configurations spanning solar, storage, generators, fuel cells and EV charging.

- **The industry's most comprehensive EV charging solutions**

Through an industry-first partnership with ChargePoint, Eaton brings together trusted power distribution solutions with comprehensive EV charging infrastructure and software to simplify vehicle electrification at scale.

- **Turnkey microgrid consulting and engineering services**

Our experienced team of field and applications engineers provides end-to-end project support spanning from feasibility studies to design, commissioning and ongoing operations support. Services include DER sizing, load and site profiling, utility interconnection guidance, protection coordination and cybersecurity risk analysis.

- **A nationwide network of application engineering experts**

Eaton's network of experienced application engineers spans all major U.S. regions with additional teams in Canada and Latin America. This team is dedicated to supporting consulting-specifying engineers with the local market knowledge, deep technical expertise and hands-on collaboration needed to accelerate any type of electrical project.

## THE POWER OF CHOICE

Together, these solutions give consulting engineers a complete, proven toolkit for designing systems that can operate flexibly within constrained grid environments, from concept through commissioning.

### **Let's energize a future built on the power of choice**

Rising electricity demands, constrained grid capacity and the shift toward bidirectional energy systems are reshaping how buildings generate, store and use power. The decisions engineers make today will define the resilience, efficiency and sustainability of the built environment for decades to come. When approaching these decisions, it is important to recognize the future of energy infrastructure will not be

shaped by a single technology. It will be shaped by the choices engineers make and the systems they design to support them. By embracing the power of choice and designing systems that are diversified, intelligent and future-ready, consulting engineers can transform today's electrical constraints into tomorrow's competitive advantage.

At Eaton, we're committed to providing the expertise, solutions and application engineering support you need to make those choices with confidence. Together, let's shape a future where energy systems everywhere are smarter, more efficient and more capable than ever before.

Learn more at [Eaton.com/Consultants](https://www.eaton.com/consultants).



*Powering Business Worldwide*

# 2026 MEP GIANTS SPECIAL REPORT

Peter Frank, Morrissey Goodale LLC, Boston

## More MEP Giants join the deal-making fray in 2025


*Total deal volume by the 2026 MEP Giants eased last year, but a record share of firms got in on the acquisition action.*

**R**ather than tapping the brakes in the face of global geopolitical turmoil and economic uncertainty, *Consulting-Specifying Engineer's* 2026 MEP Giants continued a strong pace of deal-making last year, even as total activity eased from 2024's blistering pace. As a group, the largest mechanical, electrical, plumbing (MEP) and fire protection engineering firms completed 64 acquisitions in 2025 — a 7% decline from the previous year's near-record total of 69, though still one of the most active years for the group over the past decade.

The percentage of MEP Giants making at least one acquisition climbed from 21% in 2024 to 30% in 2025 — the highest ever share recorded. Further, 15 MEP Giants closed more than one acquisition last year, up from 12 in 2024, even as the average number of deals per active buyer eased from 2024's elevated pace.

MEP firms of all types are prime acquisition targets. According to Morrissey Goodale's proprietary database of architecture, engineering (AE) and environmental industry deals, MEP firms are commanding median valuations around seven times annual EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes,

**Number of deals made by MEP Giants**



**Figure 1:** The number of deals made by the 2026 MEP Giants firms eased in 2025 from 2024's near-record pace but remained among the group's most active years of the past decade. Courtesy: Morrissey Goodale

depreciation and amortization) compared to median valuations in the range of six times annual EBITDA for engineering firms overall. The edge in valuations for MEP firms likely reflects the higher demand for firms with niche specialties

# 2026 MEP GIANTS SPECIAL REPORT

**Figure 2:** In 2025, 30% of the MEP Giants reported a transaction, the highest percentage on record. Courtesy: Morrissey Goodale

in critical sectors like energy efficiency, healthcare and pharmaceuticals and especially data centers.

With MEP firms in high demand over the past year, it's no surprise that the MEP Giants aggressively pursued acquisitions to add specialties to their service lines while sellers looked to capitalize on favorable valuations.


## Global, U.S. M&A activity climbs to new highs

The deal-making surge among the MEP Giants mirrors the broader M&A boom among AE and environmental firms that's been driven on the supply side by a wave of baby boomers and Gen-X sellers seeking capital to support growth and facilitate ownership transitions and on the demand side by strategic buyers and investors hungry for growth, talent and superior returns on investment.

Morrissey Goodale tracked 805 global industry deals in 2025 — a new record that eclipsed the previous high of 770 worldwide acquisitions in 2024 and represented a 5% increase over the previous year. In the U.S., 512 transactions were concluded in 2025, surpassing the prior all-time domestic peak of 497 deals set in 2022 and up 6% from 485 in 2024.

As with the wider AE and environmental industry, Sun Belt firms continue to be among the most attractive M&A targets for MEP Giants. With five, four and four deals, respectively, California, Florida and North Carolina were the top states where MEP Giants completed acquisitions in 2025. That was followed by Ohio, South Carolina, New York, Texas and Massachusetts with three each. MEP Giants also concluded 11 international deals, with three purchases in the United

## Percent of MEP Giants reporting a deal




Kingdom, two each in New Zealand, Ireland and Canada and one each in Australia and Norway.

## Private equity pulls back among MEP Giants

The MEP Giants continue to differ from the broader AE and environmental industry in the mix of buyer types pursuing acquisitions. Employee-owned buyers closed 43% of U.S. domestic AE and environmental industry transactions in 2025 and represented 45% of deals completed by the MEP Giants last year. By comparison, publicly traded buyers represented just 9% of overall industry transactions but accounted for 33% of MEP Giants deals in 2025.

Private equity-backed buyers accounted for just 22% of deals consummated by the MEP Giants in 2025. That was down from 29% in 2024 and well below the 47% of acquisitions attributed to them across the entire industry last year. The pullback in private equity activity among the MEP Giants specifically is worth watching heading into 2026. In 2025, the most acquisitive MEP Giant was a private equity-backed firm, while the next tier of buyers included both employee-owned and publicly traded companies. Broader

# 2026 MEP GIANTS SPECIAL REPORT



**Figure 3:** Global merger and acquisition activity in the architecture, engineering (AE) and environmental consulting industry set a record high in 2025. Courtesy: Morrissey Goodale

industry trends suggest private equity-backed buyers remain a fixture of the M&A market, continuing to represent a substantial share of transactions each year. It will be worth watching whether MEP-focused private equity platforms reaccelerate add-on acquisitions at a pace that brings their deal activity back in line with the rest of the industry.

## Salas O'Brien most active buyer among MEP Giants

Acquisitions have long been a key growth strategy for Salas O'Brien (Irvine, California), the 2023 recipient of Morrissey Goodale's Best M&A Post-Transaction Performance Award. Last year, the private equity-backed engineering and design firm led all MEP Giants in deal activity, completing 10 acquisitions that added more than 430 employees across nine states and Canada. Additional MEP Giants tied for the second-most acquisitions in 2025 with five apiece were NV5 Global (Hollywood, Florida); IMEG (Rock Island, Illinois), the 2023 recipient of Mor-

rissey Goodale's Most Prolific and Proficient Acquirer Award; and Bowman Consulting Group (Reston, Virginia).

Other MEP Giants that completed multiple acquisitions in 2025 included WSP (Montreal), Stantec (Edmonton, Canada), LaBella Associates (Rochester, New York), CannonDesign (Buffalo, New York), Tetra Tech (Pasadena, California), McKim & Creed (Raleigh, North Carolina), Jensen Hughes (Columbia, Maryland), HDR (Omaha, Nebraska), DLR Group (Seattle), AE-COM (Dallas) and Harris Company (St. Paul, Minnesota).

Despite ongoing economic uncertainty driven by geopolitical events abroad and adoption of artificial intelligence in 2026, MEP firms are looking at another year of solid revenue growth and profitability driven by sustained demand. With many CEOs reporting confidence in the year ahead, firms are capitalizing on the opportunities at hand by continuing to invest in acquisitions as a critical component of strategic expansion.

M&A activity in the AE and environmental industry set records again in 2025 and Morrissey Goodale expects deal-making to remain a defining feature of the industry in 2026. Buyers remain focused on securing expertise in public infrastructure and mission critical markets, while sellers are motivated by attractive valuations and opportunities to join larger platforms with deeper and better corporate resources. These dynamics continue to fuel deal-making, particularly in high-growth markets such as California, Florida, Texas and the Southeast. Whether the MEP Giants return to a faster pace of acquisitions or continue spreading deal activity across a broader set of buyers, as they did in 2025, will be one of the storylines to watch this year.

**Peter Frank** is a Research Manager with Morrissey Goodale LLC, a management consulting and research firm exclusively serving the architecture, engineering and environmental consulting industries.

A low-angle, upward-looking perspective of several modern skyscrapers with glass facades. The buildings are silhouetted against a vibrant sky with orange and yellow clouds, suggesting a sunset or sunrise. The perspective creates a sense of height and scale.

# MEP GIANTS 2026

**EAT•N**

*Powering Business Worldwide*

**Thank you for downloading the  
2026 MEP Giants eBook!**

CONSULTING - SPECIFYING  
**engineer**®