

#	Consultant Name	Phil Eller	Rank	Mike Fitch	Rank	Michael Nagel	Rank	Paste Here Name 4	Rank	Paste Here Name 5	Rank	Weighted Scores Total	Ranking
2	ASA Engineering Consultants Inc	10	17	40	1	10	18					60	18
3	Abonmarche Consultants of Indiana LLC	10	17	30	7	0	19					40	19
1	American Consulting Inc	45	4	30	7	40	8					115	7
4	Beam Longest & Neff LLC	55	1	40	1	30	12					125	3
5	Bernardin Lochmueller and Associates Inc	20	15	25	18	50	3					95	11
6	Bonar Group	35	9	35	5	35	10					105	9
7	Burgess & Niple Inc	25	12	40	1	40	8					105	9
8	Butler Fairman and Seufert Inc	50	2	30	7	45	6					125	3
9	DLZ Indiana LLC	45	4	35	5	55	2					135	2
10	Hanson Professional Services Inc	25	12	30	7	35	10					90	13
11	M D Wessler and Associates Inc	15	18	30	7	30	12					75	16
12	Parsons Cunningham & Shartle Engineers Inc	25	12	30	7	25	17					80	15
13	Schneider Engineering Corp	45	4	30	7	50	3					125	3
14	Strand Associates Inc	35	9	30	7	45	6					110	8
15	United Consulting Engineers Inc	45	4	30	7	50	3					125	3
16	URS Corporation	30	11	30	7	30	12					90	13
17	USI Consultants Inc	40	8	40	1	60	1					140	1
18	VS Engineering Inc	10	17	30	7	30	12					70	17
19	Woolpert Inc	50	2	15	19	30	12					95	11
20													

★ BL & N shall be 3rd ranking choose because of stronger evaluation summary

Scoring Team Leader Signature: *[Signature]*

Title: Consultant Services Mgr

Date: 7/17/2006

**Central Office Selection Committee Action:**

The selection committee has reviewed the recommendations and associated documentation to verify procedure compliance and has considered capacity guidelines and any known ongoing disputes with these firms and takes the following action without direction fr

- Selection of the proposed top 1 ranked firms is approved as recommended with the next 2 ranked firms approved, in order, as alternates.
- Selection of the top     ranked firms is approved as indicated above after elimination of one indicated firm for the reasons noted below. The next 2 ranked firms are approved, in order, as alternates.
- Selection based on the recommendations and the associated documentation is denied for the reasons noted below.

Contract Administration Director

*[Signature]*  
Date: 24 July 06

Production Management Director

*Absent*  
Date:

Economic Opportunity Director

*[Signature]*  
Date: 7/24/06

Planning Director


*[Signature]*  
Date: 7/24/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	ASA Engineering Consultants Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>10</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Abonmarche Consultants of Indiana LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>10</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	American Consulting Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>45</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Beam-Longest & Neff LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>55</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Bernardin Lochmueller and Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	-1	5	-5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>20</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed   
Name Phil Ellet  
Title Consultant Services Manager  
Date 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Bonar Group

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>35</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:

06-06

Item No. :

14

Services Description:

Topographic Survey Services

Consultant Name:

Burgess &amp; Niple Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>25</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Butler Fairman and Seufert Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>50</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
 Name: Phil Ellet  
 Title: Consultant Services Manager  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	DLZ Indiana LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume's.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>45</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Hanson Professional Services Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
Location	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>25</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	M D Wessler and Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume!	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>15</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Parsons Cunningham & Shartle Engineers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>25</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Schneider Engineering Corp

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>45</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:

06-06

Item No. :

14

Services Description:

Topographic Survey Services

Consultant Name:

Strand Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in <b>added value</b> to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>35</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Phil Ellet  
 Title: Consultant Services Manager  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:

06-06

Item No.:

14

Services Description:

Topographic Survey Services

Consultant Name:

United Consulting Engineers Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>45</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Phil Ellet  
 Title: Consultant Services Manager  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	URS Corporation

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.					
Project Manager	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.				
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
 Name: Phil Ellet  
 Title: Consultant Services Manager  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	USI Consultants Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>40</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: Phil Ellet  
Name: Phil Ellet  
Title: Consultant Services Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	VS Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>10</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed: Phil Ellet  
 Name: Phil Ellet  
 Title: Consultant Services Manager  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Woolpert Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>50</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Phil Ellet  
 Title: Consultant Services Manager  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	ASA Engineering Consultants Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>40</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: 

Name: Mike Fitch

Title: LPA MP

Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Abonmarche Consultants of Indiana LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	American Consulting Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Beam Longest & Neff LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>40</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Bernardin Lochmueller and Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>25</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: 

Name

Mike Fitch

Title

LPA MP

Date

7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Bonar Group

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>35</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Burgess & Niple Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume!	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>40</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed: 

Name

Mike Fitch

Title

LPA MP

Date


7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-06  
 Item No.: 14  
 Services Description: Topographic Survey Services  
 Consultant Name: Butler Fairman and Seufert Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	DLZ Indiana LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume!	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>35</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Hanson Professional Services Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgment of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Mike Fitch  
Title: LPA MP  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	M D Wessler and Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-06**  
 Item No. : **14**  
 Services Description: **Topographic Survey Services**  
 Consultant Name: **Parsons Cunningham & Shurtle Engineers**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Schnelder Engineering Corp

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Mike Fitch  
Title: LPA MP  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Strand Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Mike Fitch  
Title: LPA MP  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	United Consulting Engineers Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Mike Fitch  
Title: LPA MP  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	URS Corporation

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1				
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
51 to 150 mi.	0				
151 to 500 mi.	-1				
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Mike Fitch  
Title: LPA MP  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	USI Consultants Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

Weighted Total 40

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Mike Fitch  
Title: LPA MP  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	VS Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Mike Fitch  
Title: LPA MP  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Woolpert Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>15</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
 Name: Mike Fitch  
 Title: LPA MP  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	ASA Engineering Consultants Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>10</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Abonmarche Consultants of Indiana LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>0</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	American Consulting Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>40</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Beam Longest & Neff LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3				
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume!	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Bernardin Lochmueller and Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>50</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Bonar Group

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>35</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Burgess & Niple Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
Location	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
151 to 500 mi.	-1				
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>40</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Butler Fairman and Seufert Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Insufficient experience.	-3				
Approach to Project	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
Location	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
151 to 500 mi.	-1				
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>45</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	DLZ Indiana LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>55</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Hanson Professional Services Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>35</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	M D Wessler and Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Parsons Cunningham & Shartle Engineers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>					
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0	
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>					
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0	
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>					
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0	
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0				
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>					
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15	
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1				
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0				
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3				
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>					
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0	
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1				
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0				
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1				
	Insufficient experience.	-3				
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>					
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10	
	High level of understanding of the project.	1				
	Basic understanding of the project.	0				
	Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>					
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0	
	51 to 150 mi.	0				
	151 to 500 mi.	-1				
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
					<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>25</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Schneider Engineering Corp

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
Location	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
151 to 500 mi.	-1				
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>50</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Strand Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	-1	5	-5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>45</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	United Consulting Engineers Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
Location	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					50

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No.:	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	URS Corporation

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
 Name: Michael Nagel  
 Title: Survey Operation Manager  
 Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	USI Consultants Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.</b>	-3			
	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
Project Manager	<b>Expertise and resources at appropriate level.</b>	0			
	<b>Insufficient expertise and/or resources.</b>	-3			
	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1				
Insufficient experience.	-3				
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>60</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	VS Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.</b>	-3			
	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1				
Insufficient experience.	-3				
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.


Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-06
Item No. :	14
Services Description:	Topographic Survey Services
Consultant Name:	Woolpert Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>30</b>

For categories that are not relevant to the particular agreement being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories.

Signed:   
Name: Michael Nagel  
Title: Survey Operation Manager  
Date: 7/17/2006