

**8/8/05 RFP Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 2**

Item Title Haz. Invest. & Remed., No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1

Consultants	Thomas Duncan	Angela Rose	Kristie Davis	Weighted Scores	
				Total	Ranking
Active	5	55	70	130	
Alt & Witzig	105	15	40	160	
Arcadis	15	15	65	95	
ATC	105	75	60	240	2
Michael Baker	5	50	65	120	
Capital	65	5	15	85	
CEC	15	15	55	85	
Cortez	45	-15	-15	15	
EarthTech	5	-25	-45	-65	
Envirocorp	5	20	5	30	
EMC	40	15	10	65	
Handex	15	45	45	105	
Hull	15	30	10	55	
<del>Keramida</del>	<del>95</del>	<del>75</del>	<del>85</del>	<del>255</del>	<del>1</del>
Patriot	65	45	20	130	
QEPI	65	30	60	155	
Schneider	15	30	50	95	
Superior	15	45	45	105	
URS	25	85	95	205	3
Wightman Petrie	5	20	0	25	
				0	
				0	
				0	
				0	
				0	
				0	

Scoring Team Leader Signature: Thomas L. Duncan  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9/9/2005

**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 from outside of the committee.

- Selection of the proposed top \_\_\_ ranked firms is approved as recommended with the next 2 ranked firms approved, in order, as alternates.
- Selection of the top 1 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.

Added for review of DBE compliance of #1 ranked firm.

Contract Administration Director  
J.E. White  
 Date: 22 Sept. 05

Economic Opportunity Director  
M. [Signature]  
 Date: 9/22/05 8-19-05

Production Management Director  
[Signature]  
 Date: 9-22-05

Planning Director  
[Signature]  
 Date: 9-22-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Active Environmental**

**Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>5</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:

Thomas L Duncan

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: Alt & Witzig**

**Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>105</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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Arcadis**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

*Thomas L. Duncan*

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: ATC**

**Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>105</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:

Thomas L. Duncan

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Michael Baker Jr., Inc.**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>5</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:

*Thomas L. Duncan*

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: Capital**

**Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>65</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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2


Consultant Name: **Civil & Environmental**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2


Consultant Name: **Cortez Environmental**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5		
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	-1	5	-5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

**Consultant Name:** Earth Tech      **Services Description:** Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		-3		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	-60
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>5</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:

Thomast Duncan

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05


**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Environmental Mgmt Consultants Services Description: Hazardous Invest. & Remed.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5		
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	-2	5	-10
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2


Consultant Name: **ENVIROCORP**

Services Description: **Hazardous Invest. & Remediation**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>5</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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Handex**

Services Description: **Hazardous Invest. & Remed.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

*Thomas L. Duda*

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2


**Consultant Name: Hull & Associates**

**Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.      0 Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.      -3			20	0
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.      N/A			15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database      N/A Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database      N/A			15 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 additional staff time.      2		0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.      0				
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.      2		0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity      2		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      N/A			5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.      2				
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.      1		1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.      0				
	Lack of project understanding.      -3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.      1				
	16 to 50 mi.      0				
	51 to 150 mi.      -1		1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.      -2				
	Greater than 500 mi.      -3				
	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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Keramida**

**Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>95</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: Thomas L. Duncan  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Patriot**      Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b> No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3	0	20	0
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b> Timeliness score from performance database. Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A N/A N/A	15 15 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 additional staff time. Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule. Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	2 0 -3	2	20	40
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b> Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. Expertise and resources at appropriate level. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	2 0 -3	0	15	0
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume' Experience in different type or lower complexity Insufficient experience. Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	2 0 -1 -3	2	5	10
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b> High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed. High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed. Basic understanding of the Project. Lack of project understanding.	2 1 0 -3	1	10	10
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b> Within 15 mi. 16 to 50 mi. 51 to 150 mi. 151 to 500 mi. Greater than 500 mi. For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	1 0 -1 -2 -3 -3	1	5	5
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>65</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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: QEPI**

**Services Description: Hazardous Invest. & Remed.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5		
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>65</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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Superior**

Services Description: **Hazardous Invest. & Remed.**

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.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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				
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b> Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

Thomas L. Duncan

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Schneider**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: URS**

**Services Description: Hazardous Invest. & Remed.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

Thomas L Duncan

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

**Consultant Name: Wightman Petrie Environmental Services Description: Hazardous Invest. & Remed.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	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		N/A	5		
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	-1	5	-5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3				
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>5</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: Thomas L. Duncan  
 Title: Manager  
 Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Active Environmental Services**

**Services Description: Hazardous Materials Investigator**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>70</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:

  
 Title: ENV. Sci. 3  
 Date: 9/9/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Alt & Witzig**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: ENV. SCI. 3  
 Date: 9/1/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Arcadis G&M**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Pla**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>65</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:

  
 Title: ENV. SCI. 3  
 Date: 9/9/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: ATC Associates      Services Description: Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial F**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: ENV. Sci. 3  
 Date: 9/9/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Baker** Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>65</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:

*Kristi L. Baker*

Title: ENV. SCI. 3

Date: 9/19/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Capital Environmental Enterprises**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5		
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	-3	10	-30
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
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: Kristuloni

Title: ENV. Sci. 3

Date: 9/19/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Civil & Environmental Consultants Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Services Description: **Hazardous Materials**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5		
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
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:



Title: ENV. SC. 3

Date: 9/9/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Cortez Environmental      Services Description: Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	-3	20	-60
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: ENV. SCI. B  
 Date: 9/19/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Earth Tech**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>					
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	-3	20	-60	
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>					
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15		
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15		
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0	
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0				
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0	
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.					N/A
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1				
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0				
	Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>					
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5	
	16 to 50 mi.	0				
	51 to 150 mi.	-1				
	151 to 500 mi.	-2				
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<u>48</u>	

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:

*Kistula*

Title: ENV. SC. 3

Date: 9/9/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Envirocorp      Services Description: Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	-1	5	-5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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.

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



Title: ENV. SCI. 3

Date: 9/19/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Environmental Management Consultants  
Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

**Services Description: Hazardous Materials**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.		N/A	5	
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	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	X	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2	-2		-10
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>18</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:

  
 Title: ENV. SU. 3  
 Date: 9/9/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Handex**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: ENV. SCI. 3

Date: 9/19/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Hull & Associates**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: ENV. SCI. 3

Date: 9/19/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Keramida Environmental Inc.** Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5		
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	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>85</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:



Title: ENV. SCI. 3

Date: 9/9/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Patriot Engineering & Environmental Inc.      Services Description: Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: ENV. SCI 3  
 Date: 9/9/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Quality Environmental Professionals, Inc.**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: ENV SCI. 3  
 Date: 9/19/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **The Schneider Corporation**      Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.		N/A	5		
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
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:

  
 Title: ENV. SCI. 3  
 Date: 9/19/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: Superior Environmental Services Description: Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: ENV. SCUB  
 Date: 9/9/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **URS** Services Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations & Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	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.		N/A	5		
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>95</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:

  
 Title: ENV. SCI. 3  
 Date: 9/9/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Wightman Petrie Environmental Services** Description: **Hazardous Materials Investigations Remedial Plan Development**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	-1	5	-5
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	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:

  
 Title: ENV. Sci. 3  
 Date: 9/19/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Active Env. Services Services Description: Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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



Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Alt & Witzig**

Services Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

**Consultant Name:** ARCADIS      **Services Description:** Hazardous Investigation & Remediation

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

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

**Consultant Name: ATC**

**Services Description: Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
<b>Disputes</b>	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
<b>Past Performance</b>	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A N/A	15 10	
<b>Capacity of Team to do Work</b>	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
<b>Team's Demonstrated Qualifications</b>	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
<b>Project Manager</b>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
<b>Approach to Project</b>	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
<b>Location</b>	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>75</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: Angela Rose

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Capitol**

**Services Description: Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Civil & Env. Consult. Services** Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela K. Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name:** Cortez      **Services Description:** Environmental Investigation & Remediation

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

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Earth Tech**

Services Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b> No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	-3	20	-60
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b> Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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 additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time 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 unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	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 experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	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.				
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b> High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b> Within 15 mi.	1	-1	5	-5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					-55

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:

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Env Man Consult.** Services Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

  
 Title: Environmental Scientist  
 Date: 9/7/2005

15

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: **Envirocorp**

Services Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Handex**

**Services Description: Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela K Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name:** Hull & Associates **Services Description:** Hazardous Investigation & Remediation

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



Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Keramida**

**Services Description: Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
<b>Disputes</b>	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
<b>Past Performance</b>	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A N/A	15 10	
<b>Capacity of Team to do Work</b>	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
<b>Team's Demonstrated Qualifications</b>	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
<b>Project Manager</b>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	2	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
<b>Approach to Project</b>	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
<b>Location</b>	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>75</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:

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

**Consultant Name:** Michael Baker      **Services Description:** Hazardous Investigation & Remediation

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
<b>Disputes</b>	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.      0 Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.      -3			20	0
<b>Past Performance</b>	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.      N/A			15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.      N/A Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.      N/A			15 10	
<b>Capacity of Team to do Work</b>	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.      2		2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.      0 Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.      -3				
<b>Team's Demonstrated Qualifications</b>	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.      2		0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.      0 Insufficient expertise and/or resources.      -3				
<b>Project Manager</b>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.      2		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.      N/A			5	
<b>Approach to Project</b>	<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 and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.      1 Basic understanding of the Project.      0 Lack of project understanding.      -3				
<b>Location</b>	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.      1		-1		
	16 to 50 mi.      0		(1)	5	-5
	51 to 150 mi.      -1				
	151 to 500 mi.      -2 Greater than 500 mi.      -3 For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.      -3				
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<u>55</u> 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:

Angela Rose

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **Patriot**

Services Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **QEPI**

Services Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela Klose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2

**Consultant Name: Schneider**      **Services Description: Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angelak Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Superior Services Description: Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
<b>Disputes</b>	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b> No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
<b>Past Performance</b>	<b>Historical Performance.</b> Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
<b>Capacity of Team to do Work</b>	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
<b>Team's Demonstrated Qualifications</b>	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b> Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
<b>Project Manager</b>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	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.		N/A	5		
<b>Approach to Project</b>	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b> High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
<b>Location</b>	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
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: Angela K Rose  
 Title: Environmental Scientist  
 Date: 9/7/2005



**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: <sup>a</sup> **Wishtman Petrie** Services Description: **Hazardous Investigation & Remediation**

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

*Angela Rose*

Title: Environmental Scientist

Date: 9/7/2005