

8/8/05 RFP Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 3

Item Title Hazardous Materials Invest., No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1 _____

Consultants	Janice	Tom	Ben	Weighted Scores	
	Osadczyk	Duncan	Lawrence	Total	Ranking
Active Environmental Services, Inc.	5	5	5	15	14
Alt & Witzig Engineering, Inc.	25	95	95	215	2
AmTech Engineering	15	5	5	25	13
Arcadis	15	15	55	85	10
ATC Associates, Inc.	25	105	95	225	1
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	15	5	5	25	13
BCA Consultants, Inc.	25	65	55	145	5
Butler, Fairman and Seuvart	15	55	55	125	7
Capital Environmental Enterprises, Inc.	25	65	55	145	5
Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc.	15	15	15	45	12
Cortez Environmental Services, LLC	5	35	5	45	12
Earth Tech	-45	15	-5	-35	17
Environmental Management Consultants	-10	25	-5	5	15
Handex	5	25	25	55	11
Envirocorp, Inc.	5	45	45	95	9
HNTB	15	65	65	145	5
Hull & Associates, Inc.	15	15	15	45	12
Keramida	25	95	65	185	3
K & S	-10	-10	-10	-30	16
MS Consultants, Inc.	-30	0	0	-30	16
Patriot Engineering and Environmental, Inc.	15	65	65	145	5
Presnell Engineers, Inc.	-5	15	5	15	14
QEPI	25	65	15	105	8
Schnider Engineering	15	15	15	45	12
Shrewsbury & Associates	15	25	5	45	12
Strand Associates, Inc.	30	90	60	180	4
Superior Environmental Corp.	15	15	15	45	12
URS Corporation	15	65	55	135	6
Wightman Petrie Environmental, Inc.	5	45	45	95	9

Leader Signature: _____

Title

Chief, Div. of Env., Plan. & Eng.

Date

[Handwritten Signature]
9/19/06

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

Contract Administration Director

Date: 9/19/05

Production Management Director

Date: 9-19-05

Economic Opportunity Director

Date: 9/19/05

Planning Director

9/19/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Active Environmental

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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 Assessment Mgr

Date: 1-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **A&W**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	95

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: Eval. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 7-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Arcadis**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	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:

Title: EN Assessment Mgr

Date: 1-2-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: ATC

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					95

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. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Baker

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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: Eric Assessment Mga
 Date: 9-2-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Bruce Carter

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					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:


 Title: Env. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 1-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Butler Fairman

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					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:


 Title: Env. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Capital

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					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:


 Title: Env. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Civil & Environmental Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Cortez Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-6-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

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

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		-3		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	-60
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					-5

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: Eyal Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Envirocorp Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					45

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: Evaluator
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Handex Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	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			
Weighted Total					25

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: E.A. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: HNTB Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					65

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: E. V. Assessment
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Hull Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

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

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2		0	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated 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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2		2	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1		1	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	65

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: E.A. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: K & S Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

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

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. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: MS Consultants Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					0

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. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Patriot Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					65

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. Assessment Mgr.

Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

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

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	5

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. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

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

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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: E.A. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Schneider Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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: E. J. Assessment Manager
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _3_

Consultant Name: Shrewsberry Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05


Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Strand Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					60

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. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

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

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	15

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. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

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

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					15

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 Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: URS Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					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:



Title: Env. Assessment Man

Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Wightman Petrie** Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	45

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: E.V. Assessment Mgr.
 Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Env. Mgmt Consultants Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-2	5	-10
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					-5

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. Assessment Mgr
 Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Handex Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					25

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. Assessment mgr
 Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Active Environmental Services, Inc. **Services Description:** Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	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	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Alt & Witzig Engineering, Inc. **Services Description:** Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2		20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2		15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated 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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					25

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: AmTech Engineering

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Arcadis

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: ATC Associates, Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding	-3				
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					25

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **BCA Consultants, Inc.**

Services Description: **Haz. Mat. Invest.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					25

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Butler, Fairman and Seufert**

Services Description: **Haz. Mat. Invest.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Capital Env. Enterprises, Inc. **Services Description:** Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					25

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng. _____

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Civil & Environ. Cons., Inc.**

Services Description: **Haz. Mat. Invest.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Cortez Environ. Services, LLC

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Earth Tech

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		-3		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	-60
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					-45

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Envirocorp Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3


Consultant Name: **Env. Mgmt. Cons.**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-2	5	-10
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				Weighted Total	-10

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: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/8/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Handex

Services Description: Hazardous Materials Investigation

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	5

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: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan. & Eng.

Date: 9/8/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng. _____

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Hull & Associates, Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng. _____

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Keramida

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					25

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: Chief, Div of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: K & S

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	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	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-2	5	-10
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
Weighted Total					-10

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: MS Consultants, Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	-3	10	-30
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					-30

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Patriot Eng. And Env., Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Div of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Presnell Engineers, Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	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	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	-5

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: Chief, Div of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **QEPI**

Services Description: **Haz. Mat. Invest.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					25

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Schneider Engineering

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Shrewsberry & Associates

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Strand Associates, Inc.

Services Description: Haz. Mat. Invest.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					30

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Superior Env. Corp.**

Services Description: **Haz. Mat. Invest.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **URS Corp.**

Services Description: **Haz. Mat. Invest.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					15

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Wightman Petrie Env., Inc.**

Services Description: **Haz. Mat. Invest.**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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: Chief, Divl of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Active Environmental

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	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	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	5

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. 3

Consultant Name: Alt & Witzig Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					95

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. 3

Consultant Name: AmTech

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	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	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					5

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. 3

Consultant Name: **Arcadis**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	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	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	15

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. 3

Consultant Name: ATC

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1			
Basic understanding of the Project.	0				
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					105

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. 3


Consultant Name: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					5

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. 3

Consultant Name: Environmental Mgmt Consultants Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-2	5	-10
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
Weighted Total					25

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. 3

Consultant Name: **Bruce Carter**

Services Description: **Hazardous Mat. Investigations**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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				
Weighted Total					65

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. Dunbar

Title: Manager

Date: 9-9-05


Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Butler Fairman & Seufert Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
				Weighted Total	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:


 Title: Manager
 Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Capital Services Description: Hazardous Mat. Investigations

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	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	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	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	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	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	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	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	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	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	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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			
Weighted Total					65

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