

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

**Item Title Historic Bridges Inventory, No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1**

Consultants	Janice Osadczuk	Mary Kennedy	Curt Tomak	Weighted Scores Total	Ranking
Cultural Resources Analysts, Inc.	-15	-25	-60	-100	6
HNTB	65	65	55	185	1
Wilbur Smith Associates	15	-30	-45	-60	5
Weintraut & Associates	15	25	10	50	4
Wiss, Janney, Elstner Assoc., Inc.	0	25	40	65	2
WTH Engineering	15	15	25	55	3

**Scoring Team Leader Signature:** 

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

**Date:** 9/2/05

**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**

  
Date: 9/19/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

**Consultant Name:** Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. **Services Description:** Historical Bridge Inv.

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

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

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

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

Date: 9/6/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

**Consultant Name: HNTB**

**Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>65</b>

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

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

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

Date: 9/6/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

**Consultant Name:** Wilbur Smith Associates      **Services Description:** Historic Bridges Inventory

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

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

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

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

Date: 9/6/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

**Consultant Name:** Weintraut & Associates      **Services Description:** Historic Bridges Inventory

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

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

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

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

Date: 9/6/2005

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

Consultant Name: **WTH Engineering**

Services Description: **Historic Bridges Inventory**

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

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

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

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

Date: 9/6/2005


## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

**Consultant Name: Wiss, Janney, Elstner Assoc. Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

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

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

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

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

Date: 9/6/2005

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8**

Consultant Name: Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. Services Description: Historic Bridges

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	-3	15	-45
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3				
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	-1	5	-5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1	-2	5	-10
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
Greater than 500 mi.	-3				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>-60</b>

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

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Curtis H. Tomak  
 Title: Archaeologist  
 Date: 9/9/05

HNTB Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

Consultant Name: M & H Engineers & Architects, Inc.

Services Description: Historic Bridges

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>55</b>

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

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Curtis H. Tomak  
 Title: Archaeologist  
 Date: 9/9/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8**

Consultant Name: Weintraut & Associates Services Description: Historic Bridges

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

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

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Curtis H. Tomak  
 Title: Archaeologist  
 Date: 9/9/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8**

Consultant Name: Wilbur Smith Associates Services Description: Historic Bridges

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

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

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Curtis H. Tomak  
 Title: Archaeologist  
 Date: 9/9/05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8**

*Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. (WJE)*

Consultant Name:

Services Description: *Historic Bridges*

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>40</b>

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

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: *Curtis H. Tomak*  
 Title: *Archaeologist*  
 Date: *9/9/05*

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8**

Consultant Name: WTH Engineering, INC.

Services Description: Historic Bridges

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

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

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

Title: Archaeologist

Date: 9/9/05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. \_8\_

**Consultant Name: Cultural Resource Analysts      Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

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

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

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

*Mary E Kennedy*

Title: Architectural Historian

Date: 9.9.05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8

**Consultant Name: HNTB (M & H Engineers & Architects) Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time	2		0	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2		2	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1		1	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>65</b>

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

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

Title: Architectural Historian

Date: 9.9.05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. \_8\_

**Consultant Name: Weintraut & Associates      Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

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

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

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

*Mary E Kennedy*

Title: Architectural Historian

Date: 9-9-05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8**

**Consultant Name: Wilbur Smith Associates      Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

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

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

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

*Mary E Kennedy*

Title: Architectural Historian

Date: 9.9.05

## Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. \_8\_

**Consultant Name: Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates (WJE) Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		<b>0</b>		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	-1	5	-5
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-2	5	-10
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>25</b>

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

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

*Mary E Kennedy*

Title: Architectural Historian

Date: 9.9.05

**Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 8**

**Consultant Name: WTH Engineering**

**Services Description: Historic Bridges Inventory**

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

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

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

*Mary E Kennedy*

Title: Architectural Historian

Date: 9-9-05