

8/8/05 RFP Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 4

Item Title Environmental Services, No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1

Consultants	Susan Doell	Phil Ellet	Diane Keefer	Weighted Scores	
				Total	Ranking
A & F Engineering Co., LLC	70	70	80	220	25
American Consulting, Inc. (ACE)	125	145	115	385	1
ASA Engineering Consultant, Inc.	35	40	45	120	40
Beam, Longest and Neff, LLC	50	120	60	230	23
Bernardin, Lochmueller & Assoc., Inc. (BLA)	45	75	85	205	28
Bolinger, Lach & Assoc., INC (BLA)	0	0	0	0	42
Bonar Group	105	130	90	325	8
Burgess & Niple	90	90	70	250	19
Butler, Fairman & Siefert (BF & S)	55	120	85	260	16
Certified Engineering, Inc. (CEI)	25	120	90	235	21
Clark Dietz, Inc.	50	90	90	230	23
Congdon Engineering Assocs., Inc. (CEA)	90	120	50	260	16
Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers, I	70	120	120	310	10
Corradino LLC	105	120	145	370	3
CrossRoad Engineers, PC	105	115	145	365	4
Donohue & Assoc.	50	70	70	190	33
DZL Indiana, LLC	100	125	130	355	5
Earth Tech, Inc.	50	70	80	200	29
Farrar, Garvey & Assoc., LLC (FG)	75	115	145	335	7
Fink, Roberts & Petire, Inc. (FRP)	70	120	91	281	13
First Group Engineering, Inc.	95	135	145	375	2
Floyd E. Burroughs & Assoc., Inc. (FEBA)	50	100	50	200	29
Frost Engineering & Consulting Co.	0	-45	0	-45	44
GRW Engineers, Inc.	0	0	70	70	41
Hanson Professional Services, Inc.	50	90	120	260	16
HNTB Indiana, Inc.	80	120	70	270	15
Janssen & Spaans Engineering, Inc.	105	120	120	345	6
Ken Herceg & Assoc., Inc. (Herceg)	30	70	100	200	29
Lawson-Fisher Assocs. P.C. (LA)	75	90	120	285	12
Parsons	85	30		115	36
Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.	85	110	110	305	11
Paul I. Cripe, Inc.	80	120	120	320	9
Quality Environmental Professionals, Inc. (Q	-50	-140	-120	-310	45
R. W. Armstrong & Assocs., Inc. (RWA)	70	120	60	250	19
RQAW Corporation	65	120	50	235	21
Schneider	45	80	50	175	35
Stephen J. Christian & Assocs., P.C.	75	120	80	275	14
Strand Assocs., Inc.	50	120	45	215	27
Transportation Consulting Engineers, LLC	50	120	50	220	25
United Consulting Engineers & Architects (U	30	95	25	150	38
URS Corporation	50	100	50	200	29
USI Consultants, Inc.	55	85	0	140	39
VS Engineering, Inc.	50	90	50	190	34
Wilcox Professional Services LLC of Indiana	0	20	-45	-25	43
Woolpert, Inc.	40	95	25	160	37

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0%
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	2	15	50%
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20%
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated 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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	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.	2	0	5	0%
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	-3			
				Weighted Total	0

80

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Diana Keefer
 Title: DEEO
 Date: 1-26-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	3	15	45%
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20%
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated 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 Management	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10%
	High level of understanding 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.	2	0	5	0%
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements; non-Indiana firms.	--3			
				Weighted Total	0

Weighted Total 0

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: DEED

Date: 1-26-06

115
Dianne Keebler
DEED
1-26-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	00
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	10			
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualification	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	30/0
	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	-50
	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.	*	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	0/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements; non-Indiana firms:	-3			
				Weighted Total	45

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Keeber
 Title: DESO
 Date: 1-27-06

BEAM, LONGEST AND NEFF

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	00
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	2	15	50
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	00
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	00
	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	00
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	100
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	00
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	0

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Diana R. Keefe

Title: DEED

Date: 1-27-06

Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	30/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10/0
	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.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	-1	5	-5/0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	85

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Diane Keefer

Title: DEEO

Date: 1-27-06

BOLINGER, LACH & ASSOC

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	-3			
				Weighted Total	0

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Diane R. Keefer

Title: F-21-06

Date: DEFO

BONAR

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	2	15	50%
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1		20	
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0	0		
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	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	0	5	0/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1		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.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	2	5	10/0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	0

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

90

Diana Kefes

DESO

6-27-06

BURGESS & NIPLE

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	5/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	10/0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	70

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Don Keller
 Title: District 20
 Date: 1-27-00

Butter, Fairman & Seibert

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	5/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	10/0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	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.	2	1	5	5/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	85

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Nina Keefer

Title: DEED

Date: 1-27-06

Certified Engineering

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	50/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
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.	*				
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	10/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	90

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

90
Diane Keiber
 DECO
 1-27-06

CLARK DIETZ

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	50/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
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	10/0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	90

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Diane Keebler

Title: DEED

Date: 1-27-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: DEED

Date: 1-27-06

CONSOER TOWNSEND

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	10/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	50/0
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	10		1/0	
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	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	10/0
	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.	*	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	10/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	-3			
				Weighted Total	120

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

D. Keeber
DEED
1-27-06

CORRADINO, LLC

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	3	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*			
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	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	10/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	--3				
				Weighted Total	0

145

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Signed: D. Keebler
 Title: DBCO
 Date: 1-27-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	3	15	45/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	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	10/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	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.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0/0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	145

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Keeler
 Title: DESO
 Date: 1-27-06

DLZ

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

130

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D Keuber

Title:

DFEE

Date:

1-27-06

DONOHUE

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	10		0	
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*	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	0/0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Education	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	70

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

DKaerber
DAEO
1-27-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	10		0	
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*	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	10/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
Weighted Total					80

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Kaber
 Title: DEFO
 Date: 1-30-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

145

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

D. Keefer
DECO
1-30-010

FINK, ROBERTS & PETRIE

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	50/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	10			
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	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	9/0
	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.	*	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	10/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	-3				
				Weighted Total	90

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: DEEO

Date: 1-30-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

145

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Signed: Keeler
 Title: NEED
 Date: 1-30-06

Floyd E. Burroughs

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	50/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*			
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*		5	0	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	--3				
				Weighted Total	0

50

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Signed: D. Keeber
 Title: DEFO
 Date: 1-30-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name: _____ Services Description: _____

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	10			
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	-3			
				Weighted Total	0

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: DEED

Date: 1-30-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

70

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Keeber
 Title: DEED
 Date: 1-30-02

HANSON

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	2	15	30/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Management	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	10/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	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.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	0	5	0/0
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms:	-3			
				Weighted Total	120

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D Keeber
 Title: DEED
 Date: 1-30-06

Ken Herzog & Assoc

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

DKeebes
DESO
1-31-06

HNTB

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0 ⁰
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20 ⁰
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30 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 ⁰
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	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.	2	0	5	0 ⁰
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	70

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Dee Dee Keeber
 Title: DEED
 Date: 1-30-06

JANSSEN & SPAANS

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	30/0
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	10		0	
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	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	10/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	0

120

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Keebler
 Title: DEFO
 Date: 1-31-06

LAWSON FISHER

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	2	15	50/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30/0
	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	10/0
	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.	*	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	10/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	0

120

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Signed: [Signature]
 Title: DESO
 Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name: _____ Services Description: _____

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

110

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: D. Keefer
 Title: DEED
 Date: 1-31-06

PAUL I. CRIFE, Inc

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

120

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Keuber

Title: DESO

Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	-3	20	-60
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated 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.	*				
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	-3	5	-15/0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	0

-120

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Keerber

Title: DEAD

Date: 1-31-06

R.W. ARMSTRONG & ASSOC

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

600

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: DEED

Date: 1-31-06

REID, QUEBE, Allison, Wilcox & Assoc

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

50

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Keefe
 Title: DEED
 Date: 1-31-06

SCHNEIDER

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

50

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Koerber
 Title: DEED
 Date: 1-31-06

STEPHEN J. CHRISTIAN & ASSOC

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 4

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	30/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	0

50

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

DKeeber

Title: DECO

Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. ____

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	2	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	30/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*		5	0	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0/0
	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.	2	-1	5	-50
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	0

45

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

D. Keebler
 Title: DEEP
 Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. ____

Consultant Name: _____

Services Description: _____

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	2	15	30/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	A availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0/0
	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	0/0
	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.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0/0
	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.	2	0	5	0/0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	0

50

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: _____

Date: _____

D. Keeney

DEED

1-31-06