

## 8/8/05 RFP Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 6

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

Consultants	Susan	Phil	Diane	Weighted Scores	
	Doell	Ellet	Keefer	Total	Ranking
AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc.	35	-5	45	75	10
American Consulting, Inc. (ACE)	20	40	60	120	1
Beam, Longest and Neff, LLC	40	0	70	110	3
Bernardin, Lochmueller & Assoc., Inc. (BLA)	45	5	60	110	4
Bonar Group	10	10	-5	15	20
Burgess & Niple	5	0	60	65	13
Butler, Fairman & Siefert (BF & S)	30	0	35	65	13
Congdon Engineering Assocs., Inc. (CEA)	-40	0	0	-40	24
Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers, Inc. (CTE)	45	-60	60	45	17
DLZ Indiana, LLC	50	0	70	120	2
Earth Tech, Inc.	20	0	70	90	6
Envirocorp, Inc.	5	-50	70	25	18
Hanson Professional Services, Inc.	35	0	50	85	7
HNTB Indiana, Inc.	15	0	10	25	18
Keramida	20	-50	80	50	15
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	0	-5	75	70	11
Parsons	-25	-5	0	-30	23
Patriot Engineering & Environmental, Inc.	45	5	30	80	9
Quality Environmental Professionals, Inc. (QEPI)	15	-50	40	5	21
R. W. Armstrong & Assocs., Inc. (RWA)	35	0	70	105	5
RQAW Corporation	0	0	-5	-5	22
Schneider Corp.	0	0	70	70	11
Strand Assocs., Inc.	20	0	65	85	7
URS Corporation	40	-50	60	50	15

Scoring Team Leader Signature: Susan G Doell  
*Consultant Services Engineer*  
2/14/06

**Central Office Selection Committee Action:**

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

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

Contract Administration Director

John E. Martin  
Date: 2/20/06

Production Management Director

James D. Gray  
Date: 2/20/06

Economic Opportunity Director

Mark S. ...  
Date: 2/20/06

Planning Director

John ...  
Date: 2/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

Title: DEED

Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

60

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:

N. Keebler  
 Title: DEEDOC  
 Date: 1-31-06

BEAM, LONGEST & NEFF

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0/0
	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	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated 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	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10/0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10/0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	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:

W. Keck

Title: DEEDC

Date: 1-31-06

BERNARDIN, LOCHVUELLER & ASSOC

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0/0
	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	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated 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	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0/0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10/0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	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	60

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 Koerber  
 Title: DEEPC  
 Date: 1-31-06

BONAR

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

-5

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:

DKarby

Title: DESO

Date: 1-31-06

BURGESS & NIPLE

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

60

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: DESO

Date: 1-31-06

Butler, Fairman & Seifert

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

35

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: DEGC  
 Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

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:

Korben

Title: DEED

Date: 1-31-06

CONSOER TOWNSEND ENVIRODYNE

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0/0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0/0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0/0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated 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	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2		5	
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	0		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	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10/0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	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	60

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:

DKeenan

Title: DEED

Date: 1-31-06

DLZ

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

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 Koeben

Title: DECO

Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0/0
Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0/0
	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	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20/0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated 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	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10/0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10/0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	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:

W. Keenan

DEED

1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

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:

DeLo  
 Title: DELO  
 Date: 1-31-06

HANSON

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

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.	*		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	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:

D Keenan

Title: SEEO

Date: 1-31-06

HNTB

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

10

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. Keenan  
 Title: SECO  
 Date: 1-31-06

KERAMIDA

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

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. Keenan

Title: DECO

Date: 1-31-06

Michael Baker Jr

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

75

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:

Michael Baker Jr

Title: DEED

Date: 1-31-06

PARSONS

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 1e

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

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: Dee Dee  
 Title: Dee Dee  
 Date: 1-31-06

PATRIOT ENGINEERING

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

30

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. Keeley

DEEO

1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

40

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: W. Keeter  
 Title: CEO  
 Date: 1-31-06

RQAW CORP.

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

-5

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. Keates  
 Title: DESO  
 Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

R.W. ARMSTRONG

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

Signed: DKoerber  
 Title: DESO  
 Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

SCHNEIDER CORP

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 <sup>0</sup>
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Timeliness score from performance database.	*			
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		15	0 <sup>0</sup>
	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.	*		10	0
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0	1	20	20 <sup>0</sup>
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
Project Manager	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0	2	15	30 <sup>0</sup>
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
Approach to Project	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2	5	10 <sup>0</sup>
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Location	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*			
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.			5	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
Location	Basic understanding of the Project.	0	1	10	10 <sup>0</sup>
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.		-2	0	5	0 <sup>0</sup>
		-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:

Signed: Neelbes  
 Title: DECO  
 Date: 1-31-06

STRAND ASSOC.

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Services Description: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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. Keiser  
 Title: DEFO  
 Date: 1-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 6

Consultant Name:

Services Description:

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

60

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. Keenan  
 Title: NSCO  
 Date: 1-31-00