

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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 | 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: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Lawson-Fisher

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agrcments, 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:

Title: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: MS Consultants

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 | |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | | | |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Parsons Brinckerhoff Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 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. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | Weighted Total | 20 |

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: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Stephen J. Christian Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:


 Title: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: URS Corp.

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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:


 Title: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: USI Consultants Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| Category | Scoring Criteria | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|---|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes | Outstanding Agreement Disputes. | | | | |
| | No outstanding unrcsolved 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Woolpert

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| 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 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| 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 | | | |
| 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative idcas proposed. | 2 | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative idcas 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 | | | | | 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: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: United Consulting

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Servi

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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 | | | | | 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: 

Title: Production Director

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: DLZ

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | 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:

[Handwritten Signature]

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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 databasc. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance databasc. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | 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:

Wayne Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Beam, Longest & Neff Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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:



Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: K & S Engineers

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 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. | * | 0 | 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 | -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 | | | |
| 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 |
| | 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. | * | 0 | 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 | -3 | 10 | -30 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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:

[Signature]

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: GRW

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

[Handwritten Signature]

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008


Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: R.W. Armstrong Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposcd. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposcd. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:



Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Floyd E. Burroughs Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 proposcd. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:

Floyd E. Burroughs

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: H. Stewart Kline Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Wayne Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Frost Engineering Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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 unrcsolved 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 0 | 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 |

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:

[Handwritten Signature]

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: RQAW

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | 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:

Hay-Steiner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Transp. Consulting Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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:



Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Quality Environmental Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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 databasc. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance databasc. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 0 | 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 | -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 | | | |
| 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 |
| | 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. | * | 0 | 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 | -3 | 10 | -30 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | -150 |

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:

[Signature]

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: **B. Lochmueller**

Services Description: **Bridge Project Development Services**

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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: _____

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Bonar Group

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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 databasc. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | 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, documentattion 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 databasc. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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 | 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:

Hay- a Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | 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: _____

Hayden

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Farrar Garvey

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Hayden Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Hanson

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative idcas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative idcas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:

Hays C Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Schnelder

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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 | 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:

May-c Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Strand

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Hayden Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: American Consulting Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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:

Hayes C. Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: ASA Engineering Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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:

[Signature]

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: BF&S

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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:

Haye Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008


Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Congdon Engineering Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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:



Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Clark Dietz

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

H. Ray C. Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: CrossRoad

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 |

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:

H. Ray Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Donohue & Assoc. Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 35 |

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Ray C. Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: **First Group**

Services Description: **Bridge Project Development Services**

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 idcas 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 | | | | | 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:

Hayes C. Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Fink Roberts & Petrie Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.' | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Hayden Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Ken Hecceg & Assoc. Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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:

Hayes Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| 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 | | | |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| 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 | | | |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| 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 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | Weighted Total | 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:

Wayne Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Lawson-Fisher

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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 judgment of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Thompson Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: MS Consultants

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | | | |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:

[Handwritten Signature]

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Parsons Brinckerhoff Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 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. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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:

Maple Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Stephen J. Christian Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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:

Hayden Skurrie

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: URS Corp.

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Hay-astimmer

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: USI Consultants Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Ray Skinner

Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11


Consultant Name: Woolpert

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | 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:



Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11


Consultant Name: United Consulting

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Service

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:



Title: Bridge Engineer

Date: 1/31/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: DLZ

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| 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 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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 | | | | | 115 |

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

Rubair Hand

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| 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 | 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 | | | | | 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:

Rubair Haidar

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Beam, Longest & Neff **Description:** Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| 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 | | | | | 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:

Rubain Hendri

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: K & S Engineers Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 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. | * | 0 | 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 | -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 | | | |
| 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 |
| | 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. | * | 0 | 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 | -3 | 10 | -30 |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | | | |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | 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 |
| | 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 judgment of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Rubane Hardy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/8/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: GRW

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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 | | | |
| Historical Performance | Historical Performance. | | | | |
| | Timeliness score from performance database. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 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. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Kubair Hardy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: R.W. Armstrong

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed. | 1 | | | |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:

Lubain Hard

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Floyd E. Burroughs Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 110 |

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Rubair Haidi

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/8/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: **H. Stewart Kline** Services Description: **Bridge Project Development Services**

| 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 databasc. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from databasc. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| 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 | | | | | 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:

Lubain Hardy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Frost Engineering Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 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. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 0 | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| Weighted Total | | | | | 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

Lubain Hand

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/8/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: RQAW

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed. | 1 | | | |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:

Lubain Handy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Transp. Consulting **Services Description:** Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | 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:

Lukair Hand

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Quality Environmental Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 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. | * | 0 | 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 | -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 | | | |
| 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 |
| | 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. | * | 0 | 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 | -3 | 10 | -30 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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:

Lubair Haidi

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: B. Lochmueller

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| 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 | 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 | | | | | 115 |

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:

Zubair Khatib

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: **Bonar Group**

Services Description: **Bridge Project Development Services**

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Lubair Hindi

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | 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 | 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:

Rubai H. ...

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Farrar Garvey

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:

Rubair Haidi

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Hanson

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | 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:

Lubain Haid

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Schneider

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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: Zubair Haidy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager
Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Strand

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| 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 | 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 | | | | | 105 |

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:

Zubair Hardy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: American Consulting Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDO ^T work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 INDO ^T . | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDO^T cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| Weighted Total | | | | | 125 |

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:

Zubair Haidry

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: ASA Engineering Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | 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: Rubair Linder

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: BF&S

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| Weighted Total | | | | | 135 |

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:

Zubair Haidar

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Congdon Engineering Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Kubair Haidi

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Clark Dietz

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative idcas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative idcas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Kubair Handal

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: CrossRoad

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | 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: Lubain Haido

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Donohue & Assoc. Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Zubair Haidar

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: First Group

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| Category | Scoring Criteria | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes | Outstanding Agreement Disputes. | | | | |
| | No outstanding unrcsolved 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 databasc. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance databasc. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance databasc. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resuonc'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposcd. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposcd. | 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 | | | | | 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:

Lubain Hader

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2008

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Flnk Roberts & Petrie Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Xubair Haider

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Ken Herceg & Assoc. Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| Weighted Total | | | | | 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:

Zubair Haidy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 | |
| 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 | 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 | | | | | 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:

Ruban Haidy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Lawson-Fisher Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 2 | | | |
| | 16 to 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 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:

Rubair Haidy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: MS Consultants

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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 databasc. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 databasc. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | |

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:

Lubain Handi

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/8/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Parsons Brinckerhoff Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 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. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 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. | * | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative idcas 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 | 75 |

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Zubair Husni

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: Stephen J. Christian Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | | 120 |

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Lubain Hard

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: URS Corp.

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 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 | | | |
| | 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 | 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: Lubain Haider

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: USI Consultants Services Description: Bridge Project Development Services

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 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 |
| | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | 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:

Lubain Haidi

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 11

Consultant Name: United Consulting

Services Description: Bridge Project Development Servic

| 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. | * | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | * | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | * | 1 | 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 | 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 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. | | | | |
| | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | 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. | * | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Approach to Project | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. | | | | |
| | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed. | 2 | | | |
| | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the Project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. | | | | |
| | Within 15 mi. | 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 | | | | | 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:

Lubain Hardy

Title: Design and Consultant Services Manager

Date: 2/6/2006