

RFP 05-02 Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 15

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

Consultants	Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Weighted Scores	
	Dave Dye	Jim Ude	John McCrary	Total	Ranking
BLA	40	30	40	110	1
HNTB	10	30	30	70	2*
BLN	30	10	30	70	3*
DLZ	5	30	25	60	4*
Burgess & Niple	0	30	30	60	5*
AMEC	0	30	20	50	6
URS	0	30	10	40	7
BF&S	20	0	10	30	8
American	10	10	10	30	9
RQAW	0	20	0	20	10
Parsons	10	0	10	20	11
Strand	5	5	5	15	12
HMB	5	5	5	15	13
Earth Tech	0	0	10	10	14
Bonar	-10	10	5	5	15
Patriot	0	0	0	0	16
RWA	0	0	0	0	17
Keramida	0	0	0	0	18
Hanson	0	0	0	0	19
Schneider	0	0	0	0	20
QEPI	0	0	0	0	21
K&S	-5	-5	-5	-15	22

* D&D
* D&D
* D&D
* D&D

* Ties were broken by evaluating Districts previous experience with the consultants involved.

Scoring Team Leader Signature [Signature]
Title: Environ. Scoping Manager
Date: 3/16/2006

Central Office Selection Committee Action:

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

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

Contract Administration Director
[Signature]
Date: 3/21/06

Economic Opportunity Director
[Signature]
Date: 3/21/06

Production Management Director
[Signature]
Date: 3/21/06

Planning Director
[Signature]
Date: 3/21/06

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: URS Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
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	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Strand Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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			
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	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	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			
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:

James Udo

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **Schneider**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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			
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	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	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			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
		0	0	5	0
		-1			
		-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:

James Uda

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **R.W. Armstrong**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. 0			20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old. -3				
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database. *		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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: RQAW

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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	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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: QEPI Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score				
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0						
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0				
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3							
	Historical Performance.								
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0				
Capacity of Team to do Work	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				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	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							
Project Manager	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3							
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.								
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0				
Approach to Project	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0							
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3							
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.								
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2	0	5	0				
Location	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							
Location	Lack of project understanding.	-3							
	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.								
	Within 15 mi.	2							
	16 to 50 mi.	1							
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0				
Location	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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **Patriot**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Parsons

Consultant Name: ~~ASC~~

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: **KERAMIDA**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006


Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: K&S Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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:


 Title: Planning Director
 Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: HNTB Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database	*	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	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	*	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					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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/24/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: **HMB**

Services Description: **Environmental 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	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	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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: Earth Tech

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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			
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	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	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			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	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:

James Ude
 Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **DLZ**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database	*	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	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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					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: James Udo

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/24/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: **BF&S**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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			
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	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	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			
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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **BLA**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
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	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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. For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-2 -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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple

Services Description: Environmental 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
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
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
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:

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: **Bonar**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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	10

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **Beam, Logest & Neff**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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. For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-2 -3			
Weighted Total					10

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/24/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: ACE Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database	*	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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					10

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/25/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: AMEC

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -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	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -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	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: James Ude

Title: Planning Director

Date: 1/24/2006


Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: URS Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0			
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0	
Past Performance	Historical Performance.					
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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				
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	0	5	0	
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	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				
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:



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Strand Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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			
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			
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:


 Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_


Consultant Name: Schneider

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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:



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: **RWA**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database	*	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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: _____

Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: RQAW

Services Description: Environmental Services

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

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: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **QEPI**

Services Description: **Environmental 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	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:


Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: Patriot Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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:


 Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: **Parsons**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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	10

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: HMB

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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:



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006


Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Hanson Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0			
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0	
Past Performance	Historical Performance.					
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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				
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	0	5	0	
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	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	
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:



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15


Consultant Name: **Earth Tech**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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:



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: **DLZ**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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			
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			
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	-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:



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006


Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: BFS Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.			15	0
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0		
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0		
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.			20	0
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	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.			15	0
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	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.			5	0
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2	2		
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.			10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1		
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.			5	0
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0		
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				Weighted Total	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: Environmental Scoping Manager
 Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_


Consultant Name: **BLA**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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. For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-2 -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: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple

Services Description: Environmental Services

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

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: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: BONAR Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume	0	-1	5	-5
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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					-10

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: **BLN**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3		20	0
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	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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. For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-2 -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:



Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_

Consultant Name: American Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	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			
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	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	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
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	10

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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


 Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. _15_


Consultant Name: **AMEC**

Services Description: **Environmental Services**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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:


 Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: KERAMIDA

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	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:


 Title: Environmental Scoping Manager

Date: 1/20/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Patriot Engineering & Environmental Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15


Consultant Name: R.W. Armstrong

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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	0

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

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


Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Keramida

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Hanson Professional Services

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: The Schneider Corporation

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Quality Environmental Professionals Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: K & S Engineers, Inc.

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Bernardin Lochmueller & Assoc.

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			5	0
Approach to Project	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					40

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15


Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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	30

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

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


Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Beam, Longest & Neff, Inc.

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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	30

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: DLZ

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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 additional staff time.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					25

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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					30

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager


Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc. Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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					20

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15


Consultant Name: URS Corporation

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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					10

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

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


Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Butler Fairman & Siefert

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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	10

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Ammerican Consulting, Inc.

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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					10

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15


Consultant Name: RQAW

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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

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

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


 Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Parsons

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	10

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Strand Associates, Inc.

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			0	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	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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: HMB Professional Engineers

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.			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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Earth Tech

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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					10

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP No. 05-02 , Item No. 15

Consultant Name: Bonar Group

Services Description: Environmental Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of additional staff time.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	-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

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

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

Title: System Assessment Manager

Date: 3/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015


Consultant Name: URS Corporation

Services Description: Environmental 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.	*	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:



Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **Strand Associates, Inc.**

Services Description: **Environmental 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
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	0	10	0
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0
	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			
Location	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	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: _____

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **The Schneider Corporation**

Services Description: **Environmental 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 innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	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:

Kevin A. Woodman

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **R.W. Armstrong & Associates, Inc.**

Services Description: **Environmental 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. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	0 -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. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	0 -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. Insufficient experience.	-1 -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	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project. Lack of project understanding.	0 -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:

Kevin A. Poolman

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **RQAW Corporation**

Services Description: **Environmental 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
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	0	10	0
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	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:


 Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader
 Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **Quality Environmental Professionals, Inc.**

Services Description: **Environmental 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:

Kevin P. Hood

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: Patriot Engineering and Environmental, Inc. Services Description: Environmental 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:


 Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader
 Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: Parsons

Services Description: Environmental 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:

Kevin P. Voshell

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **Keramida**

Services Description: **Environmental 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
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	0	10	0
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	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 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:


 Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader
 Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **K & S Engineers, Inc.**

Services Description: **Environmental 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
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	0	10	0
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	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 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:

Kevin A. Johnson

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: HNTB Indiana, Inc.

Services Description: Environmental 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:

Kevin B. Hoodum

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: **HMB Professional Engineers, Inc.**

Services Description: **Environmental 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
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	0	10	0
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	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 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:

Kevin P. Sooker

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 015

Consultant Name: Hanson Professional Services Inc.

Services Description: Environmental 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
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	0	10	0
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	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 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:

Kevin P. Johnson

Title: Design Engineer/Squad Leader

Date: 1/26/2006