

RFP 05-02 Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 16

Item Title Project Development, No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1

| Consultants         | Bryan Veale | Bart Mueller | Linda Painter | Weighted Scores |         |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|
|                     |             |              |               | Total           | Ranking |
| BLA                 | 85          | 105          | 105           | 275             | 1       |
| Woodport, Inc.      | 55          | 100          | 80            | 235             | 2       |
| USI Consultants     | 55          | 80           | 80            | 215             | 3       |
| DLZ                 | 20          | 95           | 75            | 190             | 4       |
| B L & N             | 45          | 70           | 70            | 185             | 5       |
| Farrar, Garvey      | 55          | 100          | 30            | 185             | 6       |
| American Cons.      | 10          | 100          | 70            | 180             | 7       |
| United Consulting   | 80          | 100          | 20            | 180             | 8       |
| CrossRoad Eng.      | 35          | 90           | 50            | 175             | 9       |
| Congdon Eng.        | 45          | 90           | 30            | 165             | 10      |
| ROAW                | 40          | 100          | 10            | 150             | 11      |
| Corradino LLC       | 30          | 70           | 45            | 145             | 12      |
| Transport Consult   | 35          | 80           | 30            | 145             | 13      |
| Janassen, Spaans    | 20          | 85           | 40            | 145             | 14      |
| First Group Eng.    | 10          | 100          | 30            | 140             | 15      |
| Earth Tech          | 45          | 45           | 40            | 130             | 16      |
| GPD Assoc.          | 30          | 85           | 10            | 125             | 17      |
| S. J. Christian     | 40          | 35           | 40            | 115             | 18      |
| Bonar Group         | 15          | 75           | 20            | 110             | 19      |
| Burroughs           | 10          | 90           | 10            | 110             | 20      |
| VS Engineering      | 35          | 40           | 30            | 105             | 21      |
| B F & S             | 30          | 35           | 40            | 105             | 22      |
| Weastler & Assoc    | 45          | 20           | 30            | 95              | 23      |
| HNTB                | 30          | 10           | 50            | 80              | 24      |
| Certified Eng.      | 30          | 55           | 0             | 85              | 25      |
| Hanson Prof.        | 10          | 50           | 20            | 80              | 26      |
| Paul I. Cripe, Inc. | 10          | 50           | 10            | 70              | 27      |
| Parsons Brincker.   | 20          | 50           | 0             | 70              | 28      |
| Parsons Transpor    | 10          | 40           | 10            | 60              | 29      |
| Schneider Corp.     | 10          | 20           | 30            | 60              | 30      |
| Clark Dietz         | 15          | 0            | 40            | 55              | 31      |
| R.W. Armstrong      | -5          | 40           | 10            | 45              | 32      |
| Burgess & Niple     | 10          | 10           | 20            | 40              | 33      |
| Donohus Assoc.      | 10          | 0            | 25            | 35              | 34      |
| ASA Eng.            | 10          | 10           | 10            | 30              | 35      |
| URS Corporation     | 20          | 0            | 10            | 30              | 36      |
| GRW Engineers       | 10          | 40           | -30           | 20              | 37      |
| A & F Eng.          | 20          | 0            | 0             | 20              | 38      |
| FRP                 | -15         | 20           | 15            | 20              | 39      |
| MS Consultants      | 10          | 0            | 0             | 10              | 40      |
| Strand Assoc.       | 10          | 0            | 0             | 10              | 41      |
| HMB Prof. Eng.      | 0           | 0            | 0             | 0               | 42      |
| Frost Eng.          | -5          | -115         | -5            | -125            | 43      |
| K & S               | -65         | -145         | -125          | -335            | 44      |
| Quality Env.        | -150        | -140         | -150          | -440            | 45      |

Scoring ties were broken using average scores from past performance evaluations on roadway projects.

Scoring Team Leader Signature: T. Bryan M. Veale  
 Title: HEI Consultant Services  
 Date: 3/3/06

**Central Office Selection Committee Action:**

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

- Selection of the proposed top 1-ranked firms is approved as recommended with the next 2 ranked firms approved, in order, as alternates.
- Selection of the top \_\_\_ ranked firms is approved as indicated above after elimination of \_\_\_ 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

17



18

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Bernardin Lochmueller Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     | 2     | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>105</b>     |

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:           Bernardin Lochmueller            
 Title:           HE-2            
 Date:           3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Woolpert, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

B. M. [Signature]

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: USI Consultants, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight                | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |                       |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15                    | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10                    | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20                    | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15                    | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 0     | 5                     | 0              |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5                     | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10                    | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5                     | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
|                                    |   |       |       | <b>Weighted Total</b> | <b>80</b>      |

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: B. M. J. Allen

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: DLZ      Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight                | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |                       |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15                    | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10                    | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20                    | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15                    | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5                     | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1     | 10                    | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | -1    | 5                     | -5             |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
|                                    |   |       |       | <b>Weighted Total</b> | <b>95</b>      |

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: B. M. J. [Signature]  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Beam, Longest and Neff, LLC Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score    | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | <b>0</b> |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |          | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 0        | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2        | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     | 2        | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1        | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0        | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |          |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |          |        | <b>70</b>      |

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: B. M. Neff  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Farrar, Garvey & Associates Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. [Signature]

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: American Consulting, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. J. Allen

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: United Consulting Engineers Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

B. Magallon

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: CrossRoad Engineers, PC Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>90</b>      |

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: B. B. B.

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>90</b>      |

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: B. M. J. [Signature]

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: RQAW      Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Jones  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Corradino LLC Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Allen  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Transportation Consulting Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>80</b>      |

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: B. Brown  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>85</b>      |

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: B. Janssen

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006


**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: First Group Engineering Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Earth Tech Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. J. Jones  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: GPD Associates Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score    | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | <b>0</b> |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |          | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1        | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2        | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2        | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1        | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |          |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0        | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |          |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |          |        | <b>85</b>      |

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: B. M. Green

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight                | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |                       |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10                    | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 0     | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5                     | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5                     | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1     | 10                    | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5                     | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
|                                    |   |       |       | <b>Weighted Total</b> | <b>35</b>      |

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: B. J. Christian  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

Consultant Name: **Bonar Group** Services Description: **Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score    | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | <b>0</b> |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |          | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1        | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2        | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 0        | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1        | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0        | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |          |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | -1       | 5      | -5             |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |          |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |          |        | <b>75</b>      |

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: B. M. Jones

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>90</b>      |

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: B. Burroughs  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: VS Engineering, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Mullen  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Butler, Fairman and Seufert Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>35</b>      |

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: B. M. Seufert  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: M.D. Wessler and Associates Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

B. Wessler

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: HNTB Indiana, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

B. M. [Signature]

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**onsultant Name: Certified Engineering, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. Mullen

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Hanson Professional Services Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. J. [Signature]  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Paul I. Cripe, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. J. [Signature]

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. Mjelle

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Parsons Transportation Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Quinn

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: The Schneider Corporation Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Jones  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Clark Dietz Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Powell

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

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

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: B. Magellan

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

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

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: B. M. Niple

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Donohue & Associates Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

B. M. [Signature]

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**onsultant Name: ASA Engineering Consultant Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Green

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: URS Corporation Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. [Signature]  
 Title: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: GRW Engineers, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. M. Quinn

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/6/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: A & F Engineering Co., LLC Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. Mjallan

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006


**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Fink Roberts & Petrie, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: MS Consultants, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: B. Mjallu

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Strand Associates, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

B. M. J. J.

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: HMB Professional Engineers Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

B. Mjelle

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006


**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 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        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | -3    | 20     | -60            |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | -3    | 15     | -45            |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | -1    | 5      | -5             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | -1    | 5      | -5             |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>-115</b>    |

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: HE-2  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: K & S Engineers, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 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        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | -3    | 20     | -60            |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | -3    | 15     | -45            |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | -1    | 5      | -5             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | -3    | 10     | -30            |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>-145</b>    |

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: B. Mjellen

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: QEPI      Services Description: Project Development Services**


| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight                | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 10                    | 0              |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | -3    | 20                    | -60            |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | -3    | 15                    | -45            |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | -1    | 5                     | -5             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | -3    | 10                    | -30            |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |       |                       |                |
|                                    |   |       |       | <b>Weighted Total</b> | <b>-140</b>    |

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: B. M. Quinn

Title: HE-2

Date: 3/2/2006



## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **Bernardin Lochmueller**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Bern M. Veeh*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Woolpert, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

T. Bryan M. Vesich

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: USI Consultants**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*T. Bryan M. Veech*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

Consultant Name: DLZ

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Boyer M. Veeh*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

**Consultant Name: Beam Longest and Neff**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Byron M. Vukobratovic*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Farrar, Garvey & Assoc.**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Boyer M Vuk*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: American Consulting

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Byron M. Vah*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: United Consulting Engrs.      Services Description: Project Development 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     | 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.  | 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    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |  |       |       |        | <b>60</b>      |

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: Bryan M. Vukobratovic

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: CrossRoad Engineers

Services Description: Project Development Services

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>35</b>      |

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:

*Boyer M. Vucko*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Congdon Engineering**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: T. Bryan M. Vukobratovic

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: RQAW      Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category  | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|---|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes  | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b><br>No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.                                  | 0     | 0     | 20     | 0              |
|   | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                                  | <b>Historical Performance.</b><br>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                       | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|   | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|   | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications                | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|   | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|   | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                                   | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|   | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5      | 10             |
|   | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
| Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1  |       |       |        |                |
| Approach to Project                               | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|   | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
|   | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     |       |        |                |
| Basic understanding of the Project.               | 0   |       |       |        |                |
| Location  | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|   | 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    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>                             |   |       |       |        | <b>40</b>      |

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: T. Bryan M. Veale

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2008

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Corradino LLC**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: Byron M. Vink

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Transportation Consulting      Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 0     | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>35</b>      |

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: Byron M. Vuck

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Byron M. Vank*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **First Group Engineering**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*T. Bryan M. Veach*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Earth Tech**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

Byron M. Vah

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: GPD Associates**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: Byron M. Veeh

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Stephen J. Christian**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: Byron M. Veach

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **Bonar Group**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Boyer M. Vank*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

**Consultant Name: Burroughs and Assoc.      Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Byron M. Vukobratovic*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: VS Engineering, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development 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.  | *     | 1     | 10                    | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.   |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.  | 1     | 0     | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.          |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                             | 2     | 0     | 15                    | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Project Manager                    | Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills. |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.  | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 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.   | *     | 1     | 5                     | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 1     | 1     | 10                    | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Location                           | Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.  |       |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.  | 2     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.   | 1     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.  | 0     | 0     | 5                     | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.   | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.   | -2    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
|                                    |  |       |       | <b>Weighted Total</b> | <b>35</b>      |

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:

T. Bryan M. Vukobratovic

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Butler Fairman & Seufert**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

Byron M. Vuk

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **Wessler & Assoc., Inc.**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*T. Bryan M. Veech*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Boyer M. Veck*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

**Consultant Name: Certified Engineering**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: T. Byrd M. Veeh

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02, Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Hanson Professional

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Boyer M. Veck*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Paul I. Cripe, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Boyer M. Vukobratovic*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Parsons Brinckerhoff**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Boyer M. Vester*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

Consultant Name: Parsons

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Byron M. Vuck*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Schneider Corporation**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*T. Bryan M. Veach*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Clark Dietz

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*T. Lynn M. Veal*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

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

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Byron M. Veeh*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: T. Bryan M. Vande

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Donohue Assoc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: Byron M. Veale

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **ASA Engineering**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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: Byron M. Vank

Title: Consultant Services

Date: 1/20/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: URS Corporation

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*T. M. Vukobratovic*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: GRW Engineers**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: Byron M. Vuck

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: A & F Engineering Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: Boyan M. Vukobratovic

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Fink Roberts & Petrie

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Byron M. Veeh*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: MS Consultants**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Boyer M. Veeh*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2008

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Strand Associates**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: Byron M. Veale

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

**Consultant Name: HMB Professional Engineers      Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 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        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 0     | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 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                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | 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: Byron M. Vank  
 Title: HE 1 Consultant Services  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

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

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: Boyer M. Vuck

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: K & S Engineers**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 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        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | -3    | 20     | -60            |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 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                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | -1    | 5      | -5             |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>-65</b>     |

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:

*Byron M. Vank*

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

Consultant Name: QEPI

Services Description: Project Development Services

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria   | Scale | Score | Weight                | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|--|-------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b><br>No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.   | 0     | 0     | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b><br>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        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b><br>Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | -3    | 20                    | -60            |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.  | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b><br>Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2     | -3    | 15                    | -45            |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b><br>Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.                                       | 2     | -3    | 5                     | -15            |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'   | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.  | -1    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.   | *     | 0     | 5                     | 0              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b><br>High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 2     | -3    | 10                    | -30            |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 1     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.  | 0     |       |                       |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.   | -3    |       |                       |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b><br>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    |       |                       |                |
|                                    |  |       |       | <b>Weighted Total</b> | <b>-150</b>    |

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:

T. Bryan M. Veal

Title: HE 1 Consultant Services

Date: 3/3/2006

( )



( )

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **Bernardin Lochmueller**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score    | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | <b>0</b> |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |          | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1        | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2        | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     | 2        | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1        | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |          |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |          |        | <b>105</b>     |

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*(Signature)*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Woolpert, Inc.**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score    | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | <b>0</b> |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |          | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 0        | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2        | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     | 2        | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1        | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |          |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |          |        | <b>80</b>      |

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:

*Linda Partin*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: USI Consultants, Inc.**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 0     | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2     | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>80</b>      |

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*[Signature]*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: DLZ Indiana, LLC**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0     | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1     | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1     | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 2     | 15     | 30             |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1     | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0     | 10     | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |       |        |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | -1    | 5      | -5             |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |       |        |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>75</b>      |

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:

*Timothy Paetz*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Beam Longest and Neff**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Linda Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Farrar, Garvey & Assoc.**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Donda Proctor*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2008

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: American Consulting, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score    | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|----------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | <b>0</b> |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |          | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 15     | 15             |
|                                    | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.   | *     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
| Capacity of Team to do Work        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | 1        | 20     | 20             |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |          |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | 0        | 15     | 0              |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | 2        | 5      | 10             |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |          |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 1        | 5      | 5              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |          |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 1        | 10     | 10             |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |          |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |          |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |          |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |          |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |          |        | <b>70</b>      |

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:

*John P. Pinter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinato

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: United Consulting Engrs.      Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: *Kim Porter*  
 Title: C.S. Program Coordinator  
 Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: CrossRoad Engineers, PC

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Dieta Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Congdon Engineering**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: Linda Peaster

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: RQAW Cons. Engrs.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16


Consultant Name: Corradino LLC

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

**Consultant Name:** Transportation Consulting      **Services Description:** Project Development Services

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

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:

*David Porter*  
Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans Engrs.**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: *Trinda Parviter*  
 Title: C.S. Program Coordinator  
 Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: First Group Engineering**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*[Signature]*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Earth Tech**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*[Signature]*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**


**Consultant Name: GPD Associates**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Stephen J. Christian**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Hinda Pauter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

Consultant Name: **Bonar Group**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Mark Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006


## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: FEBA Consulting Assoc.      Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2008

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: VS Engineering, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*David Perito*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Butler Fairman & Seufert**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Rinda Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16


Consultant Name: **Wessler & Assoc., Inc.**

Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16


Consultant Name: HNTB Indiana, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **Certified Engineering, Inc.**      Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Dianna Parvata*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **Hanson Professional Services** Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Jinda Paster*  
Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Paul I. Cripe, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*David Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Parsons Brinckerhoff

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Hinda Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Parsons**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Trish Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2008

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **The Schneider Corporation**      Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Clark Dietz, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Clark Dietz*  
Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: R.W. Armstrong & Assoc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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:

*Linda Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

**Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*John Painter*  
 Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Donohue Associates**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*[Signature]*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: ASA Engineering**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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:

*Deirdre Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16


Consultant Name: URS Corporation

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: GRW Engineers, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006


## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **A & F Engineering**      Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator  
 Date: 3/2/2006


**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: Fink Roberts & Petrie, Inc. Services Description: Project Development Services**

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator  
 Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: MS Consultants, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: Strand Associates, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*Diana Painter*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16

Consultant Name: **HMB Professional Engineers**      Services Description: **Project Development Services**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*[Handwritten Signature]*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

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

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

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: *Jenna Painter*  
 Title: C.S. Program Coordinator  
 Date: 3/2/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16


Consultant Name: K & S Engineers, Inc.

Services Description: Project Development Services

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score    | Weight                | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|----------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | <b>0</b> |                       |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |          | 20                    | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |          |                       |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 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        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | -3       | 20                    | -60            |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |          |                       |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | -3       | 15                    | -45            |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |          |                       |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | -3       | 5                     | -15            |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 0        | 5                     | 0              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |          |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |          |                       |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | 0        | 10                    | 0              |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |          |                       |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 2     |          |                       |                |
|                                    | 16 to 50 mi.  | 1     |          |                       |                |
|                                    | 51 to 150 mi.   | 0     | -1       | 5                     | -5             |
|                                    | 151 to 500 mi.  | -1    |          |                       |                |
|                                    | Greater than 500 mi.  | -2    |          |                       |                |
|                                    | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.  | -3    |          |                       |                |
|                                    |   |       |          | <b>Weighted Total</b> | <b>-125</b>    |

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: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 16**

**Consultant Name: QEPI**

**Services Description: Project Development Services**

| Category                           | Scoring Criteria  | Scale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|------------------------------------|---|-------|-------|--------|----------------|
| Disputes                           | <b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>  |       | 0     |        |                |
|                                    | No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.  | 0     |       | 20     | 0              |
|                                    | Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Past Performance                   | <b>Historical Performance.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Timeliness score from performance database.   | *     | 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        | <b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>   |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.   | 1     | -3    | 20     | -60            |
|                                    | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.   | -3    |       |        |                |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | <b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>      |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.                                    | 2     | -3    | 15     | -45            |
|                                    | Expertise and resources at appropriate level.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient expertise and/or resources.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Project Manager                    | <b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b> |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.   | 2     | -3    | 5      | -15            |
|                                    | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.  | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Experience in different type or lower complexity.   | -1    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Insufficient experience.  | -3    |       |        |                |
|                                    | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.  | *     | 0     | 5      | 0              |
| Approach to Project                | <b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.  | 2     |       |        |                |
|                                    | High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.   | 1     | -3    | 10     | -30            |
|                                    | Basic understanding of the Project.   | 0     |       |        |                |
|                                    | Lack of project understanding.  | -3    |       |        |                |
| Location                           | <b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>  |       |       |        |                |
|                                    | Within 15 mi.   | 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    |       |        |                |
| <b>Weighted Total</b>              |   |       |       |        | <b>-150</b>    |

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:

*Kinda Prentiss*

Title: C.S. Program Coordinator

Date: 3/2/2006

