



( )



( )

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: URS Corp

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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>		0		
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			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	2	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			20
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	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:

SEH

Title: Environmental Sci

Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: DLZ

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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:

S. Selby  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**


Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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:

  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: *BLN Beam, Longest & Neff LLC* Services Description: *ENVIRONMENTAL 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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	0	5	0
	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>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: *SE [Signature]*  
 Title: *Environmental Sci*  
 Date: *01-31-06*

(RWA)

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: RW Armstrong, Inc Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			

Weighted Total 70

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

SE high  
Title: Environmental Sci  
Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: HMB

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	-0 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	-0 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	-0 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	1	10	-0 10
	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 0 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>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:

Schaefer  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18


Consultant Name: Keramaida

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	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:

  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: R Q A W

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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	0		
	51 to 150 mi.	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:

Signed: S E hynzer  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: QEP i

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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	<del>0</del> 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:

SE Hughes

Title: Environmental Sci

Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: BLA

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	-0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	-0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	-0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	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	-0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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	1	5	-0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			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:

Schuyler

Title: Environmental Sci

Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

**Consultant Name:** BONAR Group **Services Description:** ENVIRONMENTAL 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			10
	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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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:

Signed: SEHJL  
 Title: ENVIRONMENTAL SCI  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: Burgess & NIPLE Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	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	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:

SE Niple

Title: Environmental Sci

Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: HANSON

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	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: S E Hughes  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: Schneider Corp. Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			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	2	10	0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			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>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:

Signed: SE Huff  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: Strand Asc. Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			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	2	10	0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			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>86</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: SE Hughes  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: Patriot Engineering Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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	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	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:

SE [Signature]

Title: Environmental Sei

Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: American Consulting, INC

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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>		0		
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	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	2	10	0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			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>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:

Signed: S. E. Hugel  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: BKFS

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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>		0		
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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:

Signed: SE hyl  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: Earth Tech

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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>		0		
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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:

SE [Signature]  
 Title: ENVIRONMENTAL SC  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: PARSONS

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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>		0		
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			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	2	10	0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			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		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: SE Hynley  
 Title: Environmental Sci  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: K+S ENGINEERS Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</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>		0		
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0	1		20
	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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			10
	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>		0	5	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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: SE Singh  
 Title: ENVIRONMENTAL  
 Date: 01-31-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: AMEC

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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 <i>IB (Indiana) 100% State 2300</i>	<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	<del>0</del>
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	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	<del>0</del>
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager <i>Same Sheppard</i>	<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	<del>0</del>
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			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	2	10	<del>0</del>
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			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>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:

*G. G. [Signature]*

Title: Environment Sci

Date: 01-31-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: PATRIOT

Services Description: ENV. SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0 ✓
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0 ✓
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0 ✓
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0 ✓
	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0 ✓
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications <i>(1995-2001 Mostly Private 18.5 Emp)</i>	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0 ✓
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager <i>Row Spivey 30 yrs PE-8 ENV</i>	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	-1	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			-5
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0 ✓
Location	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	<i>EVANSVILLE</i> 16 to 50 mi.	1			
	<i>MAIN INDIA, INDIANA</i> 51 to 750 mi.	0	1	5	0
151 to 500 mi.	-1			0	
Greater than 500 mi.	-2			5	
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	0.0

Subs - 13 MENTIONED - NAMES 5

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VIOLATIONS ASSESSMENT MANAGER

Date: 1/26/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

9

Consultant Name: QEP I

Services Description: ENR Services

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0 ✓
Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0 ✓
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0 ✓
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	-3	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications <i>STATES 96 5 PER 92-307 MAY 24 1998</i>	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	-3	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager <i>Tom O'Veary</i>	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	-1	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0 ✓
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2	0	5	0 ✓
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	<i>Tray</i> 51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				Weighted Total	-100 0

*Subs - 7 MENTIONS*

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VICARIES PLANNING

Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

8

Consultant Name: ROAW

Services Description: ENV. 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 ✓
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 Since 1954 3 + Subs	<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 Jim Jurcic NRPA-III	<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	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			10
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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	<u>Tray</u> 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>

Sub ASC, KRAMICA

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Wayne Dittelberg

Title: VINCENNES PLANNING

Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: R. W. ARMSTRONG Services Description: ENV. 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 ✓
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 <i>7 = 4.47 Sub DOW = 20 CE 11-62/215</i>	<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 <i>JASU Hignit 1590 NEFA-1111 BOURKE</i>	<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	0 ✓
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	5			
Approach to Project	<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>10.0</b>

Subs ASC

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VICENNES PLANNING

Date: 1/26/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: SCHNEIDER

Services Description: ENV. SERVICES

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

Subs: KRAMIRA + WILSON SMITH

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Wayne Dittelberger  
 Title: Vendor Assessment Manager  
 Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: WILLIAM STRAND ASS Services Description: ENV. SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score				
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.								
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0 ✓				
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3							
	Historical Performance.								
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0 ✓				
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*	0	15	0 ✓				
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	0	10	0 ✓				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.								
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20 ✓				
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0							
Project Manager	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3							
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.								
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30 ✓				
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0							
Approach to Project	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3							
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.								
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2							
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	2	5	10 ✓				
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1							
Location	Insufficient experience.	-3							
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0 ✓				
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.								
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2							
Location	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0 ✓				
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0							
	Lack of project understanding.	-3							
	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.								
	Within 15 mi.	2							
16 to 50 mi.	1								
<u>COLUMBUS</u> 51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0 ✓					
151 to 500 mi.	-1								
Greater than 500 mi.	-2								
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.					-3				
				Weighted Total	60	0			

Sub ASC

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Wayne Dittmann  
 Title: VENUE ASSESSOR - MAN  
 Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: URS

Services Description: ENV. 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications Starting 1963 26,000 sq ft in 20 County	<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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager Dawn R. Brown State Farm	<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	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			10
	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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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>70.0</b>

Sub: ASC, WENTON, WCC  
See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Date: 1/20/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: AMERICAN CONSULTING SERVICES Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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.	*	2	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 <u>Bob Hittler</u>	<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.	*	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	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			
	<u>Indy, Col</u> 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 0</b>

Subs - ARCH, KERAMICA, UNLTD

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VICARIOUS PERSONAL

Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: BFA S

Services Description: ENV. 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.	*	6	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	0 ✓
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications <i>STATICS 2001 73 STUDIOS 3 PROJECTS</i>	<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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager <i>ANNUNDAKOWSKI URPA - 1</i>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2		5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2		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	0 ✓
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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			
	<i>INDY, INDIANAPOLIS</i> 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> 0 ✓

Sub, ASC, Microbac, JF NEW, ARMS (Ball State)  
See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Wayne Dittlberg  
Title: NATIONAL ASSESSMENT MANAGER  
Date: 1/23/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: BEAM, LONGEST, AEEF Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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.	*			
Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*				
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	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	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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*			
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	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			
	<u>Indo</u> 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>70.0</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: Wayne Dittelberg  
 Title: VICENOR PLANNING  
 Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: BERNARDIN LOCKMULLER Services Description: ENG. SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0 ✓
Past Performance	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications I-C9	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager Tom Cervone - 20 yrs Post Grad P.H.D 16 PER 6 STAFF PA-1	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
Location	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	EVANSVILLE 16 to 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
151 to 500 mi.	-1				
Greater than 500 mi.	-2				
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	+85

Sub CONTRACT - HISTORICAL, AEC, ARMS  
See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Wayne Dittlinger  
Title: VEICENET ASSESSMENT MANAGER  
Date: 1/20/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: BOWAR Group

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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		20	0 ✓
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0	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 <u>David Smith</u>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2		5	0 ✓
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	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			
	<u>Indy, Scottsblum</u> 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>

Sub A5c

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VINCENNES PURCHASER

Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: BURGESS & NIPLE Services Description: ENV. SERVICES

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b> No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	0 -3	0	20	0 ✓
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b> Timeliness score from performance database. Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	* * *	0 0 0	15 15 10	0 0 0 ✓
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b> Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT. Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	1 0 -3	0	20	0 20
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. Expertise and resources at appropriate level. Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	2 0 -3	0	15	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. Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. Experience in different type or lower complexity. Insufficient experience. Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	2 0 -1 -3 *	0	5	0 ✓ 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. High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed. Basic understanding of the Project. Lack of project understanding.	2 1 0 -3	1	10	0 10
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b> Within 15 mi. 16 to 50 mi. <u>INDY</u> 51 to 150 mi. 151 to 500 mi. Greater than 500 mi. For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	2 1 0 -1 -2 -3	0	5	0 ✓
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>20 0</b>

Subs Ass, etc

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VISUALIZATION PLANNING

Date: 1/24/05

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: DLF

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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.	*			
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*			
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	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	0 ✓
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*				
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	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			
	<u>Tracy / Bloomington</u> 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>40.0</b>

Sub ASC, Commw CS Propu  
See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Wayne Dittelberger  
Title: VICE PRESIDENT  
Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 19

Consultant Name: EARTH TECH

Services Description: ENV 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 ✓
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	2	15	30 ✓
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager <u>MICHAEL PNEBICEZ</u> <u>NIPUN</u> <u>CPA-1</u>	<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			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	<u>INDY</u> 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> 0

Sub: CROWN 3, ARMS, EC - TCU, WENTWANT.

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

KAUST KNOWLES

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

Wendy Dittberg

Title: MANAGER OF ASSESSMENT MANAGER

Date: 1/23/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

13

Consultant Name: LANSON

Services Description: ENV. 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	8
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			20
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications 6 + 6 5-6-	<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 Ron WEBS PE Ron 86 NEPA - 1	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2		5	0 ✓
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	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			0
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			0
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	<u>Two</u> 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>720</b>

SUBASE & SHREWSBURY

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: Vice President

Date: 1/20/08

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: HMB

Services Description: ENV. SERVICES

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

Sub ASC, Columbus, OH

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the firm's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: Wayne Dittelberg  
 Title: Vendor Assessment Manager  
 Date: 1/20/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: HNTB

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications <i>30 years</i>	<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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager <i>Tim Miller 13 yrs</i>	<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	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			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	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			10
	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			
	<i>INDOT</i> 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> ✓

*Sub: IF NEW & CUR*

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Date: 11/20/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: K&S ENGINEERING Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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.	*	-	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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			-60
	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 <i>Dibakar Sun</i> <i>CEPE</i> <i>2014 RFP</i> <i>5 stars</i> <i>100% AS PER</i> <i>AGD</i>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	-1	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			-5
	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			10
	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			
	<i>Highway</i> 151 to 500 mi.	-1	-1	5	0
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			-5
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>-60.0</b>

DBE - N. Subs

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VEICENARY ASSESSMENT MAN

Date: 1/31/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: KERAMIDA

Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL 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	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 <i>As shown SACOMP 16.42</i>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	-1	5	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			
	<i>IN</i> 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> ✓

*Sub ASC*

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VINCENNES PLANNING

Date: 1/20/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: PARSONS

Services Description: ENV. 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	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			20
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications <i>11,000 PERSONS SINCE 1919 4 PEOPLE + SLB</i>	<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	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			30
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager <i>STRIVE ORCA 3042 NEPA -</i>	<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	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			10
	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			
	<i>IND.</i> 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>60.0</b>

Subj - ASS, USE

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: VICENOTES PLANS

Date: 1/20/00

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: AMEC Earth Env Services Description: ENVIRONMENTAL

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		20	0 ✓
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0	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		15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0	0		0 ✓
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager <i>Ryan P. Treason NOT NREDA C11 - Jim Hoffman</i>	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2		5	0 ✓
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	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			
	<i>Louisville (74)</i> 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>

*Subs - Williams Creek Consulting - Hoffman*

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*90 OFFICE - 280 Prosper in EAST REGION*

Title: VINCENNES PLANNING

Date: 11/20/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

**Consultant Name: K & S**

**Services Description: Environmental 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	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	-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>-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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Engr  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: DLZ

Services Description: Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping eng  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

**Consultant Name: HNTB**

**Services Description: Environmental 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			
	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>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: Britney Harlan

Title: Environmental/Scoping  
Date: 1/30/2006 engr

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: Beam, Longest, & Neff, LLC

Services Description: Environmental 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	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>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: Brittney Harlow  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

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

**Services Description: Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Engr  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: HMB

Services Description: Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: **Keramida**

Services Description: **Environmental 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	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: Brittney Hurlam  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: RQAW

Services Description: Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng  
 Date: 1/30/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 10

Consultant Name: **QEPI**

Services Description: **Environmental 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	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	-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	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>-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:

Brittney Hearlman

Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng

Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 10**

Consultant Name: BLA

Services Description: Environmental 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	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	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Emp  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: **Bonar Group**

Services Description: **Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Engr  
 Date: 1/30/2006

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

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple

Services Description: Environmental 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	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.	*	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:

Brittney Hurlan

Title: Environmental/Scoping Engr

Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

**Consultant Name: Hanson**

**Services Description: Environmental 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	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	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>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: Bretney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

**Consultant Name: Schneider**

**Services Description: Environmental 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	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	-1	15	-15
	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>-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: Brittney Harlan

Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng

Date: 1/30/2006

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

Consultant Name: Strand Associates, Inc.

Services Description: Environmental 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	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.	*	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: Bretney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Group  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 10**

Consultant Name: Patriot Engineering

Services Description: Environmental 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	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.	*	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	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<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: Brettnay Hallan

Title: Environmental Scoping Eng

Date: 1/30/2006

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

Consultant Name: American Consulting, Inc.

Services Description: Environmental 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	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:

Brittney H. Ulan

Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng

Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 10**

Consultant Name: **BF & S**

Services Description: **Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan

Title: Environmental Scoping Engr

Date: 1/30/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18

Consultant Name: Earth Tech

Services Description: Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Engr  
 Date: 1/30/2006

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

**Consultant Name: Parsons**

**Services Description: Environmental 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	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.	*	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Engr  
 Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: URS

Services Description: Environmental 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	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>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: Brittney Starling

Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng'r

Date: 1/30/2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 18**

Consultant Name: AMEC

Services Description: Environmental 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	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: Brittney Harlan  
 Title: Environmental/Scoping Eng  
 Date: 1/30/2006