

**RFP-No. 06-01, Rating Item No. 2**

**Item Title SR 62 Design/Build, No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1**

Consultants	Member 1 Walt Land	Member 2 George Snyder	Member 3 John Wright	Member 4 Greg Kicinski	Member 5 Jonthan Wallace	Weighted Scores Total	Ranking
ACE	110	60	120	90	110	490	1
JSE	35	105	105	95	120	460	2
BLN	75	45	135	75	105	435	3
United Consulting	110	105	95	60	55	425	4
RQAW	105	80	80	70	90	425	5
R.W. Armstrong	130	35	95	50	70	380	6
BLA	105	65	55	70	85	380	7
CORRADINO	95	60	60	80	75	370	8
BF&S	90	80	95	60	55	325	9
B & N	65	0	95	80	50	290	10
TCE	90	40	70	75	60	275	11
FIRST GROUP	50	30	75	50	55	260	12
FRP	20	90	65	0	30	205	13
URS	30	80	15	45	15	185	14
CTE	35	0	10	25	95	165	15
HANSON	0	25	20	35	45	125	16
WILBUR SMITH	55	0	10	20	30	115	17
A&F	30	25	15	0	10	80	18
MS	0	0	10	10	55	75	19
BAKER	25	-5	10	15	10	55	20
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	

**Scoring Team Leader Signature:**

*[Handwritten Signature]*

**Title:**

Manager, Office of Proj. Mgmt

**Date:**

April 10, 2006

**Central Office Selection Committee Action:**

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

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

**Contract Administration  
Director**

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
Date: 4/21/06

**Economic Opportunity Director**

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
Date: 4/21/06

**Production Management  
Director**

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
Date: 4/21/06

**Planning Director**

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_



**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: A & F Engineering Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06


**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Fink, Roberts & Petrie Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	2	15	30
	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	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>30</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2


Consultant Name: A & F Engineering Company, Inc.

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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:

  
 Title: MANAGER PROJECTS  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2


Consultant Name: Fink, Roberts & Petrie, Inc.

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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:

  
 Title: MANAGER PRT MGMT  
 Date: 3/12/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: A&F**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Robyn Soren  
 Date: 3/18/52

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. \_2\_**


**Consultant Name: FRP**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Policy Serv.  
 Date: 3/14/06

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name **A&F**

Services Description: **SR 62 Interchange**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A 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.		N/A 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>

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

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

*George Snyder*  
 Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name FRP

Services Description: SR 62 Interchange

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A 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.		N/A 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>

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

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

*George Snyder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: A & F

Services Description: JR62

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.	T. 1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>0</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: M. S. Suby  
 Date: 3/8/03

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2**


Consultant Name: FRP

Services Description: SR6Z INT.

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 Firm 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 Management	<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>0</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Bill Soper  
 Date: 3/18/04

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: R.W. Armstrong Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Avenue**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database	*	0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	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	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:

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: American Consulting Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton /**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	2	15	30
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	0	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	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>110</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: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: R.W. Armstrong

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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:

  
 Title: MANAGER NOT MGMT  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: American Consulting Engineers, Inc.      Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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.	*	2	15	30
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>90</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: MANAGER P18 NIGHT  
 Date: 3/12/06

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name Baker

Services Description: SR 62 Interchange

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A 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.		N/A 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>

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

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

*George Snyder*  
 Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name **Hanson**

Services Description: **SR 62 Interchange**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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.		N/A	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>

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

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

*George Snyder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No.   2**


**Consultant Name: Baker**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Regional Serv.  
 Date: 3/14/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: Hanson**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Paul W. Smith  
 Date: 3/14/06


**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Michael Baker, Jr. Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06


**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Hanson Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Avenue**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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	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	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>20</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Manager PROJ mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: Hanson

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>30</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: MANAGER, PROJ mgmt

Date: 3/12/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: Michael Baker

Services Description: SR62 Inv.

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	*	8	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database	*	8	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		10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0	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: *Michael Baker*  
 Title: PM Supt.  
 Date: 3/8/06

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: HANSON

Services Description: SR62 Int.

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: P.M. Subr.

Date: 3/8/06


## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

**Consultant Name: Bernardin, Lochmueller & Assoc., Inc. Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.**

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.	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	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	2	5	10
	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>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:

  
 Title: MANAGER PROJ MGMT  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2


Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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.	*	1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	2	10	20
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	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	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>95</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: MANAGER, PROJ mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: BLA Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Avenue**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Ave**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	2	15	30
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	0	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>120</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: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: BLA**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

  
 Title: Robert Serv  
 Date: 5/14/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No.   2**


**Consultant Name: JSE**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

  
 Title: Robyn Serv  
 Date: 3/14/06

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name BLA

Services Description: SR 62 Interchange

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A 0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A 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.		N/A 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	2	5	10
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>10</b>

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

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

*George Snyder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name JSE

Services Description: SR 62 Interchange

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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.		N/A	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>

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

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

*George Anglin*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: BLA

Services Description: SR 62 Int

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	0		
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database	*	0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	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	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1	2	5	10
	51 to 150 mi.	0			0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>90</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: 3/8/06 PM Supr  
 Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2**


Consultant Name: JSE

Services Description: JR62 INT

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 Firm 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 Management	<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	0		
	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>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: P.M. Smith  
 Date: 3/5/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Corradino, LLC Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Aven**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: United Consulting Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Av**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2


Consultant Name: Corradino Group

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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.	*	1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	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	2	5	10
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>85</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: MANAGER PFI mgmt  
 Date: 3/2/04

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **United Consulting Engineers, Inc.**

Services Description: **SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.**

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.	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5		
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<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>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:

Title:

Date:

*[Signature]*  
 Manager  
 3/12/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: Corradino**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Rudy Seew.  
 Date: 3/14/02

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: United**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Kelly Strickland  
 Date: 3/14/06

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name **Corradino**

Services Description: **SR 62 Interchange**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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.		N/A	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	2	5	10
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>10</b>

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

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

*George Snyder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name UCE

Services Description: SR 62 Interchange

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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.		N/A	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>

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

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

*George Snyder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2**


Consultant Name: CORRODINO

Services Description: JR62 INT

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	30
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	2	15	30
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database	*	2	10	20
Capacity of Firm 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	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	2	5	10
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>170</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: J. P. M. Smith  
 Date: 3/8/06

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **UNITED**

Services Description: **JR 6Z INT.**

Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b> No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	3	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b> Timeliness score from performance database.	*	3	15	45
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database	*	3	15	45
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database	*	3	10	30
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	*			
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	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>190</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: PM Super.

Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: CTE/Westport Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Avenue**

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3.13.06


**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: BF&S Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Avenue**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. \_2\_**

**Consultant Name: CTE**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

*John W. [Signature]*  
*Project Manager*  
 3/14/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: BFS**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title:           Roadway Serv.            
 Date:           3/14/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: CTE

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>30</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*Dez Panki*

Title: MANAGER OFFICE OF PROJECTS

Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2


Consultant Name: **Butler, Fairman and Seufert, Inc.**

Services Description: **SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.**

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.	*	1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	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>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:

  
 Title: manager PMS mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name CTE

Services Description: SR 62 Interchange

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

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

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

*George Snyder*  
 Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name **BFS**

Services Description: **SR 62 Interchange**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	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.		N/A	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>

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

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

*George Snyder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: CTE

Services Description: SR62 INT.

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		10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0		5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	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			10
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	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:

  
 Title: P.M. Soy  
 Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

Consultant Name: BF&S

Description: SR62107

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.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	<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		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			
				Weighted Total	60

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title: PM

Date: 3/19/04


**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: First Group Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Avenue**

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**

**Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple Services Description: Development of SR 62 Interchange at Fulton Avenue**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3-13-06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2**


**Consultant Name: First Group**

**Services Description: Dev. Of SR 62 Interch. At Fulton Ave**

Copy	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	<b>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</b>		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	<b>Historical Performance.</b>				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*	1	15	15
	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>15</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Rating Serv.  
 Date: 3/14/06



## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: **First Group Engineering, Inc.**

Services Description: **SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.**

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.	*	2	15	30
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*	1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	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:

  
 Title: Manager PJ mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 2

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple, limited

Services Description: SR 62 @ Fulton Ave.

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

Title:

Date:

*Dy Niple*  
 Title: Manager AS mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06