

## RFP 06-01, Rating - Item No.3

Item Title I-74 Design/Build, No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1

Consultants	Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Member 4	Member 5	Weighted Scores Total	Ranking
	Kenny Franklin	Walt Land	George Snyder	John Wright	Greg Kicinski		
United Consulting	85	125	110	115	65	500	1
ACE	85	115	65	125	85	475	2
BLN	110	85	50	125	90	460	3
RWA	90	135	40	115	65	445	4
TCE	85	135	45	85	80	430	5
BF&S	80	110	85	85	55	415	6
RQAW	55	125	85	70	65	400	7
PB	75	110	65	40	85	375	8
DLZ	110	70	30	70	40	320	9
B&N	55	65	5	85	75	285	10
EARTH TECH	45	75	30	60	50	260	11
URS	5	35	85	40	70	235	12
FIRST GROUP	5	55	35	80	50	225	13
STRAND	80	25	30	35	50	220	14
CTE	85	40	5	45	30	205	15
VS	5	15	50	60	40	170	16
GPD	55	30	25	5	15	130	17
FEBA	5	55	5	50	5	120	18
BONAR	40	15	0	25	25	105	19
HANSON	5	5	30	10	35	85	20
QK4	35	-20	-75	0	-30	-90	21
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	

Scoring Team Leader Signature: *Greg Kicinski*  
 Title: Manager, Office of Proj. Mgm't  
 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

*[Signature]*  
Date: 4/24/06

Production Management Director

*[Signature]*  
Date: 4/24/06

Economic Opportunity Director

*[Signature]*  
Date: 4/24/06

Planning Director

*Absent Tm*  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_



**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01

**Item No. :**

3

**Services Description:**

I-74 Interchange Design Build

**Consultant Name:**

ACE

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.		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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>85</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:



Title: Project Manager

Date: 4/7/2006



## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: R.W. Armstrong

Services Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build

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	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	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>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: Member PMS mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

**Consultant Name: American Consulting Engr**

**Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build**

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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*	0	5	
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>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 PRJ mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: RLV Armstrong Services Description: 1-74 DB

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.	*	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	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	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>205</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: [Signature]  
 Title: 1st Sup  
 Date: 3/8/04

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: ACE

Services Description: I-74 DB

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 Team to do Work	<b>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</b>				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	<b>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.</b>				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	<b>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</b>				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	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	1	5	5
	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>165</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: [Signature]

Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01

**Item No. :**

3

**Services Description:**

I-74 Interchange Design Build

**Consultant Name:**

BLN

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	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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>110</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:

*Kenny Faurli*  
Project Manager

Title:

Date:

4/7/2006



**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01

**Item No. :**

3

**Services Description:**

I-74 Interchange Design Build

**Consultant Name:**

BFS

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	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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0			
Approach to Project	<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 of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>80</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:

*Kenny Frail*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Manager

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 4/7/2006

0

0

0

**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01

**Item No. :**

3

**Services Description:**

I-74 Interchange Design Build

**Consultant Name:**

Bonar

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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity 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 of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>40</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:

*Kenny Faulk*  
Project Manager

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 4/7/2006

0

0

0

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Burgess & Niple, Limited**

Description: **New I-74 Interchange Design/Build**

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	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:

Date:

*Dog Kunkin*  
 Title: MANAGER AS MGMT  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: VS Engineering

Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build

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	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			
	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>45</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

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

**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01

**Item No. :**

3

**Services Description:**

I-74 Interchange Design-Build

**Consultant Name:**

Burgess and Niple

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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>55</b>

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

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



Title: Project Manager

Date: 4/7/2006

( )

( )

( )

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name **B&N**

Services Description: **I-74 Interchange 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	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>5</b>

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. 3

Consultant Name VS

Services Description: I-74 Interchange 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




## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

**Consultant Name: VS      Services Description: I-74 Inter. Design Build Doc.**

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			
	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	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>40</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Robyn Sevel  
 Date: 3/14/02

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: B & Neple

Services Description: I-74 DB

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			
	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	1		5
	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>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: [Signature]  
 Title: PTM/Sup  
 Date: 3/5/04

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: VS ENGINEERING Services Description: 1-74 DO

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		5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1	-1		-5
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database	*	0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable 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	2		10
	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>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: [Signature]

Title: PM Sup

Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01
3
I-74 Interchange Design Build
CTE

**Item No. :**

**Services Description:**

**Consultant Name:**

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.		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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>85</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:



Title: Project Manager

Date: 4/7/2006



## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3


Consultant Name: CTE

Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Manager P.S. Myers  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Hanson

Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

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


**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. \_3\_**

**Consultant Name: CTE Services Description: I-74 Inter. Design Build Doc.**

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	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>

See guidelines for this 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: John E. Wynn  
 Date: 3/14/06


**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. \_3\_**

**Consultant Name: Hanson Services Description: I-74 Inter. Design Build Doc.**

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	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>25</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

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

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name CTE

Services Description: I-74 Interchange 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. 3

Consultant Name **Hanson**

Services Description: **I-74 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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	
	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

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: CTE

Services Description: 1-74 D/B

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	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	2		10
	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>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: P.M. Sapp  
 Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: HANSEN

Services Description: 1-74 D/B

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	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>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: P.M. Sapp  
 Date: 3/8/16

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01, Item No. 3

Consultant Name DLZ

Services Description: I-74 Interchange Interchange

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

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

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

*George Snyder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01, Item No. 3

Consultant Name First Group

Services Description: I-74 Interchange 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	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>5</b>

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. 3

Consultant Name: DLZ

Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build

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	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	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>45</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: manager project  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3


**Consultant Name: First Group Engineering**

**Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build**

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




**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. \_3\_**

**Consultant Name: First Group      Services Description: I-74 Inter. Design Build Doc.**

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	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	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>25</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

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

**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01

**Item No. :**

3

**Services Description:**

I-74 Interchange Design Build


**Consultant Name:**

DLZ

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	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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	1	5	5
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	<b>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</b>				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>110</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:

  
Project Manager

Title:

Date:

4/7/2006



**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: DLZ

Services Description: I-74WB

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

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

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: FIRST GROUP

Services Description: 1-74 DB

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			
	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	2		10
	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>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: MM Sup

Date: 3/8/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: Earth Tech, Inc.

Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build

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	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	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>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: manager PPT mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3


Consultant Name: URS

Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build

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			
	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>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 ARS mgmt  
 Date: 3/12/06

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name Earth Tech

Services Description: I-74 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	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>5</b>

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 Angder*

Title: Bridge Rehabilitation Unit Supervisor

Date: March 10, 2006

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name URS

Services Description: I-74 Interchange

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

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. 3**

**Consultant Name: Earth Tech      Services Description: I-74 Inter. Design Build Doc.**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Riley Sevier  
 Date: 3/14/06



## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: EARTHTECH

Services Description: DB-1-74

Criteria	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	*		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	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			
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	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>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: PM, S&P

Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**


Consultant Name: URS

Services Description: I-74 D/B

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	1	5	5
	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>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: P.M. Sub.  
 Date: 3/8/06

**Selection Rating for RFP- No.:**

06-01

**Item No. :**

3

**Services Description:**

I-74 Interchange Design Build

**Consultant Name:**

EarthTec

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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	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 outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity 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 of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Lack of project understanding.	-3				
Location	<b>Location of assigned staff office relative to project.</b>				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>45</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:

*Kenny Frank*  
 Title: Project Manager

Date: 4/7/2006

0

0

0

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: **Floyd E. Burroughs**

Description: **New I-74 Interchange Design/Build**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

*Dy Karki*

Title: MANAGER PM mgmt

Date: 3/12/06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

**Consultant Name: Strand**

**Description: New I-74 Interchange Design/Build**

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	
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	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>55</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

Title:

Date:

*Manjiv Prasad*  
 Title: Manjiv Prasad  
 Date: 2/12/06


**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3**

**Consultant Name: FEBA Services Description: I-74 Inter. Design Build Doc.**

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

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

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

  
 Title: Project Manager  
 Date: 3/14/06



**Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3**

Consultant Name: FEBA

Services Description: 1-74 D/B

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			
	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	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			0
	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: [Signature]  
 Title: PM/Supr  
 Date: 3/8/06

Selection Rating for RFP - No. 05-02 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name: STRAND

Services Description: 1-74 D/B

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	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>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:

W. Head  
 Title: PM Supv  
 Date: 3/8/86

Example Selection Form

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-01 , Item No. 3

Consultant Name **FEB**

Services Description: **I-74 Interchange 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	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>5</b>

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. 3

Consultant Name Strand

Services Description: I-74 Interchange 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	
	Experience in similar type and complexity 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