RFP 05-01 [redacted] Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 9

Item Title GIS, **No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1**

Consultants	Janice Osadczuk	Mike Wood	Ben Lawrence	Weighted Scores Total	Ranking
ASA Engineering Consultants, Inc.	5	15	-55	-35	7
Indiana University	45	100	95	240	1
GRW Engineers, Inc.	10	15	5	30	6
HNTB	15	65	80	160	2
Hull & Associates, Inc.	15	15	45	75	5
Plexis group	15	15	45	75	5
Schneider Engineering	15	95	45	155	3
Woolpert, Inc.	5	55	85	145	4
WTH	25	65	55	145	4

ı Leader Signature:

Title: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/19/05

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 one indicated firm 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

Date: 9/19/05

Production Management Director

Date: 9-19-05

Economic Opportunity Director

Date: 9/19/05

Planning Director

9/19/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: ASA Eng. Cons., Inc. Services Description: GIS

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

Title: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: ASA Engineering **Services Description:**

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

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: Michael Wood

Title: Planning & Production Manager

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: ASA **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		-3	20	-60
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		0	5	0
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	10	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	-55

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: R [illegible]

Title: Env. Assessment Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: Indiana University **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		**0**		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	0	20	0
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	45

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: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. __9_

Consultant Name: IGS **Services Description:** Statewide Atlas

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

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: Michael Wood

Title: Planning & Production Mgr.

Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: IU **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		2	20	40
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		2	15	30
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		2	5	0
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	95

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: B. [illegible]

Title: Env. Assessment Mgr

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. ___

Consultant Name: GRW Engineers, Inc. Services Description: GIS

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

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

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

Title: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: GRW Engineering **Services Description: Statewide Atlas**

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

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: Michael Wade

Title: Planning & Production Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: GRW **Services Description: GIS**

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

Title: Env. Assessment Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: HNTB **Services Description: GIS**

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

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: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. __9_

Consultant Name: HNTB **Services Description: Statewide Atlas**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		**0**	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		2	20	40
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		2	5	10
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
				Weighted Total	65

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: Michael C. Wood

Title: Planning & Production Mgr.

Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: HNTB **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		2	20	40
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		2	15	30
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		1	5	5
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	10	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	80

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: [signature]

Title: Env. Assessment Mgr

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: Hull & Assoc., Inc. **Services Description: GIS**

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

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: [signature]

Title: Chief/Div. of Env. Plan, & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: Hull & Assoc **Services Description: Statewide Atlas**

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

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: N Paul Wood

Title: Planning & Production Man.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: Hull **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		2	15	30
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		2	5	0
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	45

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: R D

Title: Env. Assessment Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: Plexis Group **Services Description: GIS**

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

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: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. __9_

Consultant Name: Plexis Group **Services Description: Statewide Atlas**

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

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: Michael Wood

Title: Planning & Production Mgr.

Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: Plexis **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		2	15	30
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		2	5	0
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	45

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: [signature]

Title: Fax Assessment Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: Schneider Engineering Services Description: GIS

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

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: [signature]

Title: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: Schneider Corp **Services Description: Statewide Atlas**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**				
	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	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	95

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: Michael L Wood

Title: Planning & Production Mgr

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: Schneider **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		2	15	30
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		2	5	0
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	45

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: [signature]

Title: Env. Assessment Mgr

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: Woolpert, Inc. **Services Description: GIS**

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

Title: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan., & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: Woolpert Inc **Services Description: Statewide Atlas**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		**0**		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	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	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	55

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: [signature]

Title: Planning & Production Mgr

Date: 9-8-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: Woolpert **Services Description: GIS**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		2	20	40
	Availability of additional staff time.	2			
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		2	15	30
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		2	5	0
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	85

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: R. [illegible]

Title: Env. Assessment Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 9

Consultant Name: WTH **Services Description: GIS**

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

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

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

Title: Chief, Div. of Env., Plan. & Eng.

Date: 9/6/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. __9_

Consultant Name: WTH Engineerring **Services Description: Statewide Atlas**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		**0**		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		N/A	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		N/A	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**				
	Availability of additional staff time.	2	2	20	40
	Adequate available staff time to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available staff time to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity	2	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		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	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	**Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.**				
	Within 15 mi.	1	1	5	5
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	65

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: Michael L. Wood

Title: Planning & Production Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _9__

Consultant Name: WTH **Services Description: GIS**

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

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: [signature]

Title: Env Assessment Mgr.

Date: 9-9-05