RFP 05 - 01 [redacted] Scoring Tabulation for Item No. 12

Item Title Post-Tensioned Box Girder Insp, **No. of Firms Recommended to be selected** 1

Consultants	Member 1 Name: Bill Dittrich	Member 2 Name: Chris Bucher	Member 3 Name: Sherwood Garrison	Member 4 Name: Jim Mickler	Member 5 Name: Wayne Skinner	Weighted Scores Total	Ranking
URS	105	95	95	105	105	505	1
BFS	85	75	95	105	45	405	2
Frost	50	50	80	50	-20	210	6
Parsons	30	90	80	90	70	360	4
B&N	45	85	95	55	40	320	5
CEA	5	40	40	40	-45	80	7
JSE	55	105	95	105	45	405	2
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	

Scoring Team Leader Signature: William T. Dittrich
Title: Bridge Inspection Engr.
Date: 9-12-2005

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

Economic Opportunity Director
Date: 9/19/05

Production Management Director
Date: 9-19-05

Planning Director
Date: 9/19/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: URS **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Insp.**

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.**		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	105

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: William T. Dittrich

Title: Bridge Inspection Engr.

Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12_

Consultant Name: URS **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girders**

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.**		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	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: [signature]

Title: PROGRAM MGR ASST.

Date: 9/12/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: URS Corporation **Services Description: Inspection of Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridges**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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	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	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: Sherwood Lee Garrison

Title: Crawfordsville District Bridge Inspection Engineer

Date: 09/12/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12__

Consultant Name: URS **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridge Inspections**

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.**		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	105

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: James T. Mielke

Title: BRIDGE ENGINEER

Date: 9-12-05

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

Consultant Name: URS Corp **Services Description: RFP #12 (Insp of P-T Bridges)**

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.**		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	105

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: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 11 September '05

NOTE

URS is the preferred firm with depth in P-T related issues
Siva Venugopalan has extensive expertise in P-T strand and grout issues
VSL has extensive experience inspecting P-T ducts/strands

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Butler Fairman & Seufert **Services Description:** Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Insp.

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.**		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	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: William T. Dittrich

Title: Bridge Inspection Engineer

Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12_

Consultant Name: Butler, Fairman & Seufert Services Desc.: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girders

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.**		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	75

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: PROGRAM MGR ASST.

Date: 9/12/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Butler Fairman and Seufert, Inc. **Services Description:** Inspection of Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridges

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.**		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	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: [signature]

Title: Crawfordsville Dist. Bridge/Insp. Eng.

Date: 09/12/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12__

Consultant Name: Butler, Fairman and Seufert **Services Description:** Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridge Inspections

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.**		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	105

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: James F. Michles

Title: BRIDGE ENGINEER

Date: 9-12-05

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

Consultant Name: Butler, Fairman & Seufert Services Description: RFP #12 (Insp of P-T Bridges)

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.**		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	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: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 11 September '05

Note **Subconsultant Klein appears to have sufficient understanding of P-T strand and grout issues**

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Frost Engr. **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Insp.**

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	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.**		-2	5	-10
	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	50

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: William T. Pettrich

Title: Bridge Inspection Engineer

Date: _____

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12_

Consultant Name: Frost **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girders**

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.**		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.**		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.**		-2	5	-10
	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	50

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: Program MGR Asst.

Date: 9/12/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Frost Engineering and Consulting Company, Inc. Services Description: Inspection of Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridges

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.**		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.**		-2	5	-10
	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: Crawfordsville Dist. Bridge Insp. Eng

Date: 09/12/2005

SEP-12-2005 MON 03:43 PM INDOT-Crawfordsville FAX NO. 17653649226 P. 05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12__

Consultant Name: Frost Engineering & Consulting **Services Description:** Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridge Inspections

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	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.**		-2	5	-10
	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	50

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: James T. Miller

Title: BRIDGE ENGINEER

Date: 9-12-05

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

Consultant Name: Frost Engineering **Services Description: RFP #12 (Insp of P-T Bridges)**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		-3	20	-60
	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.**		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.**		-2	5	-10
	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	-20

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: Gary Skinner

Title: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 11 September '05

NOTE **Frost failed to include INDOT's W. Skinner in the previous analysis of the SR 912 P-T bridges**

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Parsons **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Insp.**

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	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.**		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.**		-2	5	-10
	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	30

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: William J. Dettlinger

Title: Bridge Inspection Engr.

Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12_

Consultant Name: Parsons **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girders**

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.**		-2	5	-10
	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	90

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: PROGRAM MGR. ASST.

Date: 9/12/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc. Services Description: Inspection of Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridges

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.**		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.**		-2	5	-10
	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: Sherwood Lee Harrison

Title: CRAWFORDSVILLE DIST. BRIDGE INSP. ENGR

Date: 09/12/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12__

Consultant Name: Parsons Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridge Inspections

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.**		-2	5	-10
	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	90

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: James F. Michles

Title: BRIDGE ENGINEER

Date: 9-12-05

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

Consultant Name: Parsons **Services Description: RFP #12 (Insp of P-T Bridges)**

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	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			
	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	-2	5	**-10**
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	70

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: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 11 September '05

NOTE **Subconsultant John Corven has sufficient understanding of P-T strand and grout issues**

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Insp.**

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.**		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	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: William T. Pattrick

Title: Bridge Inspection Engr.

Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12_

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girders**

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.**		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	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: [signature]

Title: PROGRAM MGR ASST.

Date: 9/12/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Burgess and Niple, Inc. **Services Description:** Inspection of Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridges

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.**		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	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: Sherwood L. Harrison

Title: Crawfordsville Dist. Bridge Insp. Engr

Date: 09/12/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12__

Consultant Name: Burgess and Niple **Services Description:** Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridge Inspections

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.**		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	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: James F. Mills

Title: BRIDGE ENGINEER

Date: 9-12-05

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

Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple **Services Description: RFP #12 (Insp of P-T Bridges)**

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.**		-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	40

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: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 11 September '05

NOTE **Burgess & Niple does not have sufficient expertise in P-T strand and grout issues.**

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Congden Engr. **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Insp.**

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: William T. Pittard

Title: Bridge Inspection Engr.

Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12_

Consultant Name: Congdon **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girders**

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.**		-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	40

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: PROGRAM MGR ASST

Date: 9/12/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Congdon Engineering Associates, Inc. **Services Description: Inspection of Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridges**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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	-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	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	40

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: [illegible]

Title: Crawfordsville Dist. Bridge Insp. Eng.

Date: 09/12/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12__

Consultant Name: Congdon Engr. Assoc. Inc. **Services Description:** Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridge Inspections

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.**		-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	40

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: James L. Mickles

Title: BRIDGE ENGINEER

Date: 9-12-05

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

Consultant Name: CEA **Services Description: RFP #12 (Insp of P-T Bridges)**

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	-3	15	-45
	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	-3	5	-15
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	-3	10	-30
	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: [signature]

Title: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 11 September '05

NOTE **CEA has little, if any, expertise in P-T strand and grout issues.**

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Jassen Spaans Engr. **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Insp.**

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.**		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.**		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: William T. Dittrich

Title: Bridge Inspection Engr.

Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12_

Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans **Services Description: Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girders**

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.**		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	105

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: PROGRAM MGR ASST.

Date: 9/12/05

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 12

Consultant Name: Janssen and Spaans Engineering, Inc. **Services Description:** Inspection of Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridges

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.**		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	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: [illegible]

Title: Crawfordsville District Bridge Inspection Engineer

Date: 09/12/2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _12__

Consultant Name: Janssen and Spaans Engr., Inc. **Services Description:** Post-Tensioned Concrete Box Girder Bridge Inspections

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.**		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	105

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: James T. Mickles

Title: BRIDGE ENGINEER

Date: 9-12-05

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

Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans **Services Description: RFP #12 (Insp of P-T Bridges)**

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	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	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: Mary C Stine

Title: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 11 September '05

NOTE

J&S has significant P-T design/analysis/retrofitting experience and expertise
J&S appears to lack experience inspecting/evaluating strand and grout conditions
J&S should be considered a candidate to design any retrofits of P-T bridges in the future