

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 14


Consultant Name: URS Corp.

Services Description: SR-912 Semi-Annual Insp.

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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	2	10	20
	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	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: Bridge Inspection Engr
 Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 14

Consultant Name: URS

Services Description: Semi-Annual Inspection

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	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	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					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: 9/18/05

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

Consultant Name: URS Corp.

Services Description: RFP #14 (SR 912 Bridge Insp)

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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	2	10	20
	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					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: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 10 September 05

NOTE

URS is the preferred firm with depth in P-T related issues.
Siva Venugopalan's expertise with P-T strand and grout issues should prove invaluable.
VSL's prior SR 912 experience and their Peter Emmons add significant technical resources to this team.

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

Consultant Name: URS

Services Description: RFP #14 SR 912 Semi-Annual Insp

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	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. Within 15 mi.	1	-2	5	-10
	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:

Richard Fuchsberg
 Title: HELV BRUNSP LA PORTE
 Date: 09/09/05

URS and VSL was an excellent investigative team. They lead and directed the 90% of the investigative effort and submitted extensive reports summarised by Jerry Frost.

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 14


Consultant Name: Frost Engineering

Services Description: SR-912 Semi-Annual Insp.

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


 Title: Bridge Inspection Eng. r.
 Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. _14_


Consultant Name: Frost

Services Description: Semi-Annual Inspection

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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	2	10	20
	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	65

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

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


 Title: PROGRAM MGR ASST
 Date: 9/12/05

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

Consultant Name: Frost Engineering

Services Description: RFP #14 (SR 912 Bridge Insp)

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		-3		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	-60
	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					-15

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

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

Title: District Bridge Engineer

Date: 10 September 05

NOTE

Frost failed to include INDOT's W. Skinner in the previous analysis of the SR 912 structures.
 Frost failed to adequately include Siva Venugopalan in the previous evaluation of the SR 912 structures.
 Frost initially resisted INDOT's W. Skinner's previous request to study the SR 912 structures.

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

Consultant Name: FROST

Services Description: RFP #14 SR 912 Semi-Annual Insp

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		-3		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	-60
	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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					-5

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

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


 Title: HEIV BRINOLA Berte
 Date: 09/05

Br. Conditions and Report support a '4' Poor Condition, NOT a '5' Fair given. URS/VSL/Skinner not included in Final Str. Analysis as promised.

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 14


Consultant Name: **Parsons**

Services Description: **SR-912 Semi-Annual Insp.**

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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	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:


 Title: Budget Inspection Eng'r.
 Date: 09-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 14


Consultant Name: Parsons

Services Description: Semi-Annual Inspection

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	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	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. _____


Consultant Name: Parsons

Services Description: RFP #14 (SR 912 Bridge Insp)

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	0	5	0
	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:


 Title: District Bridge Engineer
 Date: 10 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.

Consultant Name: PARSONS

Services Description: RFP #14 SR 912 Semi-Annual Insp

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.				
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings. High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project. Within 15 mi.	1	0	5	0
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1			
	151 to 500 mi.	-2			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-3			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					100

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

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

Richard J. Furbas

Title: HELV BRINSPLATE

Date: 09/09/05

**Inspected I-75 "Zilwaukee" Br (Saginaw), IL's I-39 "Kishwaukee Rv" Br (Rockford)
FL's Mid Bar Br., Revised FI's Cable Specs, Designed I-355 Toll Ext/Des Plaines Rv Valley**

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 14


Consultant Name: **JSE**

Services Description: **SR-912 Semi-Annual Insp.**

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


 Title: Bridge Inspection Engr.
 Date: 9-12-2005

Selection Rating for RFP FY 06 - No. 1, Item No. 14

Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans

Services Description: Semi-Annual Inspection

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	
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			
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			
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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	2	5	10
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
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	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:

Title: PROGRAM MANAGER

Date: 9/17/05

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


Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans

Services Description: RFP #14 (SR 912 Bridge Insp)

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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	0	5	0
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		N/A	5	
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	1			
	16 to 50 mi.	0			
	51 to 150 mi.	-1	-2	5	-10
	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:


 Title: District Bridge Engineer
 Date: 11 September '05

**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 needed in the future**

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


Consultant Name: JSE

Services Description: RFP #14 SR 912 Semi-Annual Insp

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			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		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	2	10	20
	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					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: HEIV BR Insp LA Rate
 Date: 09/09/05

**JSE's experience in designing and constructing in Florida is a real plus.
 John Mauser has been very helpful with bridge problems on I65, SR 152, & US 41.**