# RFP Scoring Tabulation for RFP 06-02_, Item No. _05_

## US50 North Vernon Corridor Study, No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1

| Consultants | Member 1 Eryn Hays | Member 2 Dave Butts | Member 3 Steve Smith | | | Weighted Scores Total | Ranking |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BLA | 75 | 90 | 85 | | | 250 | 1 |
| Corradino | 65 | 75 | 90 | | | 230 | 2 |
| WSA-Strand | 55 | 65 | 25 | | | 145 | 3 |
| WSA-Schneider | 55 | 60 | 25 | | | 140 | 4 |
| Schneider | 35 | 45 | 5 | | | 85 | 5 |
| Earth Tech | 35 | 20 | 0 | | | 55 | 6 |
| MS | 15 | 15 | 5 | | | 35 | 7 |
| CTE | 20 | 10 | -25 | | | 5 | 8 |
| Baker | -10 | 5 | -5 | | | -10 | |
| Burgess & Niple | 0 | 5 | -35 | | | -30 | |
| QK4 | -15 | -10 | -20 | | | -45 | |
| A & F | -70 | -60 | -95 | | | -225 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | 0 | |

**Scoring Team Leader Signature:** Stephen C. Smith

**Title:** Manager LRP Section

**Date:** 4/18/2006

**Central Office Selection Committee Action:**

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

☐ Selection of the proposed top ___ 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.

Recommend No. 1 FIRM TO BE SELECTED, No. 2 AS 1ST ALTERNATE
CHECKING ON THE DBE STATUS OF NO. 3 FIRM (2ND ALTERNATE)

Tarkiden Bann 4/21/06

**Contract Administration Director**

JEM 9MAY06

Date: 4/21/06

**Economic Opportunity Director**

Date: 4/21/06 5/9/06

**Production Management Director**

Date: 4/21/06 JEM 5-9-06

**Planning Director**

Absent JM JRW 5/9/06

Date:

2nd alternate met DBE requirements & was approved by the Selection Review Committee on 5-9-06.

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: BLA** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: BLA Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 20 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 2 | 15 | 30 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity | 1 | 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 | | 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 of the project. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 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: [signature]

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engr'g. Sect.

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: BLA** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Corradino** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02 , Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: Corradino LLC** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 20 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity | 1 | 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 | | 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 of the project. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 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: David A. Seitz

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engrg. Sec

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Corradino** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name:Wilbur Smith Assoc/ Strand** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 20 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 1 | 5 | 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 of the project. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 55 |

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

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

Title: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: Wilbur Smith Associates/Strand** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Plan and EA Study**

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

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engrg. Sect

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name:Wilbur Smith Assoc/ Strand** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| **Approach to Project** | **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 of the project. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 25 |

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

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name:Wilbur Smith Assoc/ Schneider** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: Wilbur Smith Associates/Schneider  Services Description: US 50 Corridor Plan and EA St**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 20 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume' | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database | | 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 of the project. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 60 |

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: David A. Britts

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engr'g. Sect

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name:Wilbur Smith Assoc/ Schneider** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Capacity of Team to do Work | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| Team's Demonstrated Qualifications | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| Project Manager | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Approach to Project | **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 of the project. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| Location | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 25 |

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

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Schneider / RQAW** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 20 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| **Approach to Project** | **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 of the project. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 35 |

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: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: Schneider/RQAW** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

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

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engrg Sect.

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Schneider / RQAW** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name:Earthtech** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | -1 | 15 | -15 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 1 | 5 | 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 of the project. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | 35 |

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: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: Earthtech** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

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

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engrg. Sect.

Date: 04-13-06

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name:Earthtech** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

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: Stephen C. Smith

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: MS** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: ms Consultants** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Plan and EA Study**

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

Title: Supervisor Feas. Engrg Secty

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: MS** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: CTE** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02 , Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: CTE** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

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

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

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

Title: Supervisor, Preas Engrg Sect

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: CTE** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | -1 | 5 | -5 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| **Approach to Project** | **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 of the project. | 1 | -2 | 10 | -20 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | -25 |

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

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Baker** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

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

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

Title: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02 , Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: Michael Baker, Jr. Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

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

Title: Supervisor, Fees-Engrg Sect

Date: 04-13-06

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Baker** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Burgess Niple** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

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: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: Burgess and Niple  Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

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

Title: Supervisor, Trans-Engrg Sect

Date: 04-13-06

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: Burgess Niple** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | -1 | 15 | -15 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| **Approach to Project** | **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 of the project. | 1 | -2 | 10 | -20 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | -35 |

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: Stephen C. Smith

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02, Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: QK4** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

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

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

Title: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: QK4** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Planning and EA Study**

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

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

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

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engrg. Sect.

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: QK4** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

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

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02, Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: A & F** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | -3 | 15 | -45 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | -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. | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| **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 of the project. | 1 | -1 | 10 | -10 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | -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: Mgr. Office of U & C Planning

Date: 4/18/2006

## Selection Rating for RFP - No. 2006-02, Item No. 5

**Consultant Name: A & F Engineering** **Services Description: US 50 Corridor Plan and EA Study**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule. | -3 | | | |
| **Team's Demonstrated Qualifications** | **Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | -3 | 15 | -45 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity | 2 | | | |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity | 1 | -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 | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| **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 of the project. | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | | | |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **Weighted Total** | -60 |

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: David A Batts

Title: Supervisor, Feas. Engrg. Sect.

Date: 04-13-06

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 2006-02 , Item No. _05

**Consultant Name: A & F** **Services Description:Corridor / EA**

| 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. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database. | | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| | Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database. | | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| **Capacity of Team to do Work** | **Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.** | | | | |
| | Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT. | 1 | -2 | 20 | -40 |
| | Adequate capacity to meet the schedule. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient available capacity 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 outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 2 | -2 | 15 | -30 |
| | Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit. | 1 | | | |
| | Expertise and resources at appropriate level. | 0 | | | |
| | Insufficient expertise and/or resources. | -3 | | | |
| **Project Manager** | **Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.** | | | | |
| | Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. | 2 | -1 | 5 | -5 |
| | Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. | 1 | | | |
| | Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'. | 0 | | | |
| | Experience in different type or lower complexity. | -1 | | | |
| | Insufficient experience. | -3 | | | |
| | Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database. | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| **Approach to Project** | **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 of the project. | 1 | | | |
| | Basic understanding of the project. | 0 | | | |
| | Lack of project understanding. | -3 | | | |
| **Location** | **Location of assigned staff office relative to project.** | | | | |
| | Within 50 mi. | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | 51 to 150 mi. | 0 | | | |
| | 151 to 500 mi. | -1 | | | |
| | Greater than 500 mi. | -2 | | | |
| | For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms. | -3 | | | |
| | | | | **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: Stephen C. Smith

Title: LRP Planning Section Mananger

Date: 4/17/2006