RFP Scoring Tabulation for RFP 06-10 Item No. 1

Item Title INDOT Organizational Development Plan No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1

Consultants	Member 1 Name	Member 2 Name	Member 3 Name	Member 4 Name	Member 5 Name	Weighted Scores Total	Ranking
	Duane Newman	Dan Hackler	Gary Phillips				
OEC, Inc	35	110	55			200	1
~~Figment Group, Inc.~~	~~-65~~	~~-5~~	~~0~~			~~-70~~	~~2~~
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	
						0	

Scoring Team Leader Signature: [signature]

Title: Director of Training

Date: 9/06/06

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.

- [x] Selection of the proposed top 1 ranked firms is approved as recommended. ~~with the next 2 ranked firms approved, in order, as alternates.~~
- [ ] Selection of the top ___ ranked firms is approved as indicated above after elimination of one indicated firm for the reasons noted below. The next 2 ranked firms are approved, in order, as alternates.
- [ ] Selection based on the recommendations and the associated documentation is denied for the reasons noted below.

Contract Administration Director

[signature]

Date: 9/8/06

Economic Opportunity Director

Absent

Date: 9/7/06

Production Management Director

[signature] (yes)

Date: 9/8/06

Planning Director

[signature]

Date: 9/8/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-10, Item No. _1__

Consultant Name: OEC,INC **Services Description:**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	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.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	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.**		2	5	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	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.			5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		0	5	0
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				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: [signature]

Title: Director of Training

Date: 9/5/06

10-Jun

OEC, Inc.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		2	15	15
	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.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	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.**		2	15	30
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	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.**		2	5	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	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.			5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		3	10	30
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	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.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	110

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: D.L. Hackler

Title: Deputy Dir. State Personnel

Date: 9/5/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-10, Item No. _1__

Consultant Name: OEC,INC. **Services Description:**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1			
	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.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	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.**		1	5	5
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	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.			5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	10	10
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				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: OPS Manager

Date: 9/5/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-10, Item No. _1__

Consultant Name: Figment Group, INC **Services Description:**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		-3	20	-60
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	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.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	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.**		-1	5	-5
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	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.			5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	10	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		0	5	0
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				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: [signature]

Title: Director of Training

Date: 9/5/06

10-Jun

Figment Group, Inc.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	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.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	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.**		0	5	0
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	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.			5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	10	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		-1	5	-5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				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: D.L. Hackler

Title: Deputy Dir. State Personnel

Date: 9/5/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No. 06-10, Item No. 1

Consultant Name: FIGMENT GROUP INC. **Services Description:**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**		0	20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.			15	
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.			10	
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1			
	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.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	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.**		0	5	0
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	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.			5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	10	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		0	5	0
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				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: [signature]

Title: OPS Manager

Date: 9/5/2006