RFP Scoring Tabulation for RFP: 06-12 **Item No.:** 6

10/24/2006, 10:05 AM

Item Title: US 31 Marshall-St. Joseph Co **No. of Firms Recommended to be selected** 1

#	Consultant Name	John Wright	Rank	Walter Land	Rank	Tim Muench	Rank	Jonathan Wallace	Rank	Paste Here Name 5	Rank	Rank Scores Total	Ranking
6	R W Armstrong & Associates Inc	75	4	130	1	100	1	105	1			7	1
3	DLZ Indiana LLC	80	3	65	2	60	4	105	1			10	2
5	Janssen & Spaans Engineering Inc	85	1	40	4	100	1	90	4			10	~~2~~ 3
1	Beam Longest & Neff LLC	85	1	25	6	85	3	100	3			13	4
2	Burgess & Niple Inc	75	4	50	3	60	4	45	6			17	5
4	HDR Engineering Inc	50	6	30	5	30	6	80	5			22	6
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													

THE SCORING TEAM MET 10/24/2006 AND DETERMINED THAT DLZ SHOULD BE RANKED 2ND AND JSE SHOULD BE RANKED 3RD. DLZ WAS SELECTED OVER JSE DUE TO THEIR PROXIMITY TO THE PROJECT, THEIR CURRENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE BRIDGES & WORK ON THE SURVEY.

Scoring Team Leader Signature: Doug Kienitz

Title: MANAGER, PRJ MGMT

Date: 10/24/2006

Central Office Selection Committee Action: Doug Kienitz

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 fr

☒ 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

John E. Mutz

Date: 21 November 2006

Production Management Director

Date: 21 NOV 06 (yes)

Economic Opportunity Director

Matthew

Date: 11/21/06

Planning Director

Absent

Date:

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**Beam Longest & Neff LLC**

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.		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
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.		0	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	**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:	John Wright
Name	John Wright
Title	Roadway Services Manager
Date	10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**Burgess & Niple 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.		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.**		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.		0	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	**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: John Wright

Name John Wright

Title Roadway Services Manager

Date 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**DLZ Indiana LLC**

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.		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.**		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.		0	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	**80**

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

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

Signed: John Wright

Name John Wright

Title Roadway Services Manager

Date 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**HDR Engineering 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.		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.**		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.		0	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	**50**

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

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

Signed:	John Wright
Name	John Wright
Title	Roadway Services Manager
Date	10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**Janssen & Spaans Engineering 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.		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
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.		0	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	**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:	John Wright
Name	John Wright
Title	Roadway Services Manager
Date	10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**R W Armstrong & Associates 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.		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.**		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.		0	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	**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:	John Wright
Name	John Wright
Title	Roadway Services Manager
Date	10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**Beam Longest & Neff LLC**

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		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**		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		0	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	**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: Walter Land

Name	Walter Land
Title	Mgr.,Major Projects
Date	10/11/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**Burgess & Niple 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.		1	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.**		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.**		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.		0	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	**50**

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

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

Signed: Walter Land

Name Walter Land

Title Mgr.,Major Projects

Date 10/11/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**DLZ Indiana LLC**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added valu**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.**		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.		0	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	**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: Walter Land

Name Walter Land

Title Mgr.,Major Projects

Date 10/11/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**HDR Engineering Inc**

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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**		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.**		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.		0	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	**30**

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

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

Signed: Walter Land

Name Walter Land

Title Mgr.,Major Projects

Date 10/11/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**Janssen & Spaans Engineering 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.		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**		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.**		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.		0	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	**40**

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

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

Signed:	Walter Land
Name	Walter Land
Title	Mgr.,Major Projects
Date	10/11/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	**06-12**
Item No. :	**6**
Services Description:	**New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co**
Consultant Name:	**R W Armstrong & Associates 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	30
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
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 valuto 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.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding 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	**130**

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: Walter Land

Name Walter Land

Title Mgr.,Major Projects

Date 10/11/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	Beam Longest & Neff LLC

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.		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.**		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.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding 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	**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: Tim Muench

Name Tim Muench

Title Project Manager

Date 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	Burgess & Niple 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.		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.**		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.		0	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	**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: Tim Muench

Name Tim Muench

Title Project Manager

Date 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	DLZ Indiana LLC

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.		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.**		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.**		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.		0	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	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: Tim Muench

Name Tim Muench

Title Project Manager

Date 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	HDR Engineering 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.		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.**		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.**		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.		0	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	**30**

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

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

Signed: Tim Muench

Name Tim Muench

Title Project Manager

Date 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	Janssen & Spaans Engineering 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.		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
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.**		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.		0	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	**100**

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

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

Signed: Tim Muench

Name Tim Muench

Title Project Manager

Date 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	R W Armstrong & Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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.**		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.**		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.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding 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	100

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

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

Signed: Tim Muench

Name Tim Muench

Title Project Manager

Date 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31 Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	Beam Longest & Neff LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		2	15	30
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
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.		0	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	**100**

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

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

Signed:

Name Jonathan Wallace

Title Project Manager

Date 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31 Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	Burgess & Niple 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.		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.**		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.**		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.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding 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	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:

Name Jonathan Wallace

Title Project Manager

Date 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31 Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	DLZ Indiana LLC

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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.**		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.**		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.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding 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	**105**

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

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

Signed:

Name Jonathan Wallace

Title Project Manager

Date 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	HDR Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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.**		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.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding 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	80

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

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

Signed:

Name Jonathan Wallace

Title Project Manager

Date 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St, Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	Janssen & Spaans Engineering 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	30
	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.**		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.**		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.		0	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	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:

Name Jonathan Wallace

Title Project Manager

Date 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	6
Services Description:	New Road, US 31Marshall St. Joseph Co
Consultant Name:	R W Armstrong & Associates Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Historical Performance.**				
	Timeliness score from performance database.		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.**		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.		0	5	0
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		2	10	20
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding 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	105

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

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

Signed:

Name Jonathan Wallace

Title Project Manager

Date 10/12/2006