

Item Title: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.

No. of Firms Recommended to be selected

1

#	Consultant Name	Terine Smu	Rank	Dan Wilson	Rank	Gary Pence	Rank	Nathan Wall	Rank	Paste Here Name 5	Rank	Rank Scores Total	Ranking
2	Beam Longest & Neff LLC	120	1	75	4	125	2	90	5			12	1
12	Janssen & Spaans Engineering Inc	115	3	65	7	130	1	95	3			14	2
15	R W Armstrong & Associates Inc	100	8	80	2	120	5	90	5			20	3
11	HNTB Indiana Inc	100	8	60	8	110	8	100	1			25	4
17	Transportation Consulting Engineers LLC	120	1	60	8	110	8	80	9			26	5
18	United Consulting Engineers Inc	100	8	70	5	120	5	85	8			26	5
13	Lawson-Fisher Associates PC	100	8	60	8	105	11	90	5			32	7
8	Fink Roberts & Petrie Inc	105	7	45	16	125	2	80	9			34	8
10	Hanson Professional Services Inc	95	12	80	2	105	11	75	11			36	9
1	American Consulting Inc	90	14	55	11	125	2	75	11			38	10
6	Corradino LLC	85	16	70	5	85	18	100	1			40	11
7	Farrar Garvey & Associates LLC	40	21	85	1	95	16	95	3			41	12
16	RQAW Corporation	110	4	50	13	115	7	65	17			41	12
4	Butler Fairman and Seufert Inc	95	12	55	11	105	11	75	11			45	14
20	USI Consultants Inc	90	14	50	13	110	8	70	15			50	15
3	Burgess & Niple Inc	110	4	50	13	85	18	50	18			53	16
9	First Group Engineering Inc	110	4	35	20	100	14	70	15			53	16
19	URS Corporation	55	19	45	16	100	14	75	11			60	18
21	VS Engineering Inc	85	16	45	16	65	20	45	19			71	19
5	Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers Inc.	65	18	40	19	90	17	35	20			74	20
14	Qk4	50	20	25	21	25	21	20	21			83	21
22													
23													
24													
25													
26													
27													
28													
29													
30													

Scoring Team Leader Signature:

Doug Kinski

Title:

Manager of AS Dept

Date:

10/23/2006

Item Title: New Interchange US 35,
Delaware Co.

No. of Firms Recommended to be selected 1

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 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

J. E. Martin
Date: 2 November 2006

Economic Opportunity Director

Absent from
Date: _____

Production Management Director

[Signature]
Date: 22 NOV 06 *(Yes)*

Planning Director


[Signature]
Date: 11/2/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	American Consulting 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.		2	10	20
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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Katherine Smutze
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: American Consulting 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.				
	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	0	5	0
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **American Consulting 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.		2	15	30
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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	2	5	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
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					125

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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: American Consulting 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.				
	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	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			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Jonathan Wallace
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.		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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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			
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	1	5	5
	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	120

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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
	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			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
Location	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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					125

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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.		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	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			

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.

Weighted Total 90

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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No.: **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Burgess & Niple 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.		2	10	20
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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Burgess & Niple 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.		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	0	5	0
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Burgess & Niple 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.				
	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	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	-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	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			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Burgess & Niple 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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Jonathan Wallace
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	Butler, Fairman and Seufert 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.		2	10	20
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	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutze
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	Butler Fairman and Seufert 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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
	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			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5	
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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	Butler Fairman and Seuffer 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.		2	10	20
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	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Butler Fairman and Seufert 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.		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	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Jonathan Wallace
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers**

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
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			
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	2	5	10
	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			
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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers

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.				
	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	0	5	0
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers

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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
	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			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
Location	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Consoer Townsend Envirodyne Engineers

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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5	
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: 
 Name: Jonathan Wallace
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Corradino 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.		0	15	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	Corradino 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.		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	0	5	0
	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	1	5	5
	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					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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Corradino 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.				
	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	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			
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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US-35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Corradino 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.		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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Farrar Garvey & Associates 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.		2	10	20
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	0	5	0
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Farrar Garvey & Associates 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.		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	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	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			
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	1	5	5
	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: *Dan Wilson*
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Farrar Garvey & Associates 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.		2	10	20
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	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			
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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Farrar Garvey & Associates 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.		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	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	0	5	0
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Jonathan Wallace
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Fink Roberts & Petrie 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.		2	10	20
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	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	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			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Fink Roberts & Petrie 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.				
	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	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	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	1	5	5
	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: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Fink Roberts & Petrie 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.		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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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					125

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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Fink Roberts & Petrie 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.		2	15	30
	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	0	5	0
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				

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 10/18/2006


Weighted Total 80

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: First Group 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.		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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: First Group 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
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	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			
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			
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			
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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: First Group 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.		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.				
	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	2	5	10
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: First Group 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.		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.				
	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	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	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	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	1	5	5
	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	76

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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Hanson Professional Services 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.		2	10	20
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	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	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	Hanson Professional Services 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.		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.				
	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	1	5	5
	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: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	Hanson Professional Services 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.		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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Hanson Professional Services 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.				
	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	2	5	10
	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	0	10	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Locatlon of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			

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.

Weighted Total 75

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: 10/18/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **HNTB Indiana 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.		2	10	20
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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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 Katherine Smutzer
 Title Project Manager
 Date 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	HNTB Indiana 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.				
	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	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			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: HNTB Indiana 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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: HNTB Indiana 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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans 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.		1	15	15
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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				
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
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	115

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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans 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.		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	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	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans 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.		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.					
	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	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	1	5	5	
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Janssen & Spaans 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.		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.				
	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	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	0	5	0
	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	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	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				

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.

Weighted Total 95

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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Lawson-Fisher Associates PC**

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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
Location	High level of understanding of the project.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
Location	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	0	5	0
	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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **Lawson-Fisher Associates PC**

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.		2	10	20
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	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	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	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	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: *Dan Wilson*
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Lawson-Fisher Associates PC

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.		2	10	20
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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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 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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Lawson-Fisher Associates PC

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.				
	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	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			
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	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	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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Qk4

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
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			
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			
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			
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			
Location	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	-1	5	-5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	Qk4

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.		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	0	5	0
	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	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	-1	5	-5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US-35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Qk4

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.		-3	15	-45
	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	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 innovative 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	-1	5	-5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Qk4

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.		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	0	5	0
	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	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			

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.

Weighted Total 20

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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.		2	10	20
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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.				
	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	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Dan Wilson
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.		2	10	20
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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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	120

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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 0612
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware 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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: RQAW Corporation

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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
	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	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	2	5	10
	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			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding 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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: RQAW Corporation

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.		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	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: RQAW Corporation

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.		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	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	2	5	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume's.	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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	115

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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US-35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: RQAW Corporation

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.				
	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	0	5	0
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Jonathan Wallace
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Transportation Consulting Engineers 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.		2	10	20
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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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	120

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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Transportation Consulting Engineers 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.				
	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	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	0	5	0
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Dan Wilson
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Transportation Consulting Engineers 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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: Transportation Consulting Engineers 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.				
	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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 86

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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: United Consulting Engineers 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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		2	10	20
	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			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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	2	5	10
	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			
Approach to Project	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	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			
Location	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: United Consulting Engineers 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.				
	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	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	1	5	5
	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	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: United Consulting Engineers 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.		2	10	20
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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	5	5
	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	120

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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006


Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: United Consulting Engineers 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.				
	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3				

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.

Weighted Total 85

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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **URS Corporation**

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.		2	10	20
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			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: URS Corporation

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
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			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	URS Corporation

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.				
	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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No. : 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US-35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: URS Corporation

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.				
	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	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	79

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: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	USI Consultants 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
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			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: USI Consultants 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.				
	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	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No.: **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **USI Consultants 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.		2	10	20
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	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	2	5	10
	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: USI Consultants 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.		2	15	30
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
	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	2	5	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
Approach to Project	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.		0	5	0
	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location	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	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: 
 Name: Jonathan Wallace
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/18/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: **06-12**
 Item No. : **7**
 Services Description: **New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.**
 Consultant Name: **VS 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.		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.				
	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	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Katherine Smutzer
 Title: Project Manager
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	7
Services Description:	New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
Consultant Name:	VS 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.		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	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	1	10	10
	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	1	5	5
	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: Dan Wilson
 Title: Contracts Coordinator
 Date: 10/12/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: VS 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
Capacity of Team to do Work	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
	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
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
	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
Project Manager	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			
	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	0	5	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
Approach to Project	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
Location	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			
Location	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	1	5	5
	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: 
 Name: Gary Pence
 Title: Project Management Engineer
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.: 06-12
 Item No.: 7
 Services Description: New Interchange US 35, Delaware Co.
 Consultant Name: VS 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.		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	0	5	0
	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	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	1	5	5
	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: 10/18/2006