

Item Title: Indiana Rail Plan

No. of Firms Recommended to be selected

1

#	Consultant Name	Michael B. Clue	Rank	Thomas Beck	Rank	Joseph Gustan	Rank	Stephen Smith	Rank	Paste Here Name 5	Rank	Rank Scores Total	Ranking
1	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.	75	1	65	1	85	1	85	1			4	1
5	Wilbur Smith Associates Inc	55	3	60	2	75	2	25	3			10	2
4	Morley and Associates Inc.	60	2	35	4	-105	4	55	2			12	3
2	HDR Engineering Inc	30	4	50	3	55	3	20	4			14	4
3	Knight E/A Inc	-35	5	-20	5	-105	4	-60	5			19	5
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													

Scoring Team Leader Signature:

Michael B. Clue

Title: Deputy Commissioner

Date: 11-2-06

Central Office Selection Committee Action:

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

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

Contract Administration Director

J.E. Miller
Date: 21 November 2006

Economic Opportunity Director

Michael J. ...
Date: 11/2/06

Production Management Director

James ...
Date: 21 Nov 06

Planning Director

Absent
Date:

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Cambridge Systematics, 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	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	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: Michael B. Cline
 Name: Michael B. Cline
 Title: Deputy Commissioner
 Date: 11-2-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	HDR Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	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	30

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

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

Signed: Michael B. Cline
 Name: Michael B. Cline
 Title: Deputy Commissioner
 Date: 11-2-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Knight E/A 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	-3	15	-45	
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1				
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0				
Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3					
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.					
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	-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
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	-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: Michael B. Cline
Name: Michael B. Cline
Title: Deputy Commissioner
Date: 11-2-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Morley and 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.		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	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	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: Michael B. Cline
 Name: Michael B. Cline
 Title: Deputy Commissioner
 Date: 11-2-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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		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	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: Michael B. Cline
 Name: Michael B. Cline
 Title: Deputy Commissioner
 Date: 11-2-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Cambridge Systematics, 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	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	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: Thomas F. Beck
 Name: Thomas Beck
 Title: Acting Mgr. - Rail Office
 Date: 10-30-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	HDR Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	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	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: Thomas J. Beck
 Name: Thomas Beck
 Title: Acting Mgr. - Rail Office
 Date: 10-27-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Knight E/A 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	-3	15	-45	
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1				
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0				
Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3					
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.					
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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
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	-20

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

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

Signed: Thomas J. Beck
 Name: Thomas Beck
 Title: Acting Mgr. - Rail Office
 Date: 10-27-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Morley and 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		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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	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: Thomas A. Beck
 Name: Thomas Beck
 Title: Acting Mgr. - Rail Office
 Date: 10-27-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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.		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	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	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	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: Thomas J. Beck
 Name: Thomas Beck
 Title: Acting Mgr. - Rail Office
 Date: 10-27-06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Cambridge Systematics, 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	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	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: Joseph Gustin
 Title: Deputy Commissioner, P3
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	HDR Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	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	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: Joseph Gustin
 Title: Deputy Commissioner, P3
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Knight E/A 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	-3	20	-60
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2	-3	15	-45
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
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			
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			
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: Joseph Gustin
 Title: Deputy Commissioner, P3
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Morley and 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.		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	-3	20	-60
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2	-3	15	-45
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	-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					-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: Joseph Gustin
 Title: Deputy Commissioner, P3
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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.		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	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	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: Joseph Gustin
 Title: Deputy Commissioner, P3
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Cambridge Systematics, 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	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	85

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

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

Signed: Stephen C. Smith
 Name: Stephen Smith
 Title: Planning Mgr.
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	HDR Engineering Inc

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0	0	20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	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	20

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

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

Signed: Stephen C. Smith
 Name: Stephen Smith
 Title: Planning Mgr.
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Knight E/A 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	-3	20	-60
	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	-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			
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			
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: Stephen C. Smith
 Name: Stephen Smith
 Title: Planning Mgr.
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Morley and 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		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	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: Stephen C. Smith
 Name: Stephen Smith
 Title: Planning Mgr.
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	RFP 06-12
Item No. :	16
Services Description:	Indiana Rail Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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			
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: Stephen C. Smith
 Name: Stephen Smith
 Title: Planning Mgr.
 Date: 11/1/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	17
Services Description:	Rural Transit Assistance Program
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		2	15	30
	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 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			
	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	145

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: Larry Buckel
 Name: Larry Buckel
 Title: Manager
 Date: 10/13/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	17
Services Description:	Rural Transit Assistance Program
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		2	15	30
	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 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		5	5	25
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding of the project	1			
	Basic understanding of the project	0			
	Lack of project understanding	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi	0			
	151 to 500 mi	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
Weighted Total					185

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: Brian Jones
 Name: Brian Jones
 Title: Program Manager
 Date: 10/13/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	17
Services Description:	Rural Transit Assistance Program
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value 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	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: Stephanie A. Belch
 Name: Stephanie Belch
 Title: Transit Planner
 Date: 10/13/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	17
Services Description:	Rural Transit Assistance Program
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		1	15	15
	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	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		2	5	10
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed	2	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					150

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: James English
 Name: James English
 Title: Program Manager
 Date: 10/13/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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		2	15	30
	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 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			
				Weighted Total	140

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: Larry Buckel
 Name: Larry Buckel
 Title: Manager, Office of Transit
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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		1	15	15
	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 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.		2	5	10
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	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	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: James English
 Name: James English
 Title: Program Manager
 Date: 10/13/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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		0	15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		0	10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity	1	1	5	5
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database		5	5	25
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed	2			
	High level of understanding of the project	1	0	10	0
	Basic understanding of the project	0			
	Lack of project understanding	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	1	5	5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms	-3			
Weighted Total					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: Brian Jones
 Name: Brian Jones
 Title: Program Manager
 Date: 10/13/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	Wilbur Smith 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		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2	1	15	15
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity	2	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					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: Stephanie Belch
 Name: Stephanie Belch
 Title: Transit Planner
 Date: 10/13/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		2	15	30
	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 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	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					160

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: Larry Buckel
 Name: Larry Buckel
 Title: Manager, Office of Transit
 Date: 10/16/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		2	15	30
	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 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.		5	5	25
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project	0			
	Lack of project understanding	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	185

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: Brian Jones
 Name: Brian Jones
 Title: Program Manager
 Date: 10/13/06

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No. :	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	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	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	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: Stephanie Belch
 Name: Stephanie Belch
 Title: Transit Planner
 Date: 10/13/2006

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	06-12
Item No.:	18
Services Description:	Statewide Coordination Plan
Consultant Name:	RLS & 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		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.		1	15	15
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.		1	10	10
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value 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.		2	5	10
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project	0			
	Lack of project understanding	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
	Within 50 mi.	1	0	5	0
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	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: James English
 Name: James English
 Title: Program Manager
 Date: 10/13/2006