RFP Scoring Tabulation for RFP: 07-01 **Item No.:** 22 2/9/2007 , 9:37 AM

Item Title: Title Research Abstracting **No. of Firms Recommended to be selected** 1

#	Consultant Name	Ron Raney	Rank	Jamie Pilk	Rank	Craig Tunge	Rank	Paste Here Scores 4	Rank	Paste Here Scores 5	Rank	Rank Total	Ranking
3	Woodco Enterprises LTD	65.0	1	65.0	1	65.0	1					3	1
2	KKM Inc	65.0	1	50.0	2	65.0	1					4	2
1	Appraisals Unlimited of Indiana, LLC	-15.0	3	5.0	3	5.0	3					9	3

Scoring Team Leader Signature: Ron Raney
Title: MANAGER
Date: 2/8/07

Central Office Selection Committee Action:

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

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

Contract Administration Director
Date: 22 February 2007

Economic Opportunity Director
Absent
Date:

Production Management Director
Date: 22 Feb 07

Planning Director
Date: 2/22/07

Sheet # / Total
1
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	Title Research
Consultant Name:	Appraisals Unlimited of Indiana, LLC

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		-1	20	-20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		0	10	0
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	15	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	-15

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

Name: Ron Raney

Title: Manager Real Estate Services

Signed: Ron Raney

Date 2/7/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0.0

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total -15.0

Sheet # / Total
1
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	Title Research
Consultant Name:	Appraisals Unlimited of Indiana, LLC

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		0	10	0
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	15	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	5

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

Name: Jamie Pilk

Title: EA-4

Signed: J. Pilk

Date 2/8/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0.0

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total 5.0

Sheet # / Total
1
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	title research
Consultant Name:	Appraisals Unlimited of Indiana, LLC

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		0	20	0
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		0	15	0
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		0	10	0
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	15	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	**5**

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

Name: Craig Tunget

Title: Surveyor 2 - RE/RW

Signed: Craig Tunget

Date 2/7/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	**0.0**

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total **5.0**

Sheet # / Total
2
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	Title Research
Consultant Name:	KKM Inc

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		1	10	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	15	15
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	65

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

Name: Ron Raney

Title: Manager Real Estate Services

Signed: Ron Raney

Date 2/7/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0.0

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total 65.0

Sheet # / Total
2
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	Title Research
Consultant Name:	KKM Inc

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		1	10	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		0	15	0
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	50

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

Name: Jamie Pilk

Title: EA-4

Signed:

Date: 2/8/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0.0

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total 50.0

Sheet # / Total
2
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	title research
Consultant Name:	KKM Inc

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		1	10	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	15	15
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	65

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

Name: Craig Tunget

Title: Surveyor 2 - RE/RW

Signed: Craig Tunget

Date 2/7/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0.0

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total 65.0

Sheet # / Total
3
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	Title Research
Consultant Name:	Woodco Enterprises LTD

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		1	10	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	15	15
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	**65**

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

Name: Ron Raney

Title: Manager Real Estate Services

Signed: Ron Raney

Date 2/7/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	**0.0**

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total **65.0**

Sheet # / Total
3
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	Title Research
Consultant Name:	Woodco Enterprises LTD

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		1	10	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	15	15
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	65

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

Name: Jamie Pilk

Title: EA-4

Signed:

Date 2/8/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0.0

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total 65.0

Sheet # / Total
3
3

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	0701
Item No. :	22
Services Description:	title research
Consultant Name:	Woodco Enterprises LTD

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	**Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.**		1	20	20
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in **added value** to INDOT.	1			
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	**Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.**		1	15	15
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	**Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.**		1	10	10
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
Approach to Project	**Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.**		1	15	15
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	**Location of assigned staff office relative to project.**		1	5	5
	Within 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	65

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

Name: Craig Tunget

Title: Surveyor 2 - RE/RW

Signed: Craig Tunget

Date 2/7/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources

Disputes	**Outstanding Agreement Disputes.**			20	0
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0			
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	**Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.**				
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.0	7	0.0
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0.0

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

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total 65.0