

RFP Scoring
Tabulation for RFP: 07-03

4/9/2007
3:36 PM

Item No.: 15

Item Title: Railroad and Utility Coordination Services

No. of Firms Recommended
to be selected: 1

Owner Office: Vincennes
District

Construction \$: [REDACTED] Max Contract
Amount \$: \$100,000.00

#	Consultancy Firm	Bryan Veale	Rank	Jelly Cummi	Rank	Matt Wallace	Rank	Frank Litherla	Rank	Paste Scores 5	Rank	Ordinal Total	Ranking
6	TBE Group Inc	60.0	1	60.0	1	65.0	1	50.0	1			4	1
1	Commonwealth Engineers Inc	30.5	5	15.5	5	15.5	5	30.5	2			13	2
3	Edwards and Kelcey Inc	45.7	2	5.7	5	45.7	2	-69.3	5			14	3
4	Morley and Associates Inc.	30.0	6	30.0	2	5.0	5	5.0	3			16	4
2	Driesenga & Associates, Inc.	40.0	3	10.0	4	0.0	6	0.0	4			17	5
5	Shrewsbury & Associates LLC	40.0	3	0.0	6	15.0	4	-75.0	6			19	6

Scoring Team Leader Signature: Byron M. Vush

Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Date: 4/9/07

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 1 ranked firms is approved as recommended with the next ¹~~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: 17 April 2007

Production Management Director

Date: 4/17/07

Economic Opportunity Director

Date: 4/7/07

Planning Director

Date: 4/17/07

Sheet # / Total
6
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	TBE Group 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.				
	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.	-1			
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			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	15	15
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					60

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

Name: Bryan Veale
Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: *Bryan M. Veale*
Date: 3/29/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 60.0

Sheet # / Total
6
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	TBE Group Inc

Evaluation Rating to be Assigned from Office of Contract Disputes					
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.				
	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.	-1			
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			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	15	15
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					60

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

Name: Kelly Cummins
 Title: Railroad & Utility Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 3/30/2007

Evaluation Rating to be Assigned from Office of Contract Disputes					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 60.0

Sheet # / Total
6
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	TBE Group Inc

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scores					
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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	10	20
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	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	15	15
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					65

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

Name: Matt Wallace
 Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 4/3/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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
6
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	TBE Group 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.				
	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.	-1			
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	2	10	20
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	15	30
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					50

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

Name: Frank Litherland
 Title: Real Estate Manager

Signed: 
 Date: Apr. 5, 2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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
5
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Shrewsberry & Associates 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.				
	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.	-1			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	15	15
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					40

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

Name: Bryan Veale
 Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: *Bryan M. Veale*
 Date: 3/29/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 40.0

Sheet # / Total
5
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Shrewsberry & Associates LLC

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Score					
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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	0	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					0

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

Name: Kelly Cummins
 Title: Railroad & Utility Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 3/30/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Source					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 0.0

Sheet # / Total
5
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Shrewsberry & Associates 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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	15
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total	15

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

Name: Matt Wallace
 Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 4/3/2007

Evaluation Criteria to be Assigned from Office or Contract Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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
5
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Shrewsberry & Associates LLC

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scores					
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.				
	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.	-1				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3				
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	-3	10	-30
	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	-3	15	-45
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					-75

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

Name: Frank Litherland
 Title: Real Estate Manager

Signed: 
 Date: Apr. 5, 2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 -75.0

Sheet # / Total
4
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Morley and Associates 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.				
	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.	-1			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	15	15
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					30

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

Name: Bryan Veale
Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: *Bryan M. Veale*
Date: 3/29/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 30.0


Sheet # / Total
4
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Morley and Associates Inc.

Evaluation Ratings 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.				
	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.	-1				
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	10	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				
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	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					30

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

Name: Kelly Cummins
 Title: Railroad & Utility Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 3/30/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 30.0

Sheet # / Total
4
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Morley and Associates Inc.

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scores					
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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					5

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

Name: Matt Wallace
 Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 4/3/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Source					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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
4
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Morley and Associates Inc.

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorer					
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.				
	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.	-1			
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	0	10	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	15	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					5

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

Name: Frank Litherland
 Title: Real Estate Manager

Signed: 
 Date: Apr. 5, 2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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
3
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Edwards and Kelcey 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.				
	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.	-1			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	15	15
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					40

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

Name: Bryan Veale
 Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: *Bryan M. Veale*
 Date: 3/29/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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.		0.1	7	0.8
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.7	7	4.8
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
Weighted Sub-Total					5.7

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 45.7


Sheet # / Total
3
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No. :	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Edwards and Kelcey 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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					0

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

Name: Kelly Cummins
 Title: Railroad & Utility Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 3/30/2007

Evaluation Rating to be Assigned from Office of Contract Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.				
	Quality score from performance database.		0.0	12	0.0
	Schedule score from performance database.		0.1	7	0.8
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.7	7	4.8
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
Weighted Sub-Total					5.7

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 5.7

Sheet # / Total
3
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Edwards and Kelcey 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.				
	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.	-1			
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			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	15	15
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					40

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

Name: Matt Wallace
 Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 4/3/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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.		0.1	7	0.8
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.7	7	4.8
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
Weighted Sub-Total					5.7

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 45.7


Sheet # / Total
3
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No. :	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Edwards and Kelcey 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.					
	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.	-1				
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.					
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0	
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1				
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0				
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3				
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.					
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	-3	10	-30	
	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	-3	15	-45	
	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.					
	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 Sub-Total	-75

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

Name: Frank Litherland
 Title: Real Estate Manager

Signed: 
 Date: Apr. 5, 2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources						
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.					
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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.		0.1	7	0.8	
	Responsiveness score from performance database.		0.7	7	4.8	
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7		
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7		
					Weighted Sub-Total	5.7

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 **-69.3**

Sheet # / Total
2
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Driesenga & Associates, 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.				
	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.	-1			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	1	15	15
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					40

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

Name: Bryan Veale
Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: *Bryan M. Veale*
Date: 3/29/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 40.0

Sheet # / Total
2
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No. :	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Driesenga & Associates, Inc.

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.				
	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.	-1			
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	10	10
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.	1			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	15	0
	High level of understanding of the project.	1			
	Basic understanding of the project.	0			
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	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 Sub-Total					10

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

Name: Kelly Cummins
 Title: Railroad & Utility Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 3/30/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Source					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 10.0

Sheet # / Total
2
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Driesenga & Associates, 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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					0

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

Name: Matt Wallace
 Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 4/3/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contract Disputes					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 0.0

Sheet # / Total
2
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No. :	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Driesenga & Associates, 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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total	0

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

Name: Frank Litherland
 Title: Real Estate Manager

Signed: 
 Date: Apr. 5, 2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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 0.0

Sheet # / Total
1
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No. :	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Commonwealth Engineers 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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	15
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total	20

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

Name: Bryan Veale

Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed: *Bryan M. Veale*

Date: 3/29/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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.		1.5	7	10.5
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	10.5

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 30.5


Sheet # / Total
1
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No. :	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Commonwealth Engineers Inc

Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Source					
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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					5

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

Name: Kelly Cummins
 Title: Railroad & Utility Engineer

Signed: 
 Date: 3/30/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contract Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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.		1.5	7	10.5
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
Weighted Sub-Total					10.5

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 15.5

Sheet # / Total
1
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Commonwealth Engineers 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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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			
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	15	0
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					5

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

Name: Matt Wallace

Title: Consultant Services Engineer

Signed:

Date

4/3/2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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.		1.5	7	10.5
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
Weighted Sub-Total					10.5

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 15.5

Sheet # / Total
1
6

Selection Rating for RFP- No.:	07-03
Item No.:	15
Services Description:	Railroad and Utility Coordination
Consultant Name:	Commonwealth Engineers 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.				
	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.	-1			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	1			
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3				
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	10	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				
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	15	15
	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.				
	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 Sub-Total					20

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

Name: Frank Litherland
 Title: Real Estate Manager

Signed: *Frank L. Litherland*
 Date: Apr. 5, 2007

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contract Data Sources					
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.				
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	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.		1.5	7	10.5
	*Budget score from performance database.		N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.		N/A	7	
Weighted Sub-Total					10.5

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 30.5