



MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor
Misty Ann Giles, Director

doa.mt.gov

406.444.2460

doadirector@mt.gov

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Solicitation Title/Event Name:

Solicitation Number:

Solicitation Close Date:

Notice of Intent to Award Post Date:

Issuing Contracts Officer contact information:

The State intends to award a contract to the apparent successful offeror(s) of the above-mentioned solicitation. The Notice of Intent to Award shall not be considered a binding commitment by the state.

Under the Montana Procurement Act, the State has made the relevant scoring matrix/bid tab for the above-mentioned solicitation available for public inspection. Comments from the public regarding the proposed award must be submitted to the Contracts Officer listed above within this 7-day notice period.

Apparent Successful Offeror(s)

Unsuccessful Offeror(s)

**West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R**

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET							
Category	Possible Points	Chloeta	Colorado State	DJ&A PC	Dudek	HDR Engineering	Mitzi Hearn
Company Profile and Experience							
Structure, Capacity and Experience of Offeror	1,000	890	815	950	820	875	770
Qualifications of Offeror	900	805	740	810	780	800	675
Unique Qualifications of Offeror	500	425	400	450	415	440	370
Qualifications of Staff	800	670	630	720	640	720	560
Workplan and Approach-Vuln. Assessment							
Best Outcomes	2,000	1,780	1,780	1,800	1,650	1,650	1,400
Maintaining Relationships	500	450	445	450	420	435	350
Strategies and Tools	2,000	1,720	1,680	1,600	1,750	1,260	1,400
Workplan and Approach-Wildfire Risk Assessment							
Best Outcomes	1,500	1,340	1,335	1,335	1,350	1,320	1,200
Maintaining Relationships	500	450	445	435	420	430	350
Strategies and Tools	1,500	1,340	1,350	1,290	1,375	1,260	1,185
Offeror Minimum Requirements							
Longevity of Offeror	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Offeror's Staff-Licenses, Resumes, Etc.	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail
Minimum Staff Experience	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail
References (2)	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail
Subtotal							
	11,200	9,870	9,620	9,840	9,620	9,190	8,260
Cost Proposal							
	2,800	2,800	2,665	2,712	2,674	2,547	2,646
TOTAL							
	14,000	12,670	12,285	12,552	12,294	11,737	10,906
Equal Pay for Montana Women							
5% Bonus Points Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points	700	700	700	700	700	700.0	700.0
FINAL TOTALS		13370	12985	13252	12994.4	12437.2	11606.0

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment			
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 14,000 points. Company Profile Experience, Work Plan and Approach-Vulnerability Assessment, Work Plan and Approach-Wildfire Assessment portions of the proposal will be evaluated on the scoring guide. The Longevity of Offeror, Minimum Staff Experience and References will be based on pass/fail, with any offeror receiving a "fail" eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Chloeta			Total Points Awarded: 13,370
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Company Profile and Experience			
Structure, Capacity and Experience of Offeror	1000	890	1) Ample experience Two recent experience is very relevant 2) 840, 3) 840 experience staff experience working with guard and DoD installations, proven experience completing similar projects related to water, land fire, risk assessments, fuel management and mitigation.
Qualifications of Offeror	900	805	1) 810, Highly qualified with similar experience. Detail throughout response indicates high capabilities. No local projects 2) 801, Program lead is engineer and staff is SMEs. Didn't see much regarding climate resiliency or flood modeling. 3) 900
Unique Qualifications of Offeror	500	425	1) 400, ample wildfire experience, risk assessment and DOD 2) 425, Experience working with military. Emphasis on modeling is not unique. This project demands more in person meetings and field work 3) 450, Included actual mitigation strategies and applied GIS to community.
Qualifications of Staff	800	670	1) 680, Solid experience in both field and planning but unfamiliar with eco system 2) 700, Their team includes engineering, zoning, commercial development, exercise design, GIS modeling, prescribed fire. 3) 640, CVS included. Offer did not include a written narrative of what each team member's relevant experience, focus areas and responsibilities in the proposed project is other than what is listed on.
Workplan and Approach-Vuln. Assessment			
Best Outcomes	2000	1780	1) 1650, Review docs and data and included field assessments, draft reports and deliverables. Doesn't go into extreme weather 2) 1700, offer provided an informative work plan and approach to gather data, identify information gaps specifically related to installation resilience, vulnerability assessment and wildfire risk assessment provided less specific methods and tools. 3) 1800, Described good combination of field work and modeling. Incorporated SOW elements.
Maintaining Relationships	500	450	1) 475, Stakeholder meetings seem adequate. Detail seemed implied based on other answers but wasn't provided 2) 445, Good description of what being a stakeholder would mean and provided specific methods and timeframe 3) 425, Plans to engage stakeholders during each draft milestone list of potential stakeholders, but it could also have included the county
Strategies and Tools	2000	1720	1) 1700, provided good information on recourse tools and methods. Confident they can meet timeline 2) 1760, detailed description of table top exercise. Not much more detail 3) 1600, included development plans, drain vegetation built environment, would like to see more specific methodology for the vulnerability component.
Workplan and Approach-Wildfire Risk Assessment			
Best Outcomes	1500	1340	1) 1380, good combination of field work, in person meetings and modeling, not a lot of detail 2) 1335, provided excellent how they would meet deliverables 3) 1340, details for meeting site visits, draft reports, table top exercises. They will review a lot of detail is given about analysis.
Maintaining Relationships	500	450	1) 425, Engage stakeholder at each milestone 2) 445, Excellent description of communication 3) 475, same as above
Strategies and Tools	1500	1340	1) 1380, detailed description of table top exercise. Not much more detail. What is described seems accurate to our needs 2) 1335, provided excellent details about how they would conduct the analysis. 3) 1340, strategies were extensive for this section. Software modelling approaches, data sets, weather components, actionable items such as St. Trimming and removal.
Requirements			
Longevity of Offeror	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Offeror's Staff-Licenses, Resumes, Etc.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Minimum Staff Experience	Pass/Fail	Pass	
References (2)	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Cost Proposal	2800	2800	
	14000	12670	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
5% Bonus Points Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points			700.0

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment			
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 14,000 points. Company Profile Experience, Work Plan and Approach-Vulnerability Assessment, Work Plan and Approach-Wildfire Assessment portions of the proposal will be evaluated on the scoring guide. The Longevity of Offeror, Minimum Staff Experience and References will be based on pass/fail, with any offeror receiving a "fail" eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Colorado State			Total Points Awarded: 12,985
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Company Profile and Experience			
Structure, Capacity and Experience of Offeror	1000	815	1) 780, Wildland fire technical work products are similar. Nothing offered as far as resiliency or local planning products that are similar. 2) 850, The consultant would need additional time to complete this project. That includes that in the clock cost, 20 years of work experience project for the Texas National Guard is similar but is missing actual items in future steps 3) 850, Timeline exceeds scope of project requirement. Proven experience working with DoD units. And then proven experience working with flood vulnerability and wildfire risk assessments and climate risk assessments.
Qualifications of Offeror	900	740	1) 801, Provided documentation and staff have worked for military clients across us 2) 740, Proposal listed engineering planning for military and local governments. 3) 720, No local experience in similar climate/vulnerability aspect
Unique Qualifications of Offeror	500	400	1) 450, Extensive statistical analysis was listed, including custom tools from CEMML able to model future fire risk alongside present risks. 2) 445, Offer completed 36 wildfire risk assessments many dozen wildfire management plans, numerous flood analysis and risk mitigation projects, and went into depth about their mapping, analysis and proprietary tools. 3) 350, Wildland fire qualifications are superior. Very small team, limited experience with policy, community, planning, etc.
Qualifications of Staff	800	630	1) 712, CVs not included but they did include concise narrative for each team member and relevant experience 2) 600, I gave them a 600 because it's a very small team of three professionals, two of whom are storm water or flooding experts, which flooding is an aspect of the project. Didn't mention how available staff would be. 3) 690, Ample report expertise, but no planning documents, no communications lead and rely on an e-mail distribution list proposal. List what specific projects and proposal asks for a local fuel expert during site.
Workplan and Approach-Vuln. Assessment			
Best Outcomes	2000	1780	1) 1760, emphasized specific elements t 2) 1790, timeline and do outs through a list of datasets, interviews, meetings and potential recommended actions. They're missing the 30% design. Lacked some elements from SOW 3) 1780, provided a very well thought out technical approach to gather data and identify information gaps specifically related to flood vulnerability, risk mitigation and climate resiliency, and addressed post fire flash floods.
Maintaining Relationships	500	445	1) 425, Burden of organizing meeting falls to DMA 2) 445, Described stakeholder engagement and maintaining information 3) 460, superior interaction with stakeholders
Strategies and Tools	2000	1680	1) 1650, proposal includes datasets for flood information, drainage infrastructure, stormwater management. No references to data sets for zoning or historical land use. 2) 1780, Recommended extended timeline. Did list tools and deliverables timeline as well as what they would need to meet the SOW 3) 1600, wildlife aspect was strong but no specific strategies for local risk
Workplan and Approach-Wildfire Risk Assessment			
Best Outcomes	1500	1335	1) 1335, provided an excellent description of how they would conduct the analysis and address the deliverables in the scope of work they provided. They proposed additional analysis such as wildfire, climate change. 2) 1425, experience shows 3) 1335, missing 30% design but shows high capability with wildfire specifically
Maintaining Relationships	500	445	1) 475, good incorporation of local resources 2) 425, explain communication methods and frequency well. 3) 445, described stakeholder engagement with good communication methods
Strategies and Tools	1500	1350	1) 1370, very thorough section including timelines, mobilization details. Extensive list of fire databases utilizing US Forest Service, Enterprise program personnel, specific analysis software and methods. 2) 1335, recommended extended timeline. very well thought out and actionable timeline and what tools, methods and sources they would use to conduct their analysis. 3) 1425, the offer of additional the additional climate tool is welcome, but they shouldn't just add that on for an additional expense. Gant is off installation not on installation
Requirements			
Longevity of Offeror	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Offeror's Staff-Licenses, Resumes, Etc.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Minimum Staff Experience	Pass/Fail	Pass	
References (2)	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Cost Proposal	2800	2664.8	
	14000	12284.8	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
5% Bonus Points Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points		700.0	

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment			
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 14,000 points. Company Profile Experience, Work Plan and Approach-Vulnerability Assessment, Work Plan and Approach-Wildfire Assessment portions of the proposal will be evaluated on the scoring guide. The Longevity of Offeror, Minimum Staff Experience and References will be based on pass/fail, with any offeror receiving a "fail" eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below.			
Offeror (Company) Name: DJ&A PC			Total Points Awarded: 13,252
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Company Profile and Experience			
Structure, Capacity and Experience of Offeror	1000	950	1) 800, very experienced staff with excellent description of background. they provided no experience working on Army Guard or DoD installations and the capacity of the scope of work. No provided experience regarding installation, climate resilience plans or analysis. 2) 950, excellent client history 3) 950, extensive experience in local community, stakeholders, and compatible with other MT Agencies
Qualifications of Offeror	900	810	1) 882, Vegetation survey at LHATA and FTH landscape is familiar. Already completed simulate tasks for MT gov including wildfire protection plans 2) 800, both contractor and subcontractor have provided services to local governments in Montana. 3) 801, Staff are experts in Montana Wildfire
Unique Qualifications of Offeror	500	450	1) 450, local experience with DMA and previous projects in MT 2) 400, ample wildfire experience with risk assessment and fuel mitigation. Less experience with climate resilience. 3) 500, Montana focused and Montana based experience.
Qualifications of Staff	800	720	1) 640, didn't include CVs and very informative and narrative of each team members experience, roll, and focus areas would be. Less experience with climate resilience 2) 800, community engagement team on staff, Wildlife and wildfire experts on staff 3) 720, strong team with ample experience in Montana specific to areas needs
Workplan and Approach-Vuln. Assessment			
Best Outcomes	2000	1800	1) 1800, emphasize quality product, efficiency, and communication. Clearly read SOW and hits end product needs 2) 1800, best outcomes mentioned assessing vulnerability to wildfire, drought, flooding, land use, development and identifying knowledge gaps would like to see emergency response, slash infrastructure site visits are mentioned. 3) 1700, informative work plan to fire, flood, and drought vulnerability. Timeline was May 26
Maintaining Relationships	500	450	1) 445, list of stakeholders is included. Specific goals mentioned for kickoff. 2) 445, excellent description of their stakeholder management plan and how they'd keep everyone informed. 3) 500, organization read carefully that we had already done some of the work as far as the stakeholders group
Strategies and Tools	2000	1600	1) 1700, did not provide specific methods, tools or resource they would use to accomplish the tasks, but they did have a good description of what we needed. 2) 1600, not much detail. Relying on staff expertise and would listen to stakeholders to develop. 3) 1600, no mention of specific datasets or software would like more detail on who they might interview or what reports they're evaluating. And they're missing the 30% design.
Workplan and Approach-Wildfire Risk Assessment			
Best Outcomes	1500	1335	1) 1425, seem to rely entirely on modeling without fieldwork. 2) 1250, no mention of deliverables. list analytics and a list of plans. The last lack specifics for insight into prevention. Mitigation. In response, we see answers for prevention, but no specific methods for mitigation or response. No thinning or side rehabilitation. 3) 1335, provided an informative work plan, but that it lacks details. Didn't see anything about field work. Or anything specifically related to fuels management, ignition probability or risk mitigation.
Maintaining Relationships	500	435	1) 445 2) 445, excellent description of how stakeholder meeting would go 3) 410, deliverable mention includes field work but doesn't specify
Strategies and Tools	1500	1290	1) 1335, good information about what we needed but does not provide specific tools or resources they would use or what analysis. 2) 1320, didn't provide much detail 3) 1250, they do mention software in bag datasets, but not where the data comes from and the site visit has zero context.
Requirements			
Longevity of Offeror	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Offeror's Staff-Licenses, Resumes, Etc.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Minimum Staff Experience	Pass/Fail	Pass	
References (2)	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Cost Proposal	2800	2712.4	
	14000	12552	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
5% Bonus Points Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points			700.0

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment			
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 14,000 points. Company Profile Experience, Work Plan and Approach-Vulnerability Assessment, Work Plan and Approach-Wildfire Assessment portions of the proposal will be evaluated on the scoring guide. The Longevity of Offeror, Minimum Staff Experience and References will be based on pass/fail, with any offeror receiving a "fail" eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Dudek			Total Points Awarded: 12,994
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Company Profile and Experience			
Structure, Capacity and Experience of Offeror	1000	820	1) 850, solid credentials, especially for California work and ecosystems that might be similar. 2) 880, similar projects do not include military or Montana like landscapes, but are extensive and wildfire planning and prevention. Project lists projects, list community engagement, modelling, identifying critical infrastructure, field visits, analysis, flooding mitigation. 3) 750, experience staff with some description of who will be completing what during which phases of the assessments and Appendix BI had a note that they provided no experience working with Army guard, DoD or military installations, mostly county
Qualifications of Offeror	900	780	1) 780, local government experience, no military experience and then they're listed experience highlights, wildfire mitigation. 2) 765, Most of their experience and projects appears that it's with wildfire. 3) 810, Both past military clients they listed were not related to the work that we need. Focus seemed to be California which may or may not reference our needs
Unique Qualifications of Offeror	500	415	1) 375, no provided experience working on Army Guard, DoD, military installations or in Montana. 2) 450, 3) 435, experience wildfire planning, stormwater compliance, drone mapping, which is listed as a qualification but not listed in the proposal.
Qualifications of Staff	800	640	1) 640, no work in the Rocky Mountain West will need to conduct extra work to become familiar with the new region of the United States and with the military. 2) 680, Project lead has 20 years in planning and development. Includes GIS personal. 3) 640, less experience regarding flood modelling and climate resilience projects. Appears most experiences with wildfire and in California.
Workplan and Approach-Vuln. Assessment			
Best Outcomes	2000	1650	1) 1700, interpretation of vulnerability only includes wildfire vulnerability, drought and flooding Vulnerabilities are briefly mentioned in the report section, presumed to relate to wildfires, a thorough approach to wildfire vulnerability, including zoning recommendations, mitigation procedure gaps. 2) 1500, excellent, provided an excellent work plan and approach to gather data and identify information gaps specifically related to wildfire risks. But they did not provide any specific methods, resources, or tools on how they're going to do that, especially regarding flood modelling and climate resiliency. 3) 1700, the focus is almost entirely on fire risk and technical rather than working with local planners and Emergency Management policies.
Maintaining Relationships	500	420	1) 445, well thought out stakeholder engagement plan and excellent description of communication 2) 400, all three group meetings will be virtual stakeholder group meet meetings. 3) 420, plan includes 2 in person meetings which must be public meetings in the four virtual meetings, the stakeholders a good outline of meeting objectives,
Strategies and Tools	2000	1750	1) 1760, The proposal is detailed, though it emphasized modelling more than working with the stakeholders group. It seemed to avoid field work relying heavily on modeling. 2) 1800, This organization did their background research. They list many local data sources and applicable federal data sets. 3) 1660, didn't provide much information on the specific methods, tools and resources they would use. Not much discussion of flood or drought modeling or community resilience.
Workplan and Approach-Wildfire Risk Assessment			
Best Outcomes	1500	1350	1) 1350, includes the steps toward minimizing fire risk prioritize air actions, collaboration 2) 1335, provided an informative work plan and approach to gather data how they were going to identify information gaps. 3) 1425, due to heavy project and staff experience in fire prone California, we can draw on this comprehensive knowledge and tools to get the job done.
Maintaining Relationships	500	420	1) 445, describes stakeholder relationships and methods but did not include timeline 2) 400, all 3 meetings are virtual. 3) 420, same as above
Strategies and Tools	1500	1375	1) 1450, initial fieldwork seems spot on and detailed experience with wildfire. 2) 1375, extensive lists of data sets, local and federal software site visits. They do need a local fire expert and I didn't know if this is included in their proposal cost. 3) 1335, good information on what we needed in the report section.
Requirements			
Longevity of Offeror	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Offeror's Staff-Licenses, Resumes, Etc.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Minimum Staff Experience	Pass/Fail	Pass	
References (2)	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Cost Proposal	2800	2674.4	
	14000	12294.4	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
5% Bonus Points Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points		700.0	

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment			
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 14,000 points. Company Profile Experience, Work Plan and Approach-Vulnerability Assessment, Work Plan and Approach-Wildfire Assessment portions of the proposal will be evaluated on the scoring guide. The Longevity of Offeror, Minimum Staff Experience and References will be based on pass/fail, with any offeror receiving a "fail" eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below.			
Offeror (Company) Name: HDR Engineering			Total Points Awarded: 12,437
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Company Profile and Experience			
Structure, Capacity and Experience of Offeror	1000	875	1) 780, extensive and well developed team, most of the team has over 20 years work experience listed experience. Relevant to the project was lacking two of the projects are listed to start in 2025, which doesn't add to experience. 2) 890, had a very experienced staff with a good description of who'll be completing what parts of the assessments. 3) 900, a mix of planning, resilience and it should be technical team is superior.
Qualifications of Offeror	900	800	1) 801, program is licensed PE. Staff has worked for military clients across country 2) 855, mil and gov experience 3) 720, projects listed are either not complete or only partially relevant
Unique Qualifications of Offeror	500	440	1) 450, mil and gov experience and has Helena office but doesn't list what team members are there 2) 420, planning and outreach at a local level. 3) 445, demonstrated support with DOD and local offices and climate resilience plans.
Qualifications of Staff	800	720	1) 690, extensive and knowledgeable team covering many aspects of the scope of engineering, project management, fire, urban resilience, wild and fire, GISA and communications. 2) 712, did not include a written narrative of what each team member's relevant experience, focus areas and responsibilities on the proposed project would be, other than what was listed on their CVS. 3) 800, highly qualified specifically for both assessments, including resilience, sustainability, community planning, installation and wildfire risk.
Workplan and Approach-Vuln. Assessment			
Best Outcomes	2000	1650	1) 1700, provided informative workplan and did identify flood vulnerability 2) 1700, focuses on installation and immediate buffers. 3) 1500, didn't find many actual items in this section. That description and loose blanket terms I'd like to see more specifics on how we determine vulnerability. The proposal focuses on Fort Harrison infrastructure, which is outside the scope of this grant
Maintaining Relationships	500	435	1) 425, created their own stakeholders group and were not relevant. Listed in person meetings as well as public meetings. No discussion about integration will occur 2) 445, included kickoff meeting for stakeholder meetings, two public Meetings, two table tops 3) 435.
Strategies and Tools	2000	1640	1) 1580, missing site visits and sampling. List a few data sources but not relevant on installation or where the risk maps come from. 2) 1640, good information on deliverables but not on tools or resources to pro 3) 1880, missing details on tools and strategies
Workplan and Approach-Wildfire Risk Assessment			
Best Outcomes	1500	1320	1) 1335, they did a good job of identifying what we need and gave good examples of how they would deliver what we need, but they didn't provide the information, data or the resources. 2) 1320 3) 1300, lists elements but doesn't go into detail
Maintaining Relationships	500	430	1) 400, no discussion regarding engaging with community. 2) 430, outreach to land owners, policy makers in person meetings and table presentations. 3) 430, could engage the stakeholder group or a timeline,
Strategies and Tools	1500	1260	1) 1200, monthly status reports a loose timeline with data gathering, analysis and a site visit. 2) 1330, didn't identify who would perform what work. Datasets that they were going to use were not specified and I would have liked to have seen more details. 3) 1260, come away with a thought that the recommendations will be too vague to be actionable.
Requirements			
Longevity of Offeror	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Offeror's Staff-Licenses, Resumes, Etc.	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Minimum Staff Experience	Pass/Fail	Pass	
References (2)	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Cost Proposal	2800	2547.2	
	14000	12117.2	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
5% Bonus Points Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points			
		700.0	

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment			
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R			
Individual Scoring Matrix			
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 14,000 points. Company Profile Experience, Work Plan and Approach-Vulnerability Assessment, Work Plan and Approach-Wildfire Assessment portions of the proposal will be evaluated on the scoring guide. The Longevity of Offeror, Minimum Staff Experience and References will be based on pass/fail, with any offeror receiving a "fail" eliminated from further consideration. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth below.			
Offeror (Company) Name: Mitzi Hearn			Total Points Awarded: 11,606
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Company Profile and Experience			
Structure, Capacity and Experience of Offeror	1000	770	1) 700, experienced staff, but minimal description of who will be completing what parts of the assessment. No provided experience with Army Guard or DoD installations except what is stated on page 2, but they gave no dates or references. 2) 850, rafted the Montana statewide vulnerability assessment or had some part in it but wasn't clear 3) 790, only three past project listed without much detail or examples of results.
Qualifications of Offeror	900	675	1) 738, although they do mention military work. It's unclear what that involved because there were no examples. 2) 675, there are three projects, but only one is within the last three years. Details are severely lacking. 3) 630.
Unique Qualifications of Offeror	500	370	1) 370, local experience in specific vulnerability assessments and wildfire risk assessments. 2) 350, no provided details on projects, dates or references, for passed mil or gov lands. No examples 3) 425, generalized qualifications
Qualifications of Staff	800	560	1) 560, Minimal description of who will be completing what on what parts of the assignments. minimal provided examples of similar projects regarding wildfire risk management and analysis on or installation resilience plans or analysis. 2) 680, it's unclear in the proposal whether and how many times they will visit in person,
Workplan and Approach-Vuln. Assessment			
Best Outcomes	2000	1400	1) 1700, mentioned consulting with local agencies on funding sources, which is very practical and what local governments need. There is no flooding component. 2) 1400, very few details 3) 1400
Maintaining Relationships	500	350	1) 350, minimal 2) 350, very minimal description of communication methods. 3) 400, unclear on stakeholder roles or workshops group
Strategies and Tools	2000	1400	1) 1400, very minimal details and just seemed to describe our needs but no detail on deliverables 2) 1640, assessment is not on installation and no flooding component 3) 1400, no details or actionable items
Workplan and Approach-Wildfire Risk Assessment			
Best Outcomes	1500	1200	1) 1200 2) 1200 3) 1050, very minimal detail without description and vague overall
Maintaining Relationships	500	350	1) 350, No plan or communication 2) 350, minimal description and vague 3) 400,
Strategies and Tools	1500	1185	1) 1050, didn't sound well thought out and didn't include any detail 2) 1200, unclear what data would even be collected 3) 1185, software is mentioned, but no specific analysis, simulations, projections, specific data sets aren't mentioned.
Requirements			
Longevity of Offeror	Pass/Fail	Pass	
Offeror's Staff-Licenses, Resumes, Etc.	Pass/Fail	Fail	No resume or licenses included
Minimum Staff Experience	Pass/Fail	Fail	Use of the word consultants throughout the proposal
References (2)	Pass/Fail	Fail	No references provided
Cost Proposal	2800	2646	
	14000	10906	
Equal Pay for Montana Women			
5% Bonus Points Equal Pay for Montana Women. Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points			700.0

DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment

SCORING GUIDE

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines:

Superior Response (90-100%): A superior response is an exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response may cover areas not originally addressed within the RFP and/or include additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.

Good Response (80-89%): A good response clearly meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in an unambiguous and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.

Fair Response (70-79%): A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

Failed Response (less than 70%): A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

Any proposal that fails to achieve 70% of total points available for the technical score, not including cost, will be eliminated from further consideration. A "fail" for any individual evaluation criteria may result in proposal disqualification at the discretion of the procurement officer.

**West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R**

Cost Worksheet

Lowest overall cost receives the maximum allotted points. All other proposals receive a percentage of the points available based on their cost relationship to the lowest. Example: Total possible points for cost are 300. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 300 points. Offeror B would receive 200 points ($\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 300 \text{ points} = 200$).

		Cost	
Points Available		2,800	
Lowest Cost	\$	297,734.06	
Vendor Name		Proposed Cost	Points Earned
			Notes:
Chloeta	\$	297,734.06	2800.0
Colorado State	\$	312,837.00	2664.8
DJ&A PC	\$	307,350.00	2712.4
Dudek	\$	298,334.50	2794.4
HDR Engineering	\$	313,222.14	2661.5
Mitzi Hearn	\$	315,000.00	2646.5

Scoring Calculator

Superior High	100.0%
Superior Low	90.0%
Good High	89.0%
Good Low	80.0%
Fair High	79.0%
Fair Low	70.0%
Failed	0.0%

Total Points Available

Score		100
Superior (90-100%)	90 - 100	
Good (89-89%)	80 - 89	
Fair (70-79%)	70 - 79	
Failed (70%)	0 - 0	

Technical Scoring Session

West-Central MT Community Vulnerability and Wildfire Risk Assessment
DMA-RFP-FMO2025-0119R

Date: Friday, January 17, 2025
1:30 PM

Evaluation Committee Members:

Mimi Wolok
John Thornberg
Hilary Kauth

Contracts Officer: Trenton Hatch
Rhonda Peters

Order of Evaluation: Alphabetical
Scoring Method: Consensus

Kasy Thompson, CFMO observer
Rick Dorvall, CFMO Bureau Chief, Notetaker