



## MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

### Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor  
Misty Ann Giles, Director

[doa.mt.gov](http://doa.mt.gov)

406.444.2460

[doadirector@mt.gov](mailto: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)

DEQ-RFP-2025-0167R  
Montana Climate Roadmap

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET												
Category	Possible Points	Blue Strike	Directions Research	Energy and Env.	Environmental Resources	Ernst & Young	Involved Energy	GDS Assoc	ICF	John Beath	Sustainability Solutions	Tetra Tech
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES</b>												
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	65	61.75	13	60.2	56.2	58	59	61	64	47	61	64
Develop GHG Emission Projections	65	60	13	62	51.2	59	59	61	62	47	59	64
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission Reduction Measures	65	62	13.3	61.6	53.4	60	58	61	64	44	59	63
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	65	58	10	59.2	46.3	63	57	64	58	29	62	64
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	65	58.15	11.7	61.25	51.6	62	56	62	55	30	60	64
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	65	61.25	11.7	61.6	50.8	59	51	62	53	34	46	63
Project Management	30	30	5.5	28.5	25.8	27	25	29	28	7	22	30
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS</b>												
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>												
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Relevant Experience	60	59	16.7	57	53.3	56	53	57	57	41	57	58
Relevant Past Projects	60	59	16.5	57	53.3	57	49	58	59	41	57	58
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>												
Demonstrated Competencies	30	28.5	11.5	27.5	25	28	24	28	26	20	27	30
Relevant Experience	50	48.1	17	48.7	40.3	46	40	48	45	37	47	49
Relevant Past Projects	50	48.1	14.8	49	41.3	45	40	47	43	36	47	49
<b>References</b>	P/F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
<b>Complete Contact Information Provided</b>												
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	200	190	100	191	171.7	190	163	189	189	102	185	196
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
<b>Cost Proposal</b>	350	290	241.8	262.2	287.4	291	287	254	297	259	350	255
<b>Equal Pay for Montana Women</b>												
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	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	0	66	66	66	66
	1376	1270	653	1243	1163.6	1254.7	1178.4	1171.1	1256.5	929.5	1294.4	1263.1
		2	10	6	9	5	7	8	4	10	1	3

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: Blue Strike				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	61.75	Detailed descriptions and existing plans were included, clear extensive knowledge with regional information.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	60	Clear previous experience, and well communicated but light on detail. Wish they elaborated on the How.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission F	1.3.3	65	62	Great use of the CESA tool to quantify emissions, climate action tracker!, prioritization matrix is good.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	58	Description of methodology was good but light on detail, analysis around Justice40 was good.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	58.15	Detailed qualitative analysis, broken out and digestible. Official qualitative funding plan was great.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	61.25	Clear implementation of the workforce planning.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	30	Very detailed Gantt chart and tracking plan, and exceptional project management skills demonstrated.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	59	Clear experience with analysis and data gathering as well as experience with Climate Action Plans.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	59	Large projects for climate action on multiple scales, previous CCAPand PCAPs.
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	28.5	Multi-faceted approach and clear competencies.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	48.1	The proposal articulated the staff's competencies and relevant past projects through the resumes, selected work experience.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	48.1	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	P	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	190	Demonstrated strong ability to meet timelines with a realistic schedule and clear milestones.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	290.4	
		1310	1204.25	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1270.25	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: Directions Research				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	13	No actionable information included, process was not clearly outlined, did not demonstrate an understanding of this project or process. Proposal was just a reiteration of DEQs RFP.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	13	
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	13.3	
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	10	
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	11.7	
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	11.7	
Project Management	1.3.7	30	5.5	
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	Leading market and commercial experience. Only relevant experience was data collection. No relevant previous projects but some analysis work. No experience in working with governments on climate-related action plans.
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	16.7	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	16.5	
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	11.5	Very little relevant experience other than with data collection and analysis (but their data was not relevant).
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	17	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	14.8	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	P	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	100	High-level description only, little-to-no detail provided. Schedule was laid out but it was very light, and made little mention of contingency plans.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	241.8	
		1310	586.5	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.				
		66.0	66	
			652.5	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Energy and Environmental</b>				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	60.2	Very detailed list of additional data sources specific to MT. They provided more than just modeled data. Alternative methodologies. Details on the HOW were light, however.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	62	Thorough understanding of relevant policies. They have significant experience and have developed their own modelling tools for such projects.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	61.6	Clear understanding of impact and feasibility, brings to a high score for data-driven projects, bottom-up analysis for each measure.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	59.2	Ensured strategic decision-making and resource allocation. BW Research has relevant experience but the description of the HOW was light.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	61.25	Long history of supporting government agencies, especially in climate work with state agencies.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	61.6	Detailed, well-thought out 12-step plan. Expressed clear understanding of the importance and benefits of a workforce plan analysis. Firm has previous experience producing a workforce analysis.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	28.5	Collaboration with DEQ is valued, some flexibility on that note; high-value communication, clear planning, risk mitigation and resource planning was spelled out.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	57	Demonstrated capability to achieve successful outcomes, main relevant jobs consulting on climate issues, regional experience, CPRG experience, and PATHWAYS tool.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	57	
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	27.5	
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	48.7	Clear ability to execute and manage projects successfully, firm has specific regional experience, as well as proven success and expertise in similar initiatives.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	49	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	191	We would have liked Gantt type schedule but the information was clear, detailed and feasible. Robust timeline management, ability to meet milestones in a timely manner.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	262.2	
		1310	1176.75	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1242.75	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Environmental Resources</b>				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	56.2	Developed insights, tables, and trends, alignment with state and federal standards.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	51.2	Did have a forward-looking approach to future emissions but the section was weak on examples, repetitive of RFP, and there was an insufficient description of HOW.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	53.4	Clear understanding of reduction measures, data-driven decision-making, put a cap on measures, very high-level. Description of the work was light.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	46.3	Unsatisfying overall, with a light approach to measuring health impacts. No detail or information provided on how they were going to do this.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	51.6	Clear understanding of financial implications and resource allocation, but it was a bit too high-level, and thus light on description of the work needed from them.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	50.8	Missing the how. Firm demonstrated an understanding of the demand but no examples were given. Very little detail on actionable proposals.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	25.8	Provided schedule mitigation for potential issues (" <i>Possible Schedule Issues and Steps to Mitigate Schedule Risk</i> ") but some light detail for their meetings.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	53.3	Showcased a successful track record, but could have conveyed their success better. Light on experience with developing climate action plans.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	53.3	PCAPS for Indiana and North Dakota. Otherwise, good not great.
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	25	Key competencies are aligned with experience, proposal demonstrates ability to complete projects successfully. Several members are working on CPRG-based PCAPs and CCAPs. However, key staffers had relevant experience but not overwhelmingly so. Experience in environmental work in general, but not climate-specific.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	40.3	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	41.3	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	171.7	Not superior but good demonstration of the ability to meet project deliverables. Not the most comprehensive timeline, but did include risk and mitigation table.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	287.4	
		1310	1097.6	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1163.6	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: Ernst and Young				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	57.8	Firm provided a very clear, detailed description of the work and it clearly has the experience to do this inventory.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	59.2	Provided critical insight to scenarios and short/long term. Demonstrated a clear thought process.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	59.6	Firm identified opportunity for regional collaboration. We liked the bonus of their 'measure selection enabler'. Section 2 A-D, explaining how they will conduct the work, was very detailed and spelled out.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	63	Firm included non-financial burdens, as well as financial burdens and identified counties with highest LIDAC rating. Proposal provided a comprehensive path forward for this process.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	61.6	Included detail on the how. Description had a strong focus on state and sector implications. In addition to detailing the costs of each measure, EY will also ID funding opportunities to help cover those costs.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	59.1	Seemed a bit light on research for apprenticeship programs and other entities. Did include good implementation measures and detailed actions.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	26.5	Plan demonstrated knowledge about the project but it was light on detail and explanation.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	55.7	Lots of regional and state-specific experience, as well as experience with state agencies developing PCAPS. The sub vendor, Lotus, demonstrated good geopolitical experience in the NW and MT.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	56.7	Firm developed several PCAPs, so is familiar with the CPRG program. Firm also developed the CAPs for Bozeman and Missoula.
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	27.7	Each person brings a specific detail necessary for this project, most of the staff has relevant experience lending to their competencies. Long experience times including tribal and agency experience. Kylie Blank's past projects are light and John Hodges, the Lead, has not worked extensively on CAPs.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	46.3	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	44.5	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	190	Plan is thorough and detailed. Timelines were clear and comprehensive. Proposal effectively demonstrated good communication and ability to manage.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	291	
		1310	1188.7	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1254.7	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
<b>Offeror (Company) Name: Evolved Energy Research</b>				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	58.5	Detailed sectoral approach, and good recognition that the models and actual data need to be blended. Team liked the structured approach to tracking and reporting.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	58.9	Description was well thought out and they documented experience with their methodology. Impressed that the firm developed tools for this work.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	58.1	Description provided a good understanding of expected impacts of the reduction measures; however, description was not as clear as it could have been.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	57.1	Comprehensive evaluation of project outcomes, regional analysis of impacts, heavy modeling - all good. But no mention of communities in question.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	56.4	Detailed discussion on the overall costs/benefits to the state, which was good, but little discussion on analyzing the costs of each measure.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	51.3	Really light on detail, not a lot of information provided on how they will get data, reach out to state and regional entities, etc.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	24.7	A little light on detail but comprehensive explanation of working with DEQ, meeting frequency etc. Needed to be further developed.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	53.3	Experience in climate and carbon related projects but missing detailed experience in Climate specifics. State specific politics are not included.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	49.3	
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	24.3	Team has experience and proven ability to deliver results and proposed tasks. Their staff seemed light on LIDAC and workforce development analyses, and collectively, there was not much experience with government. Also, they were heavy on energy experience, but light on working on climate-specific projects.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	40.3	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	40.3	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	P	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	163.3	The description for managing this type of project was too general. There was no contingency plan for issues or hold-ups to the project. Project schedule near the very end was difficult to follow.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	286.6	
		1310	1112.4	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1178.4	



DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: GDS Assoc.				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	60.5	Strong presentation though it seemed light on discussion of collecting actual data, instead, there was a heavy reliance on modeled data.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	60.9	Firm had developed a Climate Policy Assessment tool, which provided a methodology to analyze policies/actions, to reflect a sound approach to future emission trends.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	61.3	Firm had a good grasp of quantifying impact of reduction measures, and the firm has "the implementation knowledge needed to balance generalized planning with specialization in organizational change management."
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	63.7	"Our team will take care to listen and understand individual state and community concerns. We will connect with state agencies, cities and townships, as well as community organizations ." Proposal had great detail that went Montana-specific.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	61.6	Demonstrated high level detail on how to calculate financial implications, effective planning and resource allocation, and included key metrics derived by the proposer.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	62.3	Well-developed and multi-faceted approach to completing a workforce analysis, included a community-based approach to identify job skills gap analysis and more.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	29.3	Proposal showed strong planning and coordination, clear deliverables and ability to meet project goals; very detailed and clear project management experience.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	57.3	Clear competencies within the realm of sustainability and environmental work, but no PCAP and CCAP experience. Lots
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	58.3	
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	28.2	Clear competencies, long term experience with relevant projects. Each team member brings a necessary facet for this project.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	47.8	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	47.2	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	189	Demonstrated enough competencies to meet necessary project timelines, the workplan is detailed and they proposed a comprehensive timeline.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	253.7	
		1310	1171.1	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	0	
			1171.1	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: ICF Inc.				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	63.7	Developed EPA's SIT tool, which demonstrates extensive knowledge of developing a state inventory, and they show clear success in these projects.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	62	Provided clear, concise detail per scenario, extremely relevant experience in this area.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission P	1.3.3	65	63.7	Thorough description of the what and how regarding this section was provided.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	57.8	Team felt the proposal could have included further detail but the firm did demonstrate a high-level understanding of the process to conduct this analysis. However, there was a noticeable absence of any form of outreach or comms with the LIDAC communities. Analysis is strictly technical, data-reliant.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	55.4	Section was missing necessary descriptive detail for this process, even though the firm is likely quite capable of crunching the relevant numbers.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	53.3	Felt light on incorporating the human element. Detail needed to further ensure a well-rounded analysis. This does not seem to be the firm's area of expertise.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	27.5	Proposal was well thought out, demonstrating the firm's understanding of the tasks/deliverables.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	57.3	The firm successfully managed similar projects, and showed an ability to meet our projects objective. This team is currently supporting 3 other states in the development of their CCAPs. They have achieved other elements that align directly to our proposed project.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	59.3	
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	26.2	The proposal demonstrated strong competency within the multiple facets to this projects, and demonstrated ability to execute the tasks of this project, as the team's backgrounds align closely with the proposed project.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	45.2	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	43.2	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	189.3	Thorough and complete planning process, demonstrated clear ability to meet proposed timelines and accomplish this project well.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	296.6	
		1310	1190.5	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1256.5	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: John Beath				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	46.8	Proposal hardly demonstrated a thorough process, missing significant and relevant detail.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	47.2	Too light of a proactive approach, description was unimpressive.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	43.9	The proposal only fairly demonstrated understanding of this task, but there was too few detail, and unclear scoping process. The responded did not include a methodology - it instead just talked briefly about developing one. Perhaps they can conduct this work, but their lack of experience working w/the non-regulatory community comes through.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	28.6	Description fell far short of the mark. The firm basically provided a statement that they will do this work, but did not detail how.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	30.3	Again, the firm basically provided a statement that they will do this work, but did not detail how.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	34.2	Proposal failed to explain what the firm brings to the table to enable them to do the work. They essentially repeated the work spelled out in the Scope of Work (SOW).
Project Management	1.3.7	30	6.8	Just reiterated what was said in the SOW but offered little by way of describing how they would manage the project, outside of this
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	Note: The 'Our Company' description just contained one poorly written paragraph describing the company's 'mission', w/o a description of the work the company did.
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	41.3	In Background section, they called the CCAP the 'Climate Change Action Plan', which is incorrect. Numerous other typos, misspellings, etc. (p.5 of SOW: US Forrest Service). This poor attention to detail gave us significant pause. Firm also did not demonstrate previous work with government entities.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	41.3	
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	19.7	Staff had some relevant technical experience but they were missing some core elements. They had marketing experience, but light on the technical side.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	36.7	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	36.3	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	101.7	Insufficient workplan
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	258.7	
		1310	863.5	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			929.5	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: Sustainability Solutions				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	60.9	Firm developed ScenaCommunity, an open-source energy and emissions model designed to study complex energy systems. The description was concise and provided clear detail for a viable path forward.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	59.3	Firm demonstrated a good approach for predicting emissions trends. Well-versed in projections.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	58.9	
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	62	Proposal included technical results from a 'liberal arts' approach - "Synthesis of engagement input and technical results". Firm had a clear approach for this analysis.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	60.25	Firm had a good perspective, and takes a very holistic approach to developing the cost impacts. "For SSG, climate planning is economic development planning, and our technical analysis and messaging support this perspective".
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	46.2	This section was - surprisingly and disappointingly - pretty light. No mention of engaging Labor-based entities like apprenticeship programs, DLI, etc. And it did not elaborate on the little detail they did include.
Project Management	1.3.7	30	22.3	The description lacked comprehensive detail to pursue this project successfully.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	56.7	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	56.7	The firm has led plenty of projects with governmental entities and conducted similar projects, and has experience with similar
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	26.5	
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	46.8	The proposal showed exactly who would do what and the experience that each team member had. Set their team up for success, and many had very relevant CCAP and PCAP
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	46.8	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	185	This was very thorough and detailed! Experience with all types of data gaps and strategies to overcome.
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	350	
		1310	1228.35	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1294.35	

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R				
Montana Climate Roadmap				
Individual Scoring Matrix				
The evaluator will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria, which are worth a total of 1,310 points: The Scope of Work Deliverables, Offeror Qualifications and Method/Work Plan for Providing Services of will be evaluated based on the scoring guide. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated based on the formula set forth in the criteria.				
Offeror (Company) Name: Tetra Tech				
CRITERION	SCOPE OF SERVICES	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION COMMENTS
<b>SCOPE OF WORK DELIVERABLES 30% of points for a possible 420 points</b>				
Develop Montana's Greenhouse Gas Inventory	1.3.1	65	63.7	Good description of how the firm will leverage the top-down and bottom-up approach and will utilize both. Comprehensive approach to tracking and execution. Overall, thoroughly detailed game plan provided.
Develop GHG Emission Projections	1.3.2	65	63.7	Demonstrated a clear understanding of emissions trends and their intersection with policy. Demonstrated clear professionalism. Team liked Table 33 - Partner and Programmatic Review for BAU Development, and also like the idea of the Collaborative Workshops, and the Comprehensive Modeling Toolkit Development.
Quantify Anticipated Emissions Reductions for Emission	1.3.3	65	62.6	Firm has the experience and know-how to leverage many robust tools and datasets. Description of highly detailed analysis provided.
Conduct a Benefits and LIDAC Analysis	1.3.4	65	64.3	Proposal showed a clear understanding of the importance of this section, as demonstrated through the detail included in this section as to how they would pursue this.
Conduct an Analysis of Costs of GHG Reductions	1.3.5	65	63.7	Effective Cost analysis per measure, PLUS prioritization framework guide.
Conduct a Workforce Planning Analysis	1.3.6	65	63	Firm will conduct a comprehensive economic sector impact analysis
Project Management	1.3.7	30	30	Firm demonstrated exceptional foresight for project needs and implications, and showed thorough project management skills for this kind of project.
<b>OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS 25% of points for a possible 260 points</b>				
<b>Company Profile and Relevant Past Projects</b>				
Years in Business (5 or more = 10 points; 1-5 = 5 points)	2.1.1	10	10	
Relevant Experience	2.1.1	60	58	Firm strives to produce exceptional climate-action related results through cost effectiveness and actionable proposals.
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.1	60	58.4	Proven track record in similar projects. Previous PCAP project experience.
<b>Staff Qualifications and Experience</b>				
Demonstrated Competencies	2.1.2	30	29.7	Narrative demonstrated clear staff competencies and exceptional expertise in the ability to execute this project.
Relevant Experience	2.1.2	50	49	
Relevant Past Projects	2.1.2	50	49.3	
<b>References</b>				
Complete contact information provided	2.1.3	P/F	p	
<b>Method/Work Plan for Providing Services 20% of points for a possible 280 points</b>				
Workplan demonstrates ability to meet project timelines	2.1.4	200	196.3	Very well thought-out and detailed schedule/workplan
Workplan identifies current workloads and staff commitment to other projects	2.1.4	80	80	
<b>COST PROPOSAL 25% of points for a possible 350 points</b>				
Cost Proposal (per Ratio Method)	3.1	350	255.4	
		1310	1197.1	
Agreeing to the Equal Pay for Montana Women is 5% bonus points of the total available points. Offerors will receive an additional 66 bonus points.		66.0	66	
			1263.1	

**DEQ-RFP-2025-0167R**  
**Montana Climate Roadmap**  
**SCORING GUIDE**

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

**Superior Response (95-100%):** 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 (75-94%):** 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 (60-74%):** 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 (59% or less):** A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

**DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R  
Montana Climate Roadmap**

**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 350. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 350 points. Offeror B would receive 200 points ( $\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 300 \text{ points} = 223$ ).

Cost			
<b>Points Available</b>		<b>350</b>	
Lowest Cost		\$448,896.00	
Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Points Earned	Notes:
Blue Strike	\$540,939.00	290.4	
Directions Research	\$649,838.00	241.8	
Energy & Env.	\$599,320.00	262.2	
Env. Resources	\$546,650.00	287.4	
Ernst & Young	\$540,000.00	291.0	
Evolved Energy	\$548,240.00	286.6	
GDS Assoc	\$619,362.00	253.7	
ICF	\$529,647.78	296.6	
John Beath	\$607,385.00	258.7	
Sustainability Sol	\$448,896.00	350.0	
Tetra Tech	\$615,261.46	255.4	
Vendor # 12		#DIV/0!	

## Scoring Calculator

SH	100.0%
SL	94.0%
GH	94.0%
GL	74.0%
FH	74.0%
FL	59.0%
FDH	59.0%
FDL	0.0%

### Total Points Available

Score		100
Superior (95-100%)	94 - 100	
Good (75-94%)	74 - 94	
Fair (60-74%)	59 - 74	
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 59	



Meeting Minutes

DEQ-RFP-2025-0176R  
Montana Climate Roadmap  
Dates of Evaluation  
October 30 and November 1  
9:00-3:30 on October 30  
9:00-12:00 PM on November 1  
Teams

Evaluation Committee Members:  
Rhonda Peters, Contracts Officer

Emma Gronda, Denise Roth-Barber, Taelyn Ehlke

Order of Evaluation: In order (as submitted through eMACS)  
Scoring Method: Consensus and Average